U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

PUBLIC BRIEFING MEETING FINAL

+ + + + +

IN THE NAME OF HATE: EXAMINING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN RESPONDING TO HATE CRIMES

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, MAY 11, 2018

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Suite 1150 at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at 9:00 a.m., Catherine Lhamon, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

CATHERINE E. LHAMON, Chair

PATRICIA TIMMONS-GOODSON, Vice Chair

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

DAVID KLADNEY, Commissioner

KAREN K. NARASAKI, Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

MAUREEN RUDOLPH, General Counsel

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

* Present via telephone

PANELISTS PRESENT:

ROY AUSTIN, Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis, LLP

SUSAN BRO, Heather Heyer Foundation

SHELBY CHESTNUT, Transgender Law Center

KRISTEN CLARKE, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
Under Law

SGT. DETECTIVE CARMEN CURRY, Boston, MA Police

Department

CYNTHIA DEITLE, Matthew Shepard Foundation

MICAH DAVID-COLE FLETCHER, Survivor of Portland MAX train stabbing

MELISSA GARLICK, Anti-Defamation League

ASSISTANT CHIEF MARC GARTH GREEN, Seattle, WA
Police

Department

CHIEF TERRENCE CUNNINGHAM, Deputy Executive

Director, International Association of

Chiefs of Police (IACP)

NICOLE JORWIC, The Arc

LYNN LANGTON, Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S.

Department of Justice

LENA MASRI, Council on American-Islamic Relations

ROBERT MOOSSY, Deputy Assistant Attorney General,

Criminal Section, U.S. Department of Justice

OLABISI OKUBADEJO, Ballard Spahr

NEAL R. GROSS

DEBBIE OSGOOD, Hogan Marren Babbo & Rose

KATHARINE PRESCOTT, LGBTQ Parent, Board Member

GLSEN

SUMAN RAGHUNATHAN, South Asian Americans Leading
Together

ANDREA SENTENO, Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund

ROBBY SOAVE, Reason Magazine

AVIVA VOGELSTEIN, Brandeis Center

STAFF PRESENT:

TERESA ADAMS

ROBERT AMARTEY

LASHONDRA BRENSON

KATHERINE CULLITON-GONZALEZ

BARBARA DE LA VIEZ

PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD

LATRICE FOSHEE

ALFREDA GREENE

WARREN ORR

JOHN RADCLIFFE

SARALE SEWELL

JUANA SMITH

MICHELE RAMEY

BRIAN WALCH

MARIK XAVIER-BRIER

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

SHERYL COZART

JASON LAGRIA

CARISSA MULDER

AMY ROYCE

RUKKU SINGLA

ALISON SOMIN

IRENA VIDULOVIC

A G E N D A

Introductory Remarks: Chair Catherine E. Lhamon6
Panel One: Local Law Enforcement19
Panel Two: Community Stakeholders94
Panel Three: Policy and Legal Experts166
Panel Four: Current and Former
Federal Officials236
Open Public Comment Session313
Adjourn 332

PROCEEDINGS

2	9:00 a.m.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Good morning, this
4	briefing of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
5	comes to order at 9:00 a.m. on May 11, 2018, and
6	takes place at the Commission Headquarters, 1331
7	Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, Suite 1150,
8	Washington, D.C. 20425.
9	I'm Chair Catherine Lhamon. The
10	Commissioners present at this briefing in addition
11	to me are Vice Chair Patricia Timmons-Goodson,
12	Commissioner Adegbile, Commissioner Heriot,
13	Commissioner Kirsanow, Commissioner Kladney,
14	Commissioner Narasaki, and Commissioner Yaki.
15	A quorum of the Commissioners is
16	present. I see that the court reporter is present
17	and that the Staff Director is present.
18	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: Yes.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
20	INTRODUCTORY REMARKS: CHAIR CATHERINE E. LHAMON
21	CHAIR LHAMON: I welcome everyone to our
22	briefing titled In the Name of Hate: Examining the
23	Federal Government's Role in Responding to Hate
24	Crimes.
25	In today's briefing, the Commission

examines best practices for local law enforcement on collecting and reporting data and the role of the Justice and Education Departments in prosecution and prevention of these heinous acts.

We will hear from local law enforcement and federal government officials, experts, advocates, and survivors of hate. Testimony from this briefing will form an integral basis for the Commission's eventual report to the President, the Congress, and the American people regarding the state of hate in America.

The Commission, which voted together across partisan lines, with seven of our eight members voting to take up today's briefing, returns to a topic that the Commission has addressed multiple times in our 60 year history.

To my dismay, despite important progress the country has made in addressing hate over time, we nonetheless now confront some of the same unconscionable woes we have confronted in years past.

In 1983, the Commission recognized that creating a national database of hate crimes would be important for addressing and preventing such crimes. But today, even after Congress has

2.2

required such a database, we live substantial deficits in the data collection, about which I know we will hear more today.

In 1983, this Commission warned against taking any federal actions that would give perceived permission to act out hate. Certainly, that warning rings true still today.

I look forward to hearing today's testimony to help guide effective recommendations in our current reality about how we as a nation can fulfill our ideals of a pluralistic, equitable democracy, respectful of all persons who live and work among us.

Avoiding giving perception any of permission to act out hate necessarily includes prevention work, separate and apart from That work, when it is effective, can prosecution. avoid loss of life or violent harm and can secure productive civic and community engagement that benefits all.

I look forward to hearing from today's presenters about effective preventive efforts. And when that prevention fails, hate crimes prosecution can also send important corrective messages to communities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Just a few days ago, local prosecutors secured a conviction for illegally firing a weapon from a Maryland man who identified himself as a Ku Klux Klan Imperial Wizard, who was recorded on video firing his gun towards a black man counterprotesting at the Charlottesville Unite the Right Rally last year. These prosecutors did not secure a conviction for a hate crime and the prosecution was not federal.

One set of questions we take up today involve whether and when local prosecution without a hate enhancement is sufficient to respond to hate motivated criminality.

In the wake of the anti-Semitic and race based violence in Charlottesville last year this Commission unanimously stated that, quote, white supremacy and religious intolerance dishonor national commitments we have forged over time, and violence in the name of these ideologies must be met swiftly and forcefully with condemnation and unwavering and unified response.

Some communities are already living this unified response. While I have been devastated, as so many of us have, by news reports of acts of violence and vandalism motivated by

2.2

hate, I have also drawn hope and inspiration from the communities that have come together to condemn manifestations of hate, displaying that unified response.

Citing just one example, last year, after several Jewish cemeteries were vandalized, including in Saint Louis, Missouri, several Muslim activists started a fund-raising effort to ensure that the cemeteries could be rebuilt and repaired.

As much as that and similar stories of communities rebuilding and connecting together to strengthen themselves against hate reaffirm for me the strong pull of equity, I was astounded to learn in the course of preparing for today's briefing that the majority of hate and bias motivated crimes are committed by persons 29 years old and younger, with approximately 17 percent under the age of 17.

That statistic underscores the need for effective response to hate incidents in schools, ensuring that we train the nation's students toward productive civic engagement, not toward hate.

I look forward to benefitting from the experiences and expertise of those who will present to us today and I look forward to working with my colleagues to draw conclusions and make

2.2

1	recommendations after reviewing the materials
2	submitted to the Commission and benefitting from
3	today's briefing.
4	Today's briefing features 21
5	distinguished speakers who will provide us with an
6	array of viewpoints, as well as the opportunity to
7	hear from the public.
8	Panel 1 includes local law enforcement
9	officials, as well as representatives from a
10	national law enforcement group and the Department
11	of Justice and a journalist.
12	Panel 2 includes community
13	stakeholders, including advocates and family
14	members and survivors of hate incidents.
15	Panel 3 includes policy and legal
16	experts. Panel 4 includes current and former
17	government officials who are serving or who have
18	served at the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the
19	FBI, and the Department of Education.
20	I note here that the Commission staff
21	invited current officials from the relevant offices
22	at the Department of Education, but they declined
23	to participate in today's briefing.
24	I thank all who join us now to focus on
25	this critical topic. Your views help us to fulfill

1 our mission to be the nation's eyes and ears 2 civil rights. I now turn to Commissioner Heriot, who 3 4 has asked to speak briefly to today's topic. 5 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you, Madam I want to thank everyone responsible for 6 Chair. 7 putting together this briefing. But let me sav 8 that I am not really a fan of most hate crimes 9 laws, which I believe have a tendency to fuel 10 identity politics at a time when the nation needs 11 to come together. 12 In particular, I oppose the federal 13 hate crimes statute passed in 2009. I don't have 14 time to mention all the special problems with hate 15 crimes law, in particular with federalizing hate 16 crimes law, but let me mention just one. 17 know that the Constitution's all 18 jeopardy clause prohibits the government 19 from trying someone again after they've been 20 acquitted for a crime. 21 Many people don't know, however, that 2.2 the clause does not apply when both the state and 23 the federal government seek to prosecute the same 24 defendant. 25 their They both get chance to

1 prosecute, even in the event of an acquittal in the 2 Such rule might have been other system. a tolerable back when the number of federal crimes 3 was small, but now that large numbers of crimes are 4 5 potential federal crimes, it is essentially become 6 a two bites at the apple rule. The Hate Crimes Act is a significant 7 8 contributor to this. It defines hate crimes very, 9 very broadly. It doesn't actually require group 10 hatred, hence, a Hate Crimes Act is actually a 11 misnomer. It's enough that a violent crime occur 12 13 of, that's a quote from the because statute, 14 someone's race, sex, disability, et cetera. 15 crimes you wouldn't think of as hate crimes are 16 actionable under this law. That's not a good idea. 17 Note that hate crimes are frequently 18 the most politically sensitive crimes, and those 19 are exactly the crimes where a double jeopardy 20 prosecution protection is most important. 21 There will be pressure to reprosecute. 2.2 We've already seen that kind of pressure with the 23 Trayvon Martin case. We're likely to see more of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you,

it as time goes by.

24

25

Commissioner

Heriot. Commissioner Adegbile is one of the cosponsors of the project, also will help us introduce the briefing.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Good morning.

Today, we are here to speak about a subject of vital importance to the nation. Equal protection of the law, both as a Constitutional matter, but also as a value, is something that runs to our core.

Crimes, that is actions, not just thoughts or ideology, motivated by hate against a member of a protected class strike a blow against the rule of law, our commitment to liberty communities, equality, our families, our children, and sometimes, as we will hear today from know this people who sadly from personal experience, against individuals, that is, fellow neighbors targeted, who are terrorized, attacked, maimed, or sometimes even killed by hate motivated violence.

These crimes strike a blow against what it is to be a nation based on the values that we hold dear in America.

Today, we remember Mr. Byrd and his unspeakable murder in Jasper, Texas, dragged behind

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

a pickup truck to his death. We remember, too, Mr. Shepard, a 21-year-old college student, a gay college student who, because of his identity, was murdered in Wyoming.

We remember also too many others who are not here today, but who we think about. And most importantly, we recommit ourselves to learn about what local and federal officers, law officers, can enforcement do to prevent and prosecute these crimes.

We learn about efforts to collect data and information, so that we can understand the nature and frequency of these crimes, and so our policy and law enforcement efforts can be based on information and data.

And it is my hope too that we will hear the role that law enforcement and political leaders can play in speaking about the injury that these crimes strike against our core American values.

The United States is much as as anything else an idea that people should have an opportunity to live their lives regardless of what religion is, their their race, their gender identity, and the like.

We are grateful today for all of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

witnesses who are engaged in the continuing work to make sure that we live up to our promises in the democracy, and we look forward to being informed by all of you. Thank you very much.

CHAIR LHAMON: I now turn us to begin our briefing with a few housekeeping items. deep thanks to the Commission staff, who researched and brought today's briefing into being, Culliton Xavier-Brier and Kathy Gonzales, in addition to critical support from Teresa Adams, Sheryl Cozart, LaShonda Brenson, Pam Dunston, Latrice Foshee, Laura Gevarter, Jason Lagria, Tina Louise-Martin, Mayowa Olubakinde, Warren Orr, Lenore Ostrowsky, Krista Painter, Maureen Rudolph, Sarale Sewell, Wanda Smith, Irena Vidulovic, Brian Walch, Michele Yorkman-Ramey, and Shimeng Zeng, for preparing and making logistical details for today work.

I thank Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson for spearheading much of the work for today's briefing and Staff Director Morales for his leadership as well.

I caution all speakers, including our Commissioners, to refrain from speaking over each other for ease of transcription and to allow for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

sign language translation to my right.

2.2

For any individuals who might need to view the sign language translation, there are seats available in clear view. I ask everyone present to please silence your phones and not to take flash photos to minimize health risk to persons present.

After our four panels and an afternoon break, we will reconvene at 5:00 p.m. for a public comment period. If you are interested in participating in the public comment period, during which each person will have up to three minutes to speak, we will be honored to hear from you.

In total, the oral public comment period will last no longer than an hour and a half, with 30 spots allotted on a first-come first-served basis. If you did not already sign up for one of the first ten spots online, you may sign up at the registration desk beginning at 3:30 p.m., the spots will be available until filled.

For any member of the public who would like to submit materials for our review, our public record will remain open until Monday, June 11, 2018. Materials can be submitted by mail to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Office of Civil Rights Evaluation, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue

Northwest, Suite 1150, Washington, D.C. 20425, or by email, hatecrimes@usccr.gov.

During the briefing, each panelist will have seven minutes to speak. After each panel presentation, Commissioners will have the opportunity to ask questions within the allotted period of time and I will recognize Commissioners who wish to speak.

I will strictly enforce the seven minute allotment given to each panelist to present his or her statement. And so, to avoid my cutting you off, I do encourage you to stay within that time.

And unless we did not receive your testimony before today, you may assume that we have read your statements, so you do not need to read them to us as your opening remarks. Please focus your remarks on today's topic.

I also note that we have a very tight schedule for the day, with nearly two dozen experts who will speak before us, so I ask my fellow Commissioners to be cognizant of the number of panelists in the interest of each Commissioner to ask questions.

Please be brief in asking your

2.2

questions so we can move quickly and efficiently through today's schedule, and I will step in to move things along if necessary.

I also note that today's topic is a sensitive one and we have several panelists who will speak from personal experiences. I ask our audience to be cognizant and respectful of all our panelists, and I ask my fellow Commissioners to keep that in mind during our question and answer period.

Panelists, please notice the system of warning lights that we have set up. When the light turns from green to yellow, that means that two minutes remain. When the light turns red, you should conclude your statements so you do not risk my cutting you off mid-sentence.

My fellow Commissioners and I will do our part and keep our questions and comments concise.

PANEL ONE: LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

CHAIR LHAMON: Now, we turn to our first panel of law enforcement officials. The order in which they will speak is: Sergeant Detective Carmen Curry of the Boston Police Department; Assistant Chief Marc Garth Green of the Seattle Police

2.2

1 Department; Retired Chief Terrence Cunningham, 2 Deputy Executive Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. 3 Unfortunately, Chief Will 4 Johnson 5 the Arlington, Texas Police Department and head of the Civil Rights Subcommittee for IACP could not be 6 7 with us today, but we are very grateful, 8 Cunningham, that you have stepped in at the last 9 minute, thank you; Robert Moossy, Deputy Attorney 10 General at the U.S. Department of Justice; 11 finally, Robby Soave, Associate Editor at Reason 12 Magazine and I note also a member of our D.C. State Advisory Committee. 13 14 thank much for So, you very your 15 service to us in that capacity and also for sharing 16 your expertise with us today. 17 I note that Detective Kevin Hamm of the 18 Phoenix, Arizona Police Department was scheduled to 19 speak, but he was unfortunately unable to be with 20 us today. His written statement will be added to 21 the record for the Commission's consideration. 2.2 So, Sergeant Detective Curry, please 23 And you'll want to turn your microphone on. begin. 24 Thank you.

SGT. DETECTIVE CURRY: Good morning.

CHAIR LHAMON: Good morning.

2.2

SGT. DETECTIVE CURRY: I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the Commissioners for having this event and having me here today to talk about this most important issue of hate crimes.

I've been working in the Civil Rights
Unit of the Boston Police Department for 20-plus
years and have an opportunity to look at these and
deal with victims personally.

I think we're seeing an increase of hate crimes that are happening on a national level. When I first went into the unit, I was of the assumption that hate crimes would be eradicated by now, but what we see is that that's not happening.

I think I want to share some, what I believe are some best practices. And one of the things that I think is key for law enforcement agencies is to establish a hate crimes unit.

The Boston Police established a hate crimes unit over 40 years ago and they've had the opportunity to maintain this unit. And so, that's all we do there. So, we look at hate crimes, we're involved with victims, and I think it's crucial that police departments have someone who is going to look specifically at hate crimes.

There are not a lot of agencies that unit that does that, that's dedicated have specifically to deal with hate crimes. I think unit sends а clear message to community, would-be would-be to haters or that the issue of hate crimes perpetrators is important. It's important, it sends a message to those internally with the police departments.

We see that, in the climate that we're living in today, there is an increase in and a boldness of the verbiage that's being used by our leaders, by the media, by politicians. We see social media, Facebook, Snapchat, Twitter, they all play a role in this increase that we're seeing today.

I think establishing a civil rights unit with a diverse group of dedicated officers solely to investigate hate crimes would play a key role in getting victims to report hate crimes. When we establish that unit, we establish trust with the community.

It's important to establish that trust.

It's important to develop relationships in the community. It's important to have community outreach. When you have a unit or an individual

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 who is dedicated specifically for hate crimes, they 2 become experts, because that's all they do that's what's really important here. 3 We need community advocacy agencies, we 4 5 need the clergy, we need the local, state, and 6 federal agencies to come together. In Boston, we 7 do a lot of community outreach. We meet with a lot 8 of people to sit at the table and talk about this 9 issue. 10 One of the things in community outreach 11 like, when the holidays are coming is things 12 around, to meet with the groups. 13 So, we see Ramadan is coming on May 15, 14 we get out and we go and we introduce ourselves and 15 let them know that we're aware of 16 happening in the community, we're aware of 17 season that we're in now, to let them know we're there, to let them know to be aware, to look around 18 19 in their surroundings. 20 And that's one of the things that believe establishes a trust relationship, when they 21 2.2 know that the police are going to take these crimes 23 seriously.

don't come

forward

We talk about data collection,

Victims

different reasons.

24

25

for

it starts at the head. It starts with the police department clearly articulating that responding, documenting, and prosecuting hate crimes is a priority, these types of crimes will not be tolerated. It must trickle down from the top.

We must encourage victims to report hate crimes. There are many factors why victims don't report hate crimes. It could be contingent upon many factors.

Their immigration status, this is a huge one, we are constantly telling advocates and victims that their status has no bearing on their case, nor will we look into their status. In most instances, victims with illegal status will not move forward. Victims do not speak English and are afraid to come forward.

Victims in the LGBTQ community, in many instances, they're not out, so they're not going to come forward to report these crimes. Victims of color may have issues with mistrust with the police departments, or they may have language barriers.

The Community Disorders Unit, where we work, the Civil Rights Unit, we're a victim-oriented unit and so, we hand-hold victims and we take them through the whole process.

2.2

It doesn't matter whether it's a Part 1 crime or whether it's just a vandalism, if the person is selected because of who they are, we're going to hold their hand and we're going to take them through the whole process.

We have people who won't come forward because they lead very busy lives and they don't want to go through the process because it's too disruptive.

One of the challenges that we're seeing is college campus incidents don't get reported to the local police departments. They tend to keep those on the inside, which is a challenge for the local police departments and it's a challenge for reporting.

I believe that for law enforcement, training is the key, because if a police officer does not know how to identify a hate crime, then it's not going to be reported. And so, that's where we see that there's a decrease in reporting.

Particularly in Massachusetts, when we look at the numbers of how many Massachusetts law enforcement agencies do not participate in reporting hate crimes, I believe that they don't report them because they don't know how to identify

2.2

what a hate crime is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so, training is key. Training is key and training with victims and letting them know, understand what a hate crime is, what it isn't, and what the resources are available to them.

If an officer isn't documenting the incident correctly, it's not going to go to court.

No one is going to be arrested, there's not going to be any prosecution of that incident.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much,
Sergeant Detective. We'll now hear from Assistant
Chief Marc Garth Green.

ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman. And thank you Commissioners for having me here today. I am Marc Garth Green and I represent the Seattle Police Department at this time. Next slide, please.

So, for our Bias Crime Unit, it was staffed in 2015 as a dedicated detective, it's centered out of our Homicide and Assault Units. They are dedicated for bias crimes in the investigation, data gathering, and the analysis, as well as our public outreach. We have now moved that up to two detectives this year, based on the

1 number of increases that we are seeing. Next 2 slide, please. So, our legal authority comes from our 3 4 Revised Code of Washington 9A.36.080 5 Seattle Municipal Code 12A.06.115. The Seattle Municipal Code actually adds different classes to 6 7 We add homelessness, marital status, political 8 ideology, or parental status at the age, 9 misdemeanor level as well. 10 Both of our statutes here are 11 so that if we cannot prove the bias severable, 12 elements, we can go forward with the underlying 13 crime as well, so that allows us to work on both 14 fronts at the same time. Next slide, please. 15 So, at the Seattle Police Department, 16 we gather our data in coordination and in following 17 the Uniform Crime Reporting Standards set by the FBI and report on the NIBRS, the National Incident 18 19 Based Reporting System. The three types of incidents that 20 break it down into are the malicious harassments 21 incidents themselves, which are sometimes referred 2.2 23 to as hate crimes or bias crimes. That's the legal 24 definition of the crime.

one

are

next

25

bias

with

crimes

elements, which is generally when a crime occurs and during the commission of that crime, some type of derogatory language is used.

While not an element of the crime, it is something that we truly look at. This is where we see our greatest degree of increase in our crimes in the City of Seattle are bias elements, not actually malicious harassment crimes.

And we have non-criminal bias incidents, which are used primarily when folks are using derogatory language, but not in a criminal nature. Next slide, please.

One of the important things with it, obviously, for us is the outreach to the community. We have seen an increase in reporting over the last periods of several years that we've been keeping our data, to include a larger degree after we've had, on the political side, the national front, of the #MeToo movement and other movements along those lines.

Where we're emboldened in the City of Seattle and pleased is that we have seen an increase in reporting by witnesses, people who are walking down the street and observe something happening in front of them, across the street from

2.2

1 them, and feel that it's not right and will call in 2 to us. great thing 3 So, that is for а 4 because it means that our outreach is working, that 5 our folks in our city are not tolerating that type of behavior. 6 One of the ideas that came in channel 7 8 that we worked very hard on was what we call a Safe 9 Place Program. And it started out with the LGBTO 10 community in a specific geographic region of our 11 city. 12 it is training But what through 13 businesses that train their staff that when people 14 were victims of malicious harassment hate 15 crimes, that they could go into those businesses, 16 speak with those employees there. Those employees 17 would call 911 and offer them a safe place to wait 18 until police were coming to take their report. 19 So, over time, we've spread it citywide 20 to over 6,000 businesses in Seattle and we've had a success with this program 21 great degree of 22 really enjoy that. Move forward, please. 23 Bias Crime Coordinator Our does 24 community outreach, engage in frequent community 25 meetings, especially with the under-reporting communities that we've identified in the City of Seattle.

We have a variety of different communities that do not speak English, and so, we try to partner with the Seattle Office of Civil Rights, have interpreters, and then, move out to those communities as well, to really meet with them.

We do a lot with cultural centers and religious institutions as well to make sure that that voice is getting out, as well as issuing pamphlets in all different types of languages to help people. Next slide, please. And we'll skip to the next one, thank you.

One of the things that we're really excited about in the City of Seattle is we have publication dashboards that gather our data. They're updated daily for internal facing, however, they're updated monthly for external facing.

So, anybody in the city of Seattle can, or anywhere else in the nation, can log on and go to our crime dashboard and take a look at what's going on within their city, within their geographic area, their neighborhoods as well.

It's broken down to that, captures the

2.2

types of incidents, how they're broken down, and the actual associated offense type of those incidents. So, they can go to that.

There are also links to our outreach there and, as the Detective Sergeant said, that is probably one of the biggest things that law do, is to enforcement can try to sever that mistrust that has been built over years.

A lot of it comes from different groups that have moved to this country, where they have suffered abuse by law enforcement in their own countries, failures on those legal systems, and those memories hold dear to them and they come over with that interpretation as well.

And so, meeting with them in their place of location and their place of safety to talk about how we do things differently here. With that, one of the things that we do is, when a severe malicious harassment crime takes place, we actually have a team that moves out into the community.

It is composed of our Bias Crimes detectives, some community members, and then, also our U.S. State Attorney, one of his deputies goes out as well. We meet with the victim, in part for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the victim, but in a larger part, it's really for the community.

We mobilize with the community to let them know that this is not tolerated, to find out what they need to restore themselves to a sense of security, and then, for follow-up as to how to prevent these in the future. So, we use that program quite often when we need to as well.

But that is -- the biggest thing, as Detective Sergeant alluded to also, with immigration status being an issue right now, we also work under the premise that we do not ask, we're not concerned with immigration status at the time of reporting or through the <u>follow-up</u>, to ensure that justice is served for those folks.

As far as continued outreach, continued legislation, continued law enforcement activities as well. Obviously, the very first step in any type of these things is for the enforcement portion, for police to get in there.

What we see as a correlation of, in higher crime areas, we have higher bias related incidents. And on average, 40 percent of ours in the City of Seattle are conducted by people suffering from mental crisis or under the influence

2.2

1 alcohol or narcotics. So, those are two 2 different areas that we need to address as well. 3 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very 4 Now, we'll hear from Chief Cunningham. 5 CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: Great. Good morning, Madam Chairman and Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson and 6 7 distinguished Commissioners. My name is Terrence 8 Cunningham, I'm the Deputy Executive Director of 9 the International Association of Chiefs of Police. 10 I'm a former chief of the Wellesley, Massachusetts served 11 Police Department, and Ι also the 12 President of the IACP from 2015 to 2016. 13 The IACP is the world's largest 14 association of law enforcement leaders, with more 15 than 30,000 members in over 150 countries. 16 crime and hate incidents are heinous acts that 17 demand immediate attention, response, and 18 resolution whenever possible. 19 What makes hate crimes so malicious is that their impact spreads far beyond the direct 20 victims and their families. These crimes have far-21 2.2 reaching effects on large segments of communities 23 in which they take place, spreading fear, toxicity 24 throughout our communities.

has

been

The

IACP

25

the

discussing

challenges and impact of hate crimes for close to two decades, when we held our first summit on the issue and developed recommendations and a guide for officer response and investigation to hate crimes.

Since that time, developed we've model policy concept and issues paper in conjunction with the Anti-Defamation in League 2016, and on the investigation of hate crimes, aid to law enforcement agencies.

Additionally, the IACP has partnered the Lawyers Committee for Civil recently with Rights Under Law to create an advisory committee that encompasses diverse representation from enforcement, civil rights organizations, and academia.

We have hosted a series of meetings to hear perspectives from hate crime survivors, academic experts, national and grassroots advocacy leaders, and law enforcement officials on barriers and best practices to combat hate.

The end product will be a summary report outlining the critical issues and action items detailing the discussions from the advisory group and it will be released between this summer and early fall of 2018. It is a very comprehensive

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

document that we will clearly make available 1 2 this committee. Today, I'd like to focus on some of the 3 4 challenges law enforcement faces when it comes to 5 Under-reporting of hate crimes. hate 6 statistics, you've heard from the last as two 7 presenters. greatest 8 the years, one of the barriers confronting 9 to and overcoming hate violence has been the lack of statistical data on 10 11 the occurrence and nature of these crimes. 12 Participation in national the FBI's reporting system, which, like the rest of the UCR, 13 14 Uniform Crime Reporting Program, is voluntary. 15 While participation has increased over the years, 16 participation levels are seriously lacking. 17 We know that the figures as reported to 18 the FBI strongly suggest a serious under counting 19 of hate crimes and that there is a need for more 20 training and education the importance on and 21 utility of hate crime reporting and data collection 2.2 as a tool for law enforcement in preventing these 23 crimes and safeguarding the public.

agencies,

While more data needs to be reported by

we

also

enforcement

law

24

25

our

need

communities to report hate crime incidents. The most recent hate crime victimization publication from the Bureau of Justice Statistics shows that 54 percent of violent hate crime victimizations were not reported to police during the period of 2011 to 2015.

As law enforcement, we need to make sure that our communities understand that we want these incidents to be reported and that no hate crime or any other crime is insignificant.

We never want our communities to feel that they shouldn't bother us. It's our job and it's clearly why we chose this career, we want to protect and serve.

So, directly to the challenges of hate crimes, investigating. The decision of a law enforcement official whether to classify a crime as a hate crime and the separate decision of a local prosecutor whether or not to bring hate crime charges can be very complicated.

It is extremely difficult to determine the motives of one's heart and their intentions.

Law enforcement executives need to ensure investigators are looking at each individual case on its own merits and take a proactive approach on

2.2

identifying potential crimes with a hate nexus.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

In today's world, the internet provides extremists with an unprecedented ability to spread hate and recruit followers. Individual racists and organized hate groups now have the power to reach global audiences of millions to communicate among like-minded individuals easily, inexpensively, and anonymously.

The ease of sending internet hate messages and threats across states lines can make perpetrators and victims difficult to identify and locate, and creates criminal jurisdictional issues and pose special challenges to investigators.

And although hate speech is offensive and hurtful, the First Amendment usually protects such expressions. However, when speech contains direct credible threats against an identifiable individual, organization, institution, it or becomes criminal conduct. Regardless of the mode of delivery, hate speech containing criminal threats is not acceptable and it is not protected by the First Amendment.

In order for law enforcement to be truly effective, officers and agencies must have the active assistance and support from every facet

of our communities.

2.2

Establishing and maintaining these crucial relationships in order to build a mutual understanding and level of trust with diverse communities requires time and is an ongoing effort. To maintain and establish strong community-police relations, we must work towards prevention of hate crimes in our communities.

In order to effective prevent and respond to hate crimes, I have a few action item recommendations that I believe the federal government, law enforcement, our communities, and elected officials could take.

Number one, the National Criminal Justice Commission. There is a need to establish a National Criminal Justice Commission. This would not just be another study.

The establishment of such a committee would set forth a strategic blueprint for criminal justice that would guide efforts to protect our communities for years to come. The last commission was created in 1965 and produced landmark changes for the criminal justice system.

Training. Law enforcement officers need training to identify, investigate, and report

1	hate crimes. Training is also needed to help
2	understand the victim's culture, language, and what
3	questions to ask.
4	Enhancing community-police relations.
5	Positive relationships been law enforcement and
6	communities will encourage members to report hate
7	crimes and minimize the chance of retaliatory
8	crimes.
9	Enhanced reporting. Provide
10	incentives, including additional financial
11	resources, to states and localities to report crime
12	data, particular hate crimes, to the FBI.
13	Specialized units. Funding to create
14	specialized hate crime units or to help agencies
15	team up to develop multi-agency task forces.
16	Speak out against hate crimes. The
17	President, members of Congress, state and local
18	elected officials all need to condemn acts of
19	bigotry every chance they can.
20	And on behalf of the IACP, I conclude
21	by thanking you again for the opportunity to appear
22	before you today and would be happy to answer any
23	questions that you may have. Thank you.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much,
25	Chief Cunningham. Now, we'll hear from Mr. Moossy.

MR. MOOSSY: Good morning. It's really a pleasure to be here. I'm a 24-year career employee of the DOJ Civil Rights Division and I am delighted to be here with my fellow members of law enforcement and a journalist to talk about the important work we're doing to combat bias motivated violent crimes, often called hate crimes.

I've spent the majority of my time with the Civil Rights Division prosecuting a variety of crimes, including law enforcement misconduct, human trafficking, and hate crimes. And I can say with confidence that combating hate crimes is among the highest priorities for the Civil Rights Division and for this Justice Department.

As you know, hate crimes can be prosecuted in state or federal courts, depending on each jurisdiction's laws. We in the Civil Rights Division, working with our U.S. Attorney partners and the FBI, prosecute hate crimes in federal courts across the nation.

We're committed federal to using prosecutions to make clear that any act of bias motivated violence is unacceptable and that the Department will use our investigative and prosecutorial authority to bring perpetrators

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

justice.

The FBI is currently investigating over 200 hate crimes nationwide. Since January 2017, the Department has brought hate crimes charges against more than two dozen defendants and obtained 22 convictions.

And some examples are, on April 30, two Texas defendants were sentenced to 15 and 20 years for using social media dating platforms for gay men to arrange to meet victims in their homes where they brutally assaulted them.

On April 18, after a four week trial, a federal jury convicted three men in Kansas of conspiracy to use a weapon of mass destruction and conspiracy to commit a hate crime. The defendants plotted to blow up an apartment complex in an effort to kill the Somali Muslim immigrants who lived there and worshiped at a mosque there.

Also in April, three East Los Angeles men agreed to plead guilty to federal civil rights and racketeering charges for participating in a 2014 fire-bombing intended to drive African American residents inside of the Ramona Gardens housing developing out of that development.

In March, following a three day trial,

a jury found a man guilty of committing a federal hate crime when he used a stun device during a racially motivated assault of a neighbor at his apartment complex in Utah.

Evidence presented at trial showed that the defendant shouted racial slurs at the victim's seven-year-old son as he rode a scooter in the common area of the apartment and then, when his father tried to stand up for his son, the defendant used the stun gun to assault him.

In February of 2018, a Virginia man was indicted for a hate crime for threatening employees of the American Arab Institute.

Also in February 2018, the Department announced the indictment of a dual United States and Israeli citizen in three different jurisdictions for hate crimes and other offenses arising from alleged threats he made to Jewish community centers across the United States, specifically in the Florida, the Israeli Embassy, and the Anti-Defamation League here in D.C., well as multiple other Jewish organizations across the United States.

And in November 2017, the Department cross-designated one of our Civil Rights Division

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

prosecutors to assist in the state murder trial of an Iowa man, who was ultimately convicted of murdering Kedarie Johnson, a transgendered teenager. And he now faces life imprisonment.

So, while my background is federal prosecutions, the Department of Justice takes a broader approach in responding to hate crimes across our nation.

Attorney General Sessions has made hate crimes one of the pillars of his Task Force on Crime Reduction and Public Safety.

The Civil Rights Division has convened a Hate Crimes Enforcement and Prevention Working Group, composed of the Civil Rights Division, the FBI, the U.S. Attorneys Offices, the Office of Community Oriented Policing, our Office of Justice Programs, and our Community Relations Service, known as CRS.

And we've been working together to figure out how can the Department of Justice bring all of our authorities and abilities and resources together to really, first and foremost, federal and state investigators identify and to report these crimes and how to respond to communities that have been harmed by these crimes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Our local police and sheriff officers 2 important partners for identifying are and investigating hate crimes. They are the women and 3 4 the men who respond to violence on the streets, 5 they are the officials who will identify a hate 6 crime when it happens and collect the on-scene 7 evidence and leads. These local law enforcement have the 8 agencies must support they need 9 identify, investigate, and report hate crimes. 10 Likewise, because there are many more 11 state and local prosecutors than there are federal 12 prosecutors, our local district attorneys must also 13 have the state laws and resources they need to 14 crimes in the local prosecute hate and state 15 courts. 16 Also important the victims are 17 and community-based organizations that themselves 18 support victims. This is especially true when it 19 comes to reporting hate crimes to law enforcement. 20 really working the We are across 21 Department to figure out, how can both law 22 enforcement and victims better report hate crimes? 23 Accurate data helps localities better target crime. 24 And have to understand why 88

percent of police departments that participate

the UCR, the Uniform Crime Reporting, reported that they had zero hate crimes in 2016. And why four law enforcement agencies in jurisdictions with more than 250,000 residents didn't even report hate crimes data to the FBI.

We also have to understand and address why, according to crime victim surveys, more than half of hate crime victims do not report hate crimes when they happen.

About a quarter of those who don't report say that they didn't believe the police would want to be bothered or get involved, that the police would be inefficient or ineffective, or that the police would cause trouble to the victims. And I know you have a panelist later to talk about hate crimes data.

We are working really hard to improve our training and outreach, because we believe this will in turn improve our ability to identify and report hate crimes and then, investigate and prosecute them.

So, since January 2018, our Community Relations Service has hosted five hate crimes forums in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Texas, Oregon, and New York, bringing together 50 to 400 federal

2.2

1	and local law enforcement, community leaders,
2	federal agencies, and advocates. And we're picking
3	more locales to do these trainings in the coming
4	years.
5	CRS also recently updated two
6	trainings, one aimed at engaging and building
7	partnerships with Muslim Americans and another at
8	engaging and building partnerships with Sikh
9	Americans. These are aimed at both law enforcement
10	and community leaders to better establish community
11	relationships with those populations.
12	Our FBI has a national training
13	initiative that reaches literally thousands of
14	people every year to train them about hate crimes
15	and civil rights, both in law enforcement and in
16	the community.
17	And we in the Civil Rights Division
18	will be hosting a training at our National Advocacy
19	Center this August to bring together FBI agents and
20	prosecutors to help increase our ability to
21	identify and prosecute hate crimes.
22	So, it is a pleasure to be here, I look
23	forward to answering any questions you may have.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much, Mr.

Moossy. Mr. Soave?

MR. SOAVE: Thank you. I am deeply honored to participate in this briefing and so grateful to the Commission for inviting me. What is the government's role in preventing hate crimes? I think it might be a slightly more complicated question than it seems.

people would that the Most agree government obviously has a compelling interest preventing crime and most people would also agree that hateful conduct is unwelcome, but many actions deems hateful are nevertheless this society protected by the Bill of Rights.

I mean, the First Amendment does give us the explicit right to engage in expression that some people would consider hateful. And while many of today's college students think hate speech should be illegal, in fact, nearly half of them according to the Cato Institute, the Supreme Court has been crystal clear on this, that the thought that we hate, the famous quote, is perfectly —it's Constitutional and permissible to engage in that.

Most recently as 2011 in the famous sort of Westboro Baptist Church case, the Supreme Court said, the Snyder v. Phelps case, that people

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

shouting for the deaths of military servicemen and shouting horrific things at gay people that even that kind of speech was protected.

Now, obviously, there's a critical distinction between hate speech and hate crime. Here, I think we're generally talking about hate crime in the context of being additional penalties against people who commit crimes for reasons that are especially hateful.

Although, I think I did hear one of my fellow panelists talking about derogatory language during the commission of a crime being itself an additional crime, which I think starts to blur that distinction in ways that could impugn our civil liberties or free speech rights.

The law generally recognizes that crimes such as vandalism, assault, and murder are if committed for reasons especially heinous of bigotry or bias. Although some, I think, might contend in a philosophical sense, if not a legal in some sense murder murder one, that is not regardless of the killer's motivations, or that we could sort of read the mind of the killer and divine whether it was impugning some protected category.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Anecdotally, we hear from many media 2 outlets, as someone who is in the press and pays close attention to this, we hear often that hate 3 4 crime rates have increased or are always 5 increasing. The FBI reported a five percent rise in 6 7 hate -- and, indeed, the FBI did report a five percent rise in hate crimes from 2015 to 8 9 Still, that's a small enough increase that it could 10 actually have been the result of better reporting, 11 rather than an actual spike in hate. 12 The FBI reported an increase in anti-13 Muslim hate, but that might be because the FBI, the 14 way I understand it, changed slightly how they were 15 tracking that information from one year to 16 next. 17 According to the U.S. Bureau of Justice 18 Statistics, hate crime levels have occasionally 19 fluctuated, but remained relatively stable between 20 2004 and 2015. 21 As a reporter who focuses specifically 2.2 on education issues, schools, higher education in 23 particular, I can say that the situation on college 24 campuses is very complicated.

There is some data suggesting that hate

crimes on campuses, specifically, increased as high
-- by as much as 25 percent in just the last year
or two, possibly because of the divisiveness of the
2016 election, that's kind of been the theory that
was put out.

Many of these are hate-inspired acts of vandalism, destruction of property, and intimidation. Even so, it can be very difficult to truly kind of grapple with these incidents and understand, they are not always what they appear to be on their face, because perpetrators are almost never caught in these cases.

Buzzfeed News, for instance, reviewed 400 things that were reported on university campuses as hate crime or a bias incident.

Oftentimes, universities have а reporting system, where separate bias students, professors can anonymously file reports. This is obviously a much broader category of behavior. Many of these things I think would be perfectly legal, they would be clearly examples of free expression.

But out of 400 cases that Buzzfeed reviewed of hate generally, and it was able to verify that 154 did happen, but only in five

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

percent of the cases was the perpetrator caught.

This -- unfortunately, it is true that the incidents on college campuses turned out to be accidents or even hoaxes. Two crimes reported at Michigan, the University of Michigan, where I am a graduate, in the immediate wake of the election, in November of 2016, they were discovered to be hoaxes, one involving a young Muslim woman who claimed a man had threatened to set her on fire, another involving a young woman who said a man had attacked her with a safety pin pro-immigrant because she was sort of Police confirmed, the alleged victim demonstrator. admitted that both crimes had actually been made up.

And I bring up these incidents not at all to suggest that a large percentage of hate crimes are hoaxes, I think that's certainly not true. But on campuses particularly, and we're so focused on the school question these days, it is hard to know exactly what's going on.

I've seen cases where it appeared that it was a message of hate, like anti-immigrant hate or anti-black hate, but actually the person doing it was an immigrant or a person of color and what

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

they were saying, they were saying, this hateful message has now become acceptable in our country.

So, they were making sort of a political demonstration. So, that changes whether obviously it was an act of hate, given who was doing it.

I would urge policymakers, law enforcement, and other authorities to resist media pressure to characterize the current atmosphere in the U.S. as one of increasing hatefulness.

While we can and should continue to track and prosecute criminal activity, we should keep in mind our cherished First Amendment rights. There are vastly fewer protections for free expression in other countries, and I worry at times that we could undermine our own protections by drawing the hate crime category too broadly.

Scotland, for instance, recently arrested and fined a comedian on YouTube for a hate His crime was making a video of his dog crime. giving like a Nazi salute. He was just trying to make his girlfriend mad, is what he said. He was affiliated not а Nazi or with any Nazi organizations. And he was arrested and fined for doing so.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In Liverpool, a young woman named Chelsea Russell was reported to a hate crime unit posting the lyrics to rap song а Instagram page. She was doing it in tribute to a young man who had died in a car -- who had been run over by a car and it was like his favorite song. The authorities never charged anyone in the young man's death, but they did arrest

The authorities never charged anyone in the young man's death, but they did arrest the woman for posting the rap lyrics. The judge said there is no place in civil society for language like that.

I think these hate crime arrests in the U.K. underscore the need for officials in our own country to remain cognizant of the line between hate speech and hate crime and to avoid fatalism and pessimism when considering whether the reach of hate is actually growing. Thank you.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much, Mr. Soave. I'm going to open it up now to questions from my fellow Commissioners.

I do want to note, and I think Assistant Chief Garth Green can speak for himself, but I didn't hear Assistant Chief Garth Green actually say what you characterized him as having said about what the crimes were.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Thank you, Madam
2	Chairwoman. No, what that was was that's where we
3	captured the data, is in those
4	MR. SOAVE: Okay.
5	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: three things,
6	that the crime doesn't fit the hate speech.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. So,
8	Commissioner Narasaki has a question.
9	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I have so many
10	questions.
11	(Laughter.)
12	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I started my
13	career working on hate crimes, anti-Asian violence
14	in particular, with the murder of Vincent Chin, who
15	was viciously murdered a few days before he was
16	supposed to get married by a father and a son who
17	was angry about the Japanese car makers in Detroit.
18	And they went after him with a baseball
19	bat, killed him, and the judge slapped them on the
20	wrist and gave them time served, because they were
21	otherwise fine Americans.
22	So, I would say to Commissioner Heriot,
23	I would not worry that there is too much double-
24	dipping with the federal government, because it is
25	extremely difficult to get the federal government

1 in, there are a lot of jurisdictional step 2 hurdles. obviously, the first 3 And, choice is always local police, but unfortunately, 4 in 5 country, we have a history where local police have not always been on the side of protecting minority 6 7 victims. So, with that, I will say, I have a lot 8 questions, so because we have only a short 9 of 10 amount of time, if I cut you off, it's not because 11 I'm being rude, it's because I want to get to my 12 other questions. 13 So, first of all, this is just a short 14 question for Assistant Chief Green. So, who helped development 15 pay for the οf the Seattle data 16 website, because that sounds like it's very 17 important tool? 18 ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Thank you. That 19 was done internally, it's part of our budget 20 process is that we do that. We do get some money from the city as well, external money from them, to 21 22 add to it, but it's mostly done internally. 23 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: And is there a 24 role for the federal government to try to help

other police departments move into that technology

space?

ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Absolutely, I mean, with the increase in technology out there, capturing that and putting that out there for folks to see, I think absolutely.

Where I think the biggest thing there is just what you alluded to there earlier, ma'am, is funding. Funding for some of the smaller agencies that may not have the budgetary needs to be able to support that.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Great, thank you. And one of the reasons I'm so excited about this panel is, we picked you with, or staff picked you with precision because you are all at the cutting edge of really trying to lead on prosecuting hate crimes and we want to learn from what you are doing.

One of the things that we're concerned about is, there's been a lot of great work on trying to attack the Islamophobia issues in this country. We're wondering what's going on in terms of trying to get at the rising violence and hate violence against transgendered persons and people with disabilities.

We have witnesses who are coming later

to talk about the lack of knowledge those communities have and the difficult relationships that some of them have with law enforcement. So, if any of you have some programs that are working, it would be great to hear about that.

ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: So, I'll jump in there, if that's all right. So, as we alluded to earlier, Safe Place, that started at our LGBTQ community. We have a very large, robust community in the city of Seattle that we partner with.

And a lot of it is based on outreach to that community, with police officers that are demographic, that represent that community. We spend a lot of time working with the community, bringing them in, discussing what the issues are with them, and then, doing a lot of public outreach through the media as well.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: And people with disabilities, is anyone doing any outreach work to that community successfully?

MR. MOOSSY: I know when we do our forums across the country, we do outreach for both the transgender community and the disability community. And we are increasingly seeing a number of disability-related bias crime cases come to us

2.2

1	for investigation. It's sort of a pipeline, so
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Mr. Moossy, would you
3	mind leaning closer to your
4	MR. MOOSSY: Oh, I'm sorry.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
6	MR. MOOSSY: We're often prosecuting
7	cases today that happened three and four years ago,
8	just because of the time it takes to report,
9	investigate, and prepare for prosecution.
10	But I can say that internally, we've
11	noted the same thing. We feel like we're seeing
12	too few transgender and disability matters and we
13	want to do better at that. That is definitely an
14	area where we want to improve.
15	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Great.
16	CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: So, I just wanted to
17	add that the IACP, we're developing model policy
18	and concept and issues paper just specifically to
19	the LGBTQ issue, both internally, from a police
20	perspective, in hiring LGBTQ folks into the police
21	department, and externally, how they should be
22	handled from a street patrol officer's standpoint
23	as well.
24	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Good. I
25	particularly appreciate that, because I worked for

over a decade to try to get the hate crime law, that my colleague mentioned that she doesn't like, I worked for ten years to try to get that passed. And one of the reasons was because it expanded the definition to include --

CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki,
I'm going to ask you to do your last question.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: -- people with disabilities and LGBT. So, Mr. Moossy, one of the question I have is, a lot of groups have said that they very much appreciate the fact that Attorney General Sessions has been out there talking about hate crimes, but they sent a letter almost a year ago, a coalition of over 80 groups, raising a number of recommendations that they had for the Department of Justice.

And I'm wondering what progress has been made, because my understanding is that a response has not come.

Particularly, on the recommendation to establish a separate hate crimes task force or working group, rather than embedding it in the Crime Reduction and Public Safety Group; holding inter-agency hate crime meetings that include people who work on mental disability issues; and

1 creating website that aggregates the federal resources on these kinds of hate crimes and tools. 2 spoken 3 MR. MOOSSY: Yes, I've Ι 4 actually spoke at the ADL, Anti-Defamation League, 5 earlier this week, as did the Deputy Attorney General, and I was asked about the letter. 6 It is 7 actually with me. We will be responding soon. 8 I kind of wanted to get us to the point where we could publicly say a lot of things that 9 10 we've been doing and developing over the last year, 11 I think you'll see that we'll be doing that. 12 And I'm assuming that that letter will be made 13 public. But we definitely will be responding soon, 14 within the next couple days. 15 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Okay, thank you. 16 CHAIR LHAMON: We would welcome seeing 17 the response, the Commission also, when you do send it. 18 19 MR. MOOSSY: I'd be happy to provide it. 20 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Vice Chair, I understand you have some questions. 21 2.2 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes, I do. 23 And again, I also thank you all for taking the time 24 to appear with us. This question is for Assistant 25 Chief Green and for Sergeant Curry.

1	One of the things that we're seeking to
2	do as a commission is to identify best practices
3	that can be used to combat hate crimes. And it
4	would appear that one of the best practices would
5	be jurisdictions establishing a dedicated unit to
6	fight hate crimes.
7	And it's my understanding that Boston,
8	Sergeant Curry, has had a unit for 40 years. I've
9	been very impressed with what you've done in
10	Seattle, Assistant Chief Green.
11	So, what I was wondering, it might help
12	other jurisdictions that are beginning to consider
13	a dedicated unit to talk about what some of the
14	largest impediments or obstacles were to you
15	getting to the point that you would establish a
16	dedicated unit.
17	So, what can these other jurisdictions
18	that are considering this prepare themselves to
19	face? I know it's been a long time, you've been at
20	it a long time.
21	SGT. DETECTIVE CURRY: What can they
22	look forward to in terms of establishing a unit?
23	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: The biggest
24	barrier
25	SGT. DETECTIVE CURRY: Barrier.

1 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: or 2 impediment to you setting up a dedicated unit. SGT. DETECTIVE CURRY: I think one of 3 4 the challenges with setting up a dedicated unit is 5 whether that department resources, has 6 officers that they could dedicate to a specific 7 unit just to look at hate crimes. That's one of 8 the challenges that I see, is resources. 9 ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: I totally agree, 10 resource management is probably the number 11 thing with it. The second would probably be a true 12 understanding of what hate crimes really are, where 13 sometimes, alluded to earlier on the as we 14 capture, some people believe categories that we 15 that that's a tremendous amount of work. 16 But really, when you start to break it 17 down and you look at truly the crimes, as opposed 18 to others that just involve the bias elements, that 19 body of work actually becomes smaller. 20 That then, training with the and department, allowing the patrol officers to 21 2.2 what information they need to capture and get back. 23 And those, obviously, funding resources at that 24 point.

TIMMONS-GOODSON:

CHAIR

VICE

25

you

Did

1 want to add, sir? 2 CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: If I could, if you 3 don't mind. 4 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes. 5 CUNNINGHAM: CHIEF So, there's about 6 roughly 18,000 police agencies in the country. 7 About 80 percent of them are 25 officers or less, 8 so most agencies don't have the kind of capacity 9 that Boston and Seattle do. 10 But what we've found is really 11 important is to make sure that they have 12 individuals within the agency that they've 13 identified to get specialized training, because you 14 really need help. The officer on the street needs 15 help looking at those bias indicators, what is it -16 - is this really a bias or a hate crime? 17 it's important do So, so we have specialized, particularly at the supervisory level. 18 19 So, if we could get, say, all the sergeants 20 trained, so the sergeants are responding to these 21 type of crimes on the street and then making a 2.2 determination of whether or not it really is truly 23 a hate crime. 24 ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Ma'am, if I may 25 just add one other thing. The other important

issue would be to look at on a regional level, 1 2 because -- based on the smaller departments. One of the things that Seattle, we're 3 4 doing is reaching out to our regional partners, to 5 try to assist them with training and education and then, assistance as well, since we're a larger 6 7 So, I think that's a key thing to department. 8 focus on as well. 9 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Okay, thank 10 Madam Chair, may I -you. 11 CHAIR LHAMON: Yes. 12 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: -- ask one 13 other quick question? This is for Deputy Attorney 14 General Moossy. 15 Sir, one of our panelists, who will be 16 appearing later today, says that the Civil Rights 17 Division and none of those DOJ components regularly 18 publishes in an easily accessible location any data 19 about cases. And that they should be required to 20 report at least quarterly and those reports should 21 be prominently displayed. 2.2 I thought about that, in addition with 23 the dashboard that we heard about from in Seattle. 24 Will you address please that concern about -- as 25 expressed by a future panelist?

MR. MOOSSY: Well, I will say, everything public we can say about a hate crime prosecution, we put in a press release at the time of indictment, conviction, or sentencing.

And those are all located on our website, we put pretty much every significant action in a hate crime case, or any civil rights case, we make publicly available on our website.

So, we do have, on the DOJ website, a page devoted to hate crimes that lists hate crime statistics, that lists the statutes, and it has access to all of the publicly available press releases.

I think a number of the groups have asked, civil rights groups have asked, about a more comprehensive website that might provide information both for state and local contacts, FBI contacts, state and locally. Something that might be like the StopBullying.gov website, which I think has been very successful.

And I can say, we're looking at doing that. Our, I'm a criminal prosecutor, our technical expertise and our resources to do some of this I think important outward facing information is limited, but it is something that we've been

2.2

1 working on --2 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: But we have those resources within the federal government that 3 4 you could call on, don't we? 5 MOOSSY: Well, we're trying. MR. Wе 6 looking at trying standup have group to 7 But as I said, right now, even if you go website. 8 to DOJ.gov and you go to the Civil Rights Division 9 website, you'll see a hate crimes page. 10 if you also go to our 11 Affairs Office, you'll see every single hate crimes 12 press release will be issued publicly. 13 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Well, 14 don't know that they were necessarily talking about 15 press releases, I believe they were concerned about 16 -- his concern was about data and reports. What 17 quarterly, the notion of putting the 18 information out quarterly? 19 MR. MOOSSY: I guess I'm not -- I mean, 20 what we do at the Civil Rights what have, 21 Division is we have criminal investigations that we 2.2 determine whether they meet the elements of 23 statute and we prosecute them. So, as much as we 24 can make public about that, we do.

-- we don't

do

I don't

25

we

reports,

1 don't collect data or statistics nationally, 2 Uniform Crime Report does that with the FBI, and I think they do that. But as far as what we do, I 3 don't know what else we would have that we could 4 5 make public. VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you. 6 7 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki? 8 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I have two guick guestions, one for 9 10 Mr. Cunningham and one for Mr. Soave. 11 Mr. Cunningham, one of the things that 12 Mr. Moossy brought up in his testimony was the fact 13 that there are a large number of jurisdictions that 14 don't report hate crimes at all. In fact, Florida, 15 for example, the third most populous state in the country, reports fewer hate crimes 16 than North 17 Carolina, which is less than half its size. 18 There are places, counties in Texas, 19 for example Harris County, with over a million, 20 nearly two million people, that reported zero hate And there are other jurisdictions -- and 21 2.2 that's not, by the way, relegated to the South. 23 Baltimore County only reported one for a population

of 831,000.

24

in these larger jurisdictions to start cooperating and what can we do to make it either better, easier, or more compulsory for them to get involved?

CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: Sure. So, a couple of responses to that. Number one, I think that in a lot of the jurisdictions, they don't know what those bias indicators are, so they're not sure it's a hate crime, so they don't list it as a hate crime. That's number one.

issue But the bigger here is the reporting piece, because it's all voluntary through the Uniform Crime Report. IACP and all the major law enforcement organizations have really been very supportive of trying to move from the UCR to NIBRS, because doesn't UCR just give enough you information.

NIBRS gives you a lot more information. The problem with that is that а lot of the agencies, including the larger agencies, don't have the resources to do it. So, their current records management systems don't allow them to capture that information and then upload it and send it to the FBI -- go ahead, sir.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: When you mean by

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 resources, what do you mean? 2 CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: Well, like I said, 3 the records management system isn't capable, 4 because they're very antiquated. So, there would 5 be a significant financial investment. So, what we're seeing in dealing with 6 7 the FBI, who is leading this effort for us, we've 8 been very, very supportive of it, because police professional, you need the data and you need 9 10 the best data that you can to make decisions. 11 So, we need more information. That 12 NIBRS information gives you a lot more for you to 13 be able to make decisions on. But the problem is 14 that this transition is going to happen by 2020 and 15 we are moving into just the NIBRS and they won't even accept the UCR data anymore, but there are a 16 17 lot of agencies that need more resources. 18 They just don't have the money to 19 able to upgrade their records management systems to 20 be able to do this. And absolutely, that place where the federal government can help. 21 2.2 have provided some resources, but they need more. 23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you. Mr. 24 Soave, I was curious about some of the statements

that you made regarding the climate of hate speech.

1 You seemed to indicate that there 2 seemed to be no -- I don't want to paraphrase it, but you said something that seemed to me, struck me 3 4 as concluding that there was -- too much was being 5 made of the current climate of statements of people 6 making with regard to hate speech and whether it 7 was really increasing or not. Could vou -- am I 8 wrong or what exactly did you say about that? MR. SOAVE: I think that I was simply 9 10 stating that we -- often, people in the media 11 assert that hate crimes are getting worse or that 12 bias incidents are getting worse 13 campuses. 14 I don't know that that's not the case, 15 but I don't know that the evidence is as compelling 16 as they often suggest that it is. I think the 17 situation is more complicated, particularly in our 18 schools. We have better data, obviously, for the 19 20 hard hate crimes, for knowing whether they're although, as you just mentioned, in some places, we 21 2.2 just have simply no information. 23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm curious because, 24 to me, whether it's a college campus or whether 25 it's the city of Houston, while we all agree that

speech is protected, must be protected, certainly speech can create a climate for action.

And I looked at the fact that the reporting that's mandated by the Department of Education showed a big spike upwards in reported hate crimes -- and you may dispute that -- after November, around November of last year.

And I'm concerned, and I think this is something that goes toward the work that not just you, but other people on this panel are doing, everyone, that goes toward what this climate is that we are engaged in right now and how unusual it is.

When you have a President talking about and these are all statements, so I'm renaming out of school -- characterizing Mexican immigrants as racists and criminals, attacking a judge for his Mexican heritage as being biased, talking about people from Haiti as having AIDS, describing countries in Africa being s-hole as countries, which I won't go after, Charlottesville, the "very fine people" comment, pardoning Joe Arpaio, calling Senator Liz Warren Pocahontas. These are things that are out there, I mean, they just -- you can't undo them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We have someone here who's going to testify later about his role and his bravery in an attack against two Muslim individuals on a train in Portland.

And it took the President three days, with 21 other intervening tweets, before that incident was acknowledged by the White House, and it wasn't even acknowledged by the President's own Twitter, it was done by the actually official one, which is not handled by the President himself.

These are things that are out there. And I'm curious for you, for all of you, how that atmosphere or does that charge the atmosphere any more for you and how you're dealing with these incidents and the climate and just the average person, patrol person out on the street, in dealing with hate crimes and how that impacts what it is that you do?

MR. SOAVE: May I just add one quick -so, I would obviously agree that all the statements
you just listed that Trump and others have said
were horrible and wrongheaded things, but I
certainly wouldn't want our police doing anything
to stop people from expressing those things.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, of course not.

2.2

1 MR. SOAVE: Now, on a campus, it does 2 little more confusing, right? What 3 because teachers have power in more some circumstances, especially if we're talking K-12, 4 5 police those statements within their classroom or to make it a hospitable environment for everyone. 6 7 When you're going to like the public 8 square on a college campus, well you can write 9 whatever you want in chalk in the quad, probably 10 within a greater degree of latitude. Maybe not 11 anything, but it's just writing like, Latinos, go back to Mexico, or something, would that be -- that 12 13 might get characterized as a bias incident. 14 It's also probably a pretty clear free 15 expression thing if it's at a public university 16 campus, public property. So, that's why I 17 these things get a little more complicated when we start blurring these distinctions, particularly at 18 19 schools. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Ms. Curry, you have 20 21 Mr. Cunningham? a comment? 2.2 CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: So, I would just say 23 really matter. it's that words Whether the 24 previous administration or the current

administration, when it comes from the top of the

1 administration, what the President of the United 2 States says really matters. During the previous administration, 3 4 saw some real high profile use of force cases and I 5 think t.hat. there folks in were some the administration that jumped to some conclusions very 6 7 quickly before they let those investigations play 8 out. And because of that, there were some words 9 that caused strife within, Ι some know, law 10 enforcement, and there were some issues. 11 And then, in the current 12 administration, some remarks that are 13 insensitive remarks, they matter. Words matter 14 from all of us. 15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you. 16 CHAIR LHAMON: Ms. Curry, did you have a 17 response? 18 SGT. DETECTIVE CURRY: No. 19 CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you. 20 Commission Kladney? 21 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you, Madam 22 Chair. Chief Johnson, you made mention of 18,000 23 police departments and then, I think you said a 24 majority of them have 25 officers or less, or do 25 you have a number?

1 CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: Eighty percent, 80 2 percent of the police departments within the United States are 25 officers or less. 3 4 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you. 5 Green, Chief Johnson, in his statement, said that -- let me see here -- 44 percent of hate crimes are 6 7 not reported. I think that's what he said. 8 four, so it sounds to me like your department's 9 fairly sophisticated in that regard, have you been 10 able to determine what kind of reporting 11 percentages you have? 12 ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: No, sir. 13 know that we have quite a bit of under-reporting, 14 as the national average goes, as well. We believe 15 we do have a very robust outreach to gather that, 16 however, I think there's a lot of reasons for it. 17 it's mostly from personal interaction with 18 folks and what they bring to it. 19 So, as Mr. Soave says, is the increase 20 due to an increase or is it an increase just due to an increase in reporting? 21 At some point, there

will be a plateau, I think, and then at that point, can really start to gather the data on if they're increasing or not.

> Chief COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And,

22

23

24

1	Johnson, I found out the 44 percent, that's where
2	these matters were privately handled. What does
3	that mean? Can you give me some examples?
4	CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: I'm sorry, I'm just
5	not following your question.
6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: It said here,
7	hate crimes to police victimization were handled in
8	another way, 44 percent were privately or through
9	non-law enforcement officials.
10	CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: Oh, sure. So, I
11	mean, a lot of times, you'll see, in these hate
12	events, you'll see victims of those go to other
13	civil representatives, go to whether it's to the
14	ADL or to other folks, and not report them to law
15	enforcement.
16	As I think the first speaker, the
17	Detective Sergeant, had talked about, folks'
18	immigration status, it's such a concern to people,
19	they're really afraid to come forward and to report
20	a lot of these hate crimes. So, they go to other
21	organizations to make their report.
22	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And do police
23	organizations contact those organizations to ask
24	them to at least anonymously report those crimes?
25	CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: So, I think it is,

1 again, in my comments I made, it is so important 2 for us to maintain those relationships with those organizations, which I know we do have a 3 relationship with them. 4 5 it's really incumbent upon the local agencies to constantly reach out to those 6 7 organizations, so that the organization feels that 8 the agency, the police agencies, are trustworthy 9 and that they can make those reports to them. 10 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: ${\tt Mr.}$ Moossy, is 11 that correct? 12 MR. MOOSSY: Yes. 13 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you. You 14 said Attorney General that Sessions supports 15 prosecution of hate crimes. What is DOJ doing in 16 terms of trying to get more reporting done in this 17 regard? 18 Obviously, the software is changing, or 19 the reporting software is changing, but are there 20 other things? You were talking about educational 21 classes around the country, et cetera, can you be 2.2 more specific? 23 MR. MOOSSY: Yes, I can. First, let me 24 to your prior question about outreach 25 community groups, I think that's so important

all aspects of our criminal prosecution, whether we're doing prosecutions of police officers for excessive force, human trafficking, hate crimes. The victims in those cases often don't come to local law enforcement.

And really, creating a bridge with community groups I think is critical. That's why we have a civil rights point of contact in every U.S. Attorney's office and every FBI office in this country, whose job it is to go out and form relationships with those community groups to try to create a bridge for victims to be able to come and report these crimes through a trusted method.

We're -- the department actually has sent two people to this hearing. Later today, you're going to hear from a representative of our Bureau of Justice Statistics, who is an expert on hate crimes reporting and data.

But let me say that, I think the first thing that we're trying to figure out -- and this is something -- in our Hate Crimes Working Group, which I mentioned in my statement, this is one of our priorities, is to figure out what is going on with this reporting? Why are 80 percent reporting zero?

2.2

And, I mean, in some ways, maybe there are just people who don't want to report. I think there are a number of people who aren't trained and who don't know. In these 18,000 small person police departments, the resources to go out and train every one of them is vast. So, there's a training issue.

There's also just, the mechanism, as Chief Cunningham said, is just really difficult.

And I think for resource strained departments, the current system is difficult to use.

I think the NIBRS system, it's a drop-down box that will drive people to report. In other words, instead of just figuring out to fill out the hate crimes form and then enter that in, there's an actual sort of drop-down menu that basically drives you to report hate crimes. And I think -- and all crimes. And so, I think that that's going to work a lot better.

So, we are looking -- I think one of the things that our FBI is doing is, we've put out the word to local police departments that if you want training on reporting, we are providing resources to do that.

And we've stepped up a program to start

2.2

1 providing training to local police departments, increase their ability to do hate crimes reporting. 2 3 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Do you have any 4 idea how that's been going or how long that's been 5 going, whether there's an increase in the training, 6 the numbers? Do you have any of that? 7 MR. MOOSSY: It's new, I know that it's 8 a product of our working group. Because as the 9 Attorney General has emphasis this put an 10 the program over last year and we've been 11 mobilizing folks, Ι know that our FBI Crime 12 Reporting Unit is soliciting requests and providing 13 that training. 14 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: So, this training 15 program is new under this administration? 16 MR. MOOSSY: Ι would say, we're 17 providing new training under this administration. 18 I don't know that I would classify it as a program, 19 I think what we're trying to do is identify why are 20 people not reporting? 21 For those who are not reporting because 2.2 they lack training, let's give them that training. 23 For those who are not reporting for other Right. 24 reasons, let's try to address those 25 whether it be NIBRS, whether it be trying to fund

1 technology upgrades, things like that. 2 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you. CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot? 3 4 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you, 5 Mr. Moossy, my understanding is that the Chair. 2009 Act has a certification requirement and that 6 7 the AG or his designee must certify certain things 8 before a federal prosecution can be undertaken. Can you walk me through the process for 9 10 how that's done? Has the AG designated someone 11 else to make that certification and what sort of 12 documentation goes to that person before a federal 13 prosecution can be undertaken? 14 MR. MOOSSY: So, you're correct, before prosecution under 15 the Shepard-Byrd Act 16 commence, the Attorney General has to certify that 17 such a prosecution is in the public interest and there's a set of factors laid out in the statute. 18 19 That authority has been delegated to 20 the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. Right now, the acting Assistant Attorney General is 21 2.2 Mr. John Gore. That delegation happened as soon as 23 the statute was enacted in 2009, so it's always 24 been that way.

There was a short period of time when

1 the Attorney General, Ms. Lynch, herself had to do 2 it because of the Vacancies Act and Ms. But as long as the statute has been in 3 position. 4 place, there's been this delegation. 5 There is an internal briefing process prosecutors to the Assistant 6 by the Attorney 7 General through me, where --8 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: In writing? MR. MOOSSY: In writing -- where factors 9 10 laid out, the deliberative are process is 11 explained, the strengths and weaknesses of the 12 internal analysis of the case, and the analysis of 13 the factors as they relate to the evidence. And 14 then a decision is --15 COMMISSIONER **HERIOT:** Ι would really 16 like to see that kind of documentation, is that 17 something the Commission can get? MR. MOOSSY: I believe it would all be 18 19 deliberative process protected, just like our 20 indictment memos would all be deliberative process 21 protected. I'm not an expert at the Freedom of 2.2 Information Act, I would certainly want to comply 23 with it fully and if you filed a FOIA request, it

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.

would get through the normal course.

24

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Mr. Moossy, would you be
2	able to just share with us what the elements of the
3	memo are, even if you couldn't share what the memo
4	says?
5	MR. MOOSSY: Well, the analysis is,
6	first and foremost
7	CHAIR LHAMON: I didn't mean as a test
8	right now, you can do it later.
9	(Laughter.)
10	MR. MOOSSY: Oh, okay, sure. I can send
11	you
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
13	MR. MOOSSY: I can send you that, yes,
14	ma'am.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Then, Mr. Green,
17	you had said that there are a lot of cases that go
18	unreported, and I'm sure that's true, but isn't
19	that also true for like simple assaults? Do you
20	have a sense of is something like a simple assault
21	that isn't a hate crime, what percentage of those
22	go unreported?
23	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: I don't have a
24	number for you, ma'am, but I would agree that there
25	are a large amount of all crimes that go

1	unreported, for probably very much similar reasons
2	as hate crimes don't as well.
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And like Mr.
4	Soave, I think it was Mr. Soave, saying that like
5	hate crimes from 2015 to 2016 had gone up between
6	four and five percent. I did a quick Google search
7	and it's also true that violent crime in general
8	went up between four and five percent that year.
9	Now, it was a little bit different,
10	with hate crimes, I think it was 4.6, with violent
11	crimes, it was 4.1. But we're talking about a
12	small difference there.
13	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Yes, we are, I
14	think, overall. What I would explain, like in the
15	City of Seattle, our crimes, from 2016 to 2017, our
16	non-criminal bias incidents rose 112 percent, so
17	much higher than four to five percent and maybe
18	some of the national averages
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Wait, wait,
20	run that by me again.
21	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: So, in the City
22	of Seattle, our non-criminal bias incidents from
23	2016 to 2017 rose 112 percent.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Non-criminal bias
25	incidents?

1	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: So, what we were
2	talking about, where there was a crime, an
3	underlying
4	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, that's
5	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: crime and
6	someone used derogatory, in
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But that's one
8	that's going to be subject to
9	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Right.
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: huge variation
11	based on how that's perceived. That one is
12	that's not
13	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Right, and
14	crimes with
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: really what
16	we're talking about here.
17	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Right. Crimes
18	with bias elements, which are the malicious actions
19	crimes, rose 113 percent in the city.
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No, I want hate
21	crimes.
22	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Yes, ma'am.
23	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Hate crimes.
24	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: One hundred and
25	thirteen percent.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. How much did your violent crime go up? How much did your simple assault go up? How much did anything that would be a non-hate, how much did it go up?

ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: They increased as well, but not nearly by that. They've increased

by single or double-digits, not by triple-digits, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.

ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Now, I will caveat that with saying, with that, that was only 114 incidents in 2018. Or 2017, rather. So, the increase, while you look at the statistical number and you're like, incredible with 113, Seattle is still a very safe place, in the fact that it was still only 114 incidents.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm glad Seattle is a safe place. On the other hand, again, when we're talking about these things that are hurling epithets, you would think that would be subject to wild variations in whether or not people are thinking about reporting it, rather than what the underlying facts are.

If people are told, these things are going up, they're going to mention that much more

2.2

1	readily than they would in a case where people
2	aren't thinking about it, shall we say.
3	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: Yes, ma'am.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: With five minutes left in
5	our panel and three questioners still to go
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: I'm going to move to
8	Commissioner Kirsanow.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Madam
10	Chair. And thanks to the witnesses. I just have a
11	couple of questions for all of the witnesses, if
12	you have this information. I looked through the
13	material that was provided by all witnesses, not
14	just this panel, to see if this information was
15	there and I didn't see it, maybe I missed it.
16	Are you aware of any data, studies, or
17	other evidence that show that designating a crime a
18	hate crime deters, prevents, or reduces that crime?
19	Second, whether designating a crime a
20	federal hate crime reduces, deters, or prevents
21	incidents of that crime?
22	Then, one other question, are you aware
23	of any databases, study, or other evidence that
24	shows that designating a crime a hate crime,
25	whether municipal, state, or federal hate crime,

1	assists in the resolution of that crime or the
2	apprehension of the perpetrator? Thank you, Madam
3	Chair.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: You're welcome.
5	Commission Adegbile?
6	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes, thank you.
7	Chief Cunningham, I think you said that one of the
8	things that is important is that jurisdictions come
9	to understand and are trained in the utility of
10	reporting, the value of reporting. Right now, can
11	you give us the elevator pitch about what the
12	utility of reporting is for jurisdictions?
13	CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: Sure. I think that
14	any police administrator would look at they want
15	to make data-driven decisions. So, you look at the
16	data to decide how you put your resources out in
17	the field.
18	So, if you saw 115 percent increase in
19	your hate crimes, you'd say, okay, we either need
20	to establish a unit, add additional resources to
21	that, make sure we make the connections with the
22	community, there's clearly something happening
23	there.
24	But one of the components that I didn't
25	talk about, and one of the reluctance, particularly

in the major cities, when it comes to this shift from UCR to NIBRS, it's going to appear that there's been an increase in crime, when in fact, there hasn't been, it's just a difference in the way that it's being reported.

It's much more important that we capture all that data, but if you talk to a lot of the major city chiefs, they'll tell you that they live and die by their crime statistics. And when they shift from the UCR data to the NIBRS data, it's going to look like an increase in crime.

there's a lot of reluctance So, even though we're very, very much their part. encouraging everybody to do it at the same time, so that everybody's numbers go up together, because if it's Philadelphia you've got, say that's not reporting, and I don't know that they're not, it's Philadelphia that's not reporting you've got Chicago that's reporting, it's going to look like Chicago had an incredible uptick in crime, when in fact, they didn't.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: So, even before we get to the shift in the way that crimes are reported, I think we've heard that Florida has vanishingly small reports and North Carolina has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

considerably more and it's a much smaller state, I 1 2 take it that's not about the way the data is reported, there's some inherent reluctance. 3 4 For example, Florida is a major tourist 5 destination in the country and people may be making a judgment that it would not be a boom to tourism 6 7 to be reporting these crimes. So, how do 8 overcome other issues that are not about how it's the 9 reported, but is about reluctance of 10 jurisdictions to tell it like it is? 11 We've already heard the DOJ, while they 12 releases, don't have any dashboard press 13 any regular reporting mechanism to mechanism or 14 help us have an understanding of what this looks like over and across the nation. 15 16 So, I'm wondering if you could drive 17 down, not just about how we're changing reporting, but there seems to be some inherent reluctance. 18 19 CHIEF CUNNINGHAM: So, this actually 20 meetings that we had with the came out at our 21 Lawyers Committee on Civil Rights, and particularly 2.2 those jurisdictions that just aren't reporting 23 anything. 24 There's some shaming that's involved,

that when you hold it up and say, hey, you know

1 what, this jurisdiction didn't report anything and it's a large jurisdiction, there's something going 2 3 on there. There's also the piece where we 4 5 about, there are no penalties for not reporting, So, maybe you need to incentivize agencies 6 right? 7 to report, give them a carrot instead of the stick. 8 And the other piece that really is the communities holding those agencies responsible. 9 Ιf 10 a community stands up and says, hey, you know what 11 chief, or police department, we're showing 12 hate crimes reported here in a jurisdiction of this 13 size, it's just not possible, it's not realistic. 14 And I still go back to the fact that a 15 lot of police officers don't know what those bias 16 indicators are, so they don't report it as a hate 17 I really, in a lot of agencies, I don't 18 think it's they're doing it for nefarious purposes, 19 think they just don't know. We need more 20 training.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Mr. Moossy, there are, and Commissioner Yaki has spoken about a number of statements that the President has made that were targeted at particular groups.

I'm trying to understand, to the extent

21

22

23

24

say community outreach and building that you bridge to communities is an essential role and that there's a difficulty with respect to immigration in having reporting and the like crimes, I'm trying to understand what role those statements across a category of groups, national statements, statements about transgender origin people, policy pronouncements, how does that make your job any easier in the area of hate crimes?

MR. MOOSSY: As I said, I mean, I don't

-- I really do think that forming bridges with

these community groups is critical. Definitely, we

have some impediments to doing that, but I think

we're committed to doing it, our Attorney General

is committed to doing it, all of us are committed

to doing it.

I do want to though just say, I want to careful attributing be really about really provocative speech to criminality. And I hope none are trying to make any connection, οf we're saying that provocative speech exculpates the people who commit violent hate they're being driven crimes because to it or something like that.

I mean, that is certainly not our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

position. I think under our First Amendment jurisprudence, we see a really hard line there, where we say, if something is a threat, incitement to violence, or violence, those people, you are responsible for that conduct.

And so, I think our position has always been, we respect vibrant and, at some times, shocking speech, but that that is separate and apart from violent crime and violent conduct. And the people who engage in violent crime and violent conduct are to be held responsible for that.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: But my question went to the bridge building. I take it that there's a distinction in law between speech and conduct, we've been speaking about that today, so I'm not talking about whether or not an authority will duly prosecute when somebody steps over that line.

What I'm talking about is that I understand the law enforcement officers on the panel, all of you, to be saying that to do this job well, we need to have bridges to the community and that community interactions are a key component of being able to vindicate these laws.

And so, I'm trying to understand how

2.2

the tone from the top affects law enforcement's ability to engage with communities that may already be reluctant to participate with law enforcement and to report. That's the question.

MR. MOOSSY: Sure. And what I can tell you is, what we do is, we go to those communities. I partner with National Center for Transgender Equality and every month, I get from them a list of possible hate crimes that may happen and we look at those.

And so, we make an overt effort to go to our communities and say, I'm with the Civil Rights Division, we care about investigating and prosecuting hate violence. I'm going to stand with my local police department and say, we're the people who, if there's an act of violence, we are here and we want to take it seriously.

And so, we're putting faces to our actions. And that's why we have civil rights points of contact in every U.S. Attorney's office, in every FBI, and that's why the FBI has the national training initiative, where they're going out to these communities and saying, if an act of violence happens, my name is Agent Smith, I want you to come and tell me about it because I want to

2.2

1	do something about it, I'm showing you that our
2	commitment to do this is real. That's what we do.
3	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. We are close
5	out of time, I'm going to let the oh, I'm sorry.
6	ASSISTANT CHIEF GREEN: I'm sorry, Madam
7	Chairman. I misspoke earlier, Commissioner Heriot.
8	So, the actual increase in the crime itself was 33
9	percent, not 113, 33 percent.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: That's an important
11	clarification, thank you. And we'll let the Vice
12	Chair ask one question and then, I'm going to just
13	squeeze in another for myself.
14	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Okay.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: But that means that we're
16	going to have a very short break between this panel
17	and the next. So, go fast.
18	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you
19	very much, Madam Chair. We were speaking you
20	were speaking, Mr. Moossy, earlier about commitment
21	to eradicating hate crimes and all of that.
22	It occurred to me that I believe the
23	most recent budget proposal sought to eliminate
24	roughly 27 positions in the Civil Rights Division
25	or the Civil Rights Team, whatever. How is

1	eliminating those positions consistent with the
2	reported increases in racial harassment and hate
3	crimes?
4	MR. MOOSSY: So, our I believe we got
5	a flat, for the Civil Rights Division, I think it
6	was a flat budget. I'm not aware that there was
7	I think some reporting about some spots that were
8	eliminated that were never filled, they were
9	literally just accounting type positions. But as
LO	far
L1	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I think I'm
L2	talking about the proposal sought.
L3	MR. MOOSSY: I'm not aware that the
L4	Civil Rights Division budget was cut
L5	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Or Civil
L6	Rights Team
L7	MR. MOOSSY: we have a
L8	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: whatever
L9	you
20	CHAIR LHAMON: The Vice Chair is asking
21	about the proposal from DOJ, not what Congress gave
22	to DOJ.
23	MR. MOOSSY: Again, I know that, for
24	example, in our criminal section, we've added
25	attorneys to it. So, for the people who are

prosecuting hate crimes, I think that since January

1, 2017, we've added 16 criminal prosecutors, I

think for a net of eight, because we've had some
attrition.

So, for the unit that's doing that kind
of work, it's grown. And I know our budget has

of work, it's grown. And I know our budget has been flat. I'm not aware of a proposal to decrease the funding to the prosecutors or attorneys who would be handling hate crimes matters. I'm not aware of that all.

CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you.

VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you.

CHAIR LHAMON: I'm going to ask my quick question, Mr. Moossy, also. We received some recommendations from panelists who are coming later today also about the value of inter-agency working groups focused on hate crimes. And you've included in your testimony information about within DOJ component work about hate crimes focus.

In my last life, when I was with the Department of Education, I participated in some of the inter-agency working groups focused on hate crimes. I found them valuable and wonder if you do. And if so, whether any work like that is continuing to take place, if you think it would be

2.2

1	valuable to take place, and if not, why not?
2	MR. MOOSSY: I do think it's valuable
3	and I would love to explore reconstituting our work
4	on that.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you. Do you
6	have a reason do you why it isn't constituted
7	now?
8	MR. MOOSSY: I don't.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you. With
10	that, we're going to conclude this panel. I thank
11	very much each of the panelists for your expertise.
12	We invite you to share further
13	information if you have further information that
14	occurs to you from today. And we look forward to
15	staying in conversation with you.
16	We'll take a break for four minutes,
17	until 10:40, and invite our next panel to come up.
18	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
19	went off the record at 10:36 a.m. and resumed at
20	10:42 a.m.)
21	PANEL TWO: COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. I am as rigid as
23	possible, so we are back, because it is 10:40.
24	We're going to proceed with our second panel.
25	Commissioner Kirsanow, I'm starting us again,

1 thanks. We're going to proceed with our second 2 panel of community stakeholders. In the order in which they will speak, 3 4 panelists are: Suman Raghunathan, Executive 5 Director of the South Asian Americans Leading 6 Together, SAALT; then, Melissa Garlick, Civil 7 Rights National Counsel from the Anti-Defamation 8 League, ADL; then, Nicole Jorwic, Director 9 Rights Policy at The Arc; then, Katherine Prescott, 10 LGBTO Parent Advocate and GLSEN Board Member; and 11 Micah David-Cole Fletcher, then, survivor; 12 Susan Bro, Chair and President of the Heather Heyer Foundation. 13 14 Ι reiterate other remarks that mУ 15 several panelists today will speak from personal 16 experience and I ask our audience to be cognizant 17 and respectful of all of our panelists, and I ask 18 my fellow Commissioners to keep that in mind during 19 the question and answer session as well. Ms. 20 Raghunathan, please begin. 21 MS. RAGHUNATHAN: Good morning. 2.2 CHAIR LHAMON: Good morning. 23 MS. RAGHUNATHAN: It's an honor to join 24 today's critical hearing, in particular 25 family members of hate violence survivors and

victims. Thank you so very much for your resilience, your commitment to change, and for speaking up.

South Asian Americans Leading Together is a national nonpartisan racial justice organization fighting for the civil rights of South Asians in the U.S. Our ultimate vision is dignity and full inclusion for all.

South Asians are the second most rapidly growing demographic group in the U.S., numbering over five million today. The South Asian American population has more than doubled since 2000.

We are a largely immigrant community and roughly one in three South Asians are Muslim. Our communities increasingly are caught in a crosshairs of race, religion, and immigration. All of these factors make our communities and many others the disproportionate targets of violence, regardless of our actual religion or citizenship status.

SAALT as an organization was born in the aftermath of September 11, in response to the violent backlash and divisive policies aimed at South Asian, Muslim, Sikh, Hindu, Arab, and Middle

1 Eastern individuals, communities, and institutions. 2 Our work has grown to include rapid response efforts in the wake of hate violence, to 3 4 anticipating and working to prevent hate violence 5 through an evolved field and policy strategy. do this in partnership with the National Coalition 6 7 South Asian Organizations, a network of 8 grassroots South Asian groups across the country. 9 The NCSO reminds us of the realities 10 our communities are facing everyday on the ground, 11 which in turn informs our strategy for developing 12 national responses through executive and 13 legislative recommendations. 14 SAALT is proud that our work hinges on 15 working with community stakeholders on the front 16 lines to develop policies that prevent and respond 17 to hate violence and hate crimes. is a critical moment for 18 This South 19 Asian, Muslim, Arab, Sikh, Hindu, and Middle 20 Eastern communities as we see our nation become a 21 melting pot of hate, rather than a melting pot of 2.2 diversity. 23 This pot is being stirred by the White 24 House, key agencies in the federal government, and 25 resurgent white supremacist movement that is

amplified and, indeed, encouraged by an administration that has already demonstrated its commitment to operationalizing a white supremacist agenda.

South Asian, Muslim, Sikh, Hindu, and Middle Eastern communities are existing in a moment where we are the targets of hate that are actively spurred by the anti-immigrant, anti-Muslim, anti-people of color policies advanced by the current administration, including the Department of Justice.

We are in the throes of a divisive and troubling surge of hate violence confronting our communities. And we have actually been tracking this issue for more than a decade, since before the FBI updated its own hate crimes categories, and it's becoming tragically clear that this wave of hostility and violence will not ebb any time soon.

Our latest report, Communities on Fire, points to a different and more sinister melting pot, one where the tiki torch that was seen in the white supremacist rally of Charlottesville, Virginia has now been supplanting the Statue of Liberty as the symbol of this nation as white supremacist groups proliferate and are enabled by

2.2

the policies, pronouncements, and actions of the Trump administration.

pointing These symbols are to the xenophobic political rhetoric, as well hate violence that is impacting our communities. We're also impacted by the devastating and rising tide of anti-immigrant, anti-refugee, and asylee policies, such as the Muslim ban, the Department of Justice California's lawsuit against commitment to protecting all of its residents though its called sanctuary cities policies, the rescission of and federal efforts to erode protections DACA, against racial profiling.

These policies and rhetoric explicitly target our communities as un-America, identify us as undeserving of core rights and protections and as worthy targets of violence. As a result, our communities are increasingly questioning our very place in this nation.

We documented in the year immediately after the election of President Trump 302 incidents of hate violence and xenophobic political rhetoric aimed at South Asian, Muslim, Sikh, Hindu, Middle Eastern, and Arab communities.

This was an over 45 percent increase

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 from the previous year. Eighty-two percent of the 2 incidents that we documented were animated by anti-Muslim sentiment, 82. 3 And perhaps most troubling, one in five 4 5 $\circ f$ hate violence the perpetrators that we 6 documented explicitly referred to President Trump, 7 a President Trump policy such as the Muslim ban, or 8 Trump campaign slogan as they were violently 9 assaulting our community members. 10 So, for us right now, the connection 11 between the bully pulpit emboldening, and indeed, 12 encouraging individuals to violently assault 13 community members is perhaps never been clearer. We have a number of recommendations in 14 15 our report, which we submitted to the Commission. 16 From a top-line perspective, we know that political 17 leadership can be tied to the troubling uptick in 18 violence. 19 We are deeply troubled by the current 20 administration's silence white supremacist on а 21 are deeply troubled as well by the 2.2 elimination of the budget of the Community 23 Relations Service. 24 And we applaud the leadership of

International Association of Police Chiefs that are

unfortunately placed in the position of having to make up for the inaction or silence of the current administration when it comes to the violence that is impacting our community members every day.

know We that we need preventative respond needs of measures to to the our communities. Wе know that need build we to productive relationships with willing law enforcement leaders between our community members.

And we also know that we need to prioritize post--9/11 violence, in particular, this current moment, as an issue that is deeply and disproportionately impacting our communities.

And finally, we also know that Congress meaningful legislation to address current tide of violence stem the against our We have maintained that the NO HATE communities. currently in Act, which is Congress, is the strongest piece of legislation that addresses the spike in religious hate crimes and provides restorative justice component.

And Ι will simply end with this acknowledgment: important Deah Barakat, Khalid Jabara, Srinivas Kuchibhotla, Nabra Harnish Patel. I believe that the families of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 these individuals who were murdered in the context 2 of hate crime incidents in the last two years alone are quite clear, there's no hoax with respect to 3 4 hate violence today. Thank you. 5 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much, Ms. Raghunathan. Ms. Garlick? 6 MS. GARLICK: Good morning, Chair Lhamon 7 8 and members of the Commission. My name is Melissa I'm the Civil Rights National Counsel at 9 Garlick. 10 Anti-Defamation League, ADL. Ι greatly 11 appreciate the opportunity to testify this morning 12 on behalf of the ADL on hate crimes and the federal 13 government's role in responding to hate crimes. 14 For more than 30 years, this Commission 15 and state advisory committees have done trailblazing work elevating the issue of hate crime 16 17 and bias motivated violence, and we're grateful for 18 your continued leadership and attention to 19 national problem. Since 20 1913, ADL has been working stop the defamation of the Jewish people and 21 2.2 secure justice and fair treatment for all. 23 We are proud of our longstanding work 24 and leadership on effective responses to violent 25 bigotry, including our annual audit on anti-Semitic incidents in the country and drafting model hate crime laws for state legislatures. We are privileged to lead the broad coalition which worked in support of the 2009 Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

We all in this society have a stake in effective response to violent bigotry. Hate crimes demand priority attention, as you've heard from our law enforcement partners, because of their unique impact on both victims and members of the victims' community, leaving them feeling fearful, isolated, and vulnerable.

Hate crimes damage the fabric of our society, they fragment communities, and they make members of minority communities suspicious of other groups and the power structure that is supposed to protect them. Hate crimes are a national problem, they are all of our problems.

Over the past few years, we've seen hate-filled stereotyping, language, memes, and scapegoating injected into the mainstream of America's political and policy debate, especially through traditional and social media. Over the course of the 2016 election, we saw a level anti-Semitism and the normalization of bigotry that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

deeply concerned us at ADL.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And now, we see the rhetoric which involves stereotyping and attacks based on national origin, religion, and physical appearance cemented into federal policies and executive actions that marginalize communities already vulnerable to hate crimes and deter these individuals from reporting such crimes to local police.

The federal administration policies and positions defending such actions, such as a tax on so-called sanctuary cities, the Muslim ban, transgender military ban, they all raise legitimate fears in schools and communities across the hate, and country, encourage have created an environment in which victims are afraid to report come forward as crimes or witnesses, including The federal government has an essential crimes. leadership role to play in confronting crimes.

And thank you for bringing attention to the letter, which we attached to our testimony, which more than 80 civil rights organizations sent to acting Assistant Attorney General John Gore with recommendations for DOJ after the violence in Charlottesville to address hate crimes. And I'm glad to hear that a response is forthcoming today.

Wе hope that the Commission will recommend the creation, as has been asked, of a federal inter-agency task force on fighting hate, and recognize the importance and need for federal agencies to call out bigotry at every opportunity. At the same time, we see a rise in and anti-Semitic incidents, hate crimes, emboldening of extremists. Our recent audit anti-Semitic incidents shows that the number incidents remained significantly higher in 2017, compared to 2016, with an increase of 57 percent. incidents include both Now, these criminal and non-criminal acts of harassment, but they provide an important snapshot into trends of anti-Semitism in our society. Similarly, the FBI also documented an increase in hate crimes. In their most recent report available, the FBI documented a five percent overall increase over the 2015 report. Notably and disturbing, 21 percent all reported hate crimes in 2016 were motivated by religious bias and crimes directed against Jews increased three percent, crimes directed against

reported against Muslims ever, second only to the

percent,

the

19

Muslims

increased

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

second

backlash after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Ultimately, hate crime statistics do not speak for themselves, because behind every statistic is a victim injured or intimidated for no other reason than how they worship, who they love, and who they are.

And these crimes remain seriously under-reported, partly because of mistrust of police in communities. Eighty-eight percent of participating police agencies that participate hate crime reporting affirmatively reported zero hate crimes to the FBI last year or did not report any data to the FBI.

There are significant consequences to this lack of comprehensive reporting of Victims are far more likely to report a crimes. hate crime if they believe that police are ready respond effectively and take able to seriously. We urge that the Commission recommend support incentives for participation in FBI's hate crime data collection program.

Our ADL Center on Extremism is also tracking a resurgence in white supremacist activity in the United States. Extremists and anti-Semites are using technology in new ways to spread their

hate on college campuses and communities on- and off-line.

After the violence in Charlottesville,

ADL partnered with the United States Conference of

Mayors to promote the fundamental principles of

justice and equality that define America in the

Mayors Compact Against Hate.

Finally, the growing epidemic of cyber-harassment and stalking and the spread of hate online is something that we continue to monitor and draw attention to.

Just a few days ago, ADL released a new report analyzing anti-Semitic speech on Twitter and finding that at least 4.2 million anti-Semitic tweets were shared or re-shared in English on Twitter over the 12 month period ending January 28, 2018. Again, not all of these are going to be criminal, but they provide an important snapshot into the state of hate right now.

that the Commission will We hope recommend that Congress confer with specialists in identify new and Constitutionally the field to sound ways for victims to achieve legal redress to cyber-harassment and stalking, and that law enforcement receive training, not only in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 crimes, but also in this context, so that they are 2 better equipped to better handle such incidents. specific and detailed 3 Wе attached 4 recommendations for the Commission and hope they're 5 constructive, but that law is blunt. note 6 instrument to confront violent bigotry. It is much 7 more important to prevent these crimes in the first 8 place. 9 So, we also urge the Commission to look 10 recommending comprehensive federal and state 11 anti-bias education, hate crime prevention, 12 anti-bullying initiatives to complement anything that we do to achieve effective response to hate 13 14 violence as well. 15 There are no quick complete solutions 16 to these problems, we're in it for the long haul 17 and we look forward to working with the Commission 18 to achieve as much of these recommendations 19 possible. Thank you. 20 CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much, Ms. Garlick. Ms. Jorwic? 21 MS. JORWIC: Good morning. 2.2 My name is 23 Nicole Jorwic and I am the Director of Rights 24 Policy for The Arc of the United States. 25 appreciate the opportunity to present in front of

you today and The Arc values the continued work and engagement of the Commission when it comes to the civil rights of individuals with disabilities.

The Arc is the largest national community-based organization advocating for people with intellectual and development disabilities, or IDD, and their families. The Arc also runs the for Criminal National Center Justice and Disability, or NCCJD.

The Arc was founded over 65 years ago on the guiding principle that all people with disabilities belong in the community and have fundamental moral, civil, and the Constitutional right to be there and fully included and actively participate in all aspects of society.

This includes the criminal iustice However, the criminal justice system is system. the slowest to adequately respond to the special circumstances of people with disabilities. Ι believe it was Ruth Luckasson, an expert in the field, who referred to the criminal justice system as the last frontier for people with disabilities when it came to inclusion.

This is one reason why the disability community was relieved after the efforts

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

spearheaded by the National Disability Rights Network, that the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2009 expanded the role of the FBI to allow for the investigation of hate crimes committed against those based on biases related to disability.

This necessary role for is а t.he example federal government to lead by in documenting and enforcing these laws for the disability community after being seen as less-than in society.

More does need to be done, though, to ensure that we are fully capturing the scope of these cases and supporting individuals with disabilities to report and be active participants in prosecution. The current laws are not enough.

There are many reasons why offenses against people with disabilities go unreported. key factor is lack of understanding of stakeholders. Often, individuals with disabilities, their family members, allies, don't know what constitutes a hate crime and there is little outreach about this topic to the disability community specifically.

Most hate crime related outreach

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

focuses on other populations, as it should, but more resources must be provided to all parts of the disability community as well.

Without that knowledge, reporting will continue to be lower, despite the actual incidence not necessarily being less. This outreach must be cross-disability, reach under-served communities, and accessible to all.

We know that across the country many victim assistance organizations, local police departments, health systems, and other providers are not trained on how to assist victims with disabilities or know what kind of accommodations required provide victims they to with are disabilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Untrained law enforcement officers often believe incorrectly that victims with disabilities lack credibility and in addition, the police themselves lack standardized protocols for handling complaints by victims with disabilities leading to ineffective assistance and cases that often go unreported and uninvestigated.

Prosecuting these cases can be difficult due to the lack of training among court

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

officials, attorneys, and judges on how to assist individuals with disabilities as victims or witnesses to hate crimes based on disability bias.

Unfortunately, we have seen that if a victim of a hate crime has a disability, the case is often minimized. Cases of abuse and torture can sometimes be categorized as pranks or bullying, instead of calling them what they are, hate crimes.

We must work to change this mischaracterization, because too often, disabled lives are devalued and we know that disabled people are more than twice as likely to be victims of violent crime overall, but these cases are often lumped together as abuse instead of considered a hate crime.

And even when deemed abuse, it often goes un- or under-investigated and not properly prosecuted in the criminal justice system. This, of course, is only for incidents that are reported in the first place, and even reporting is something that is difficult for people with disabilities.

A factor in this under-reporting in this disability hate crime is that many people with disabilities know the person who harasses or abuses them, which is not a common feature in other hate

2.2

crimes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Clearly, when you know someone, it can be difficult to report an incident, as you may be more afraid of the consequence and not have anywhere to turn for support.

This is just one reason why it is imperative that law enforcement continue to make identification efforts to improve their reporting of hate crime offenses and to continue to support more people to come forward to report these crimes.

Legally, disability-related hate crimes can only be prosecuted on the federal level if it is interstate and individual states vary in their state-based hate crime laws.

Ιt imperative that the federal is government continues to lead by example to make progress in reporting, prosecuting, and preventing hate crimes, and to be a resource to states as they expand their hate crime statutes to include protections for people with disabilities and better reporting at the local, state, and federal level.

of reporting is Α key part data Uniform collection. In late 2016, the FBI's Program released data indicating Reporting

there were 88 reported hate crime offenses during 2015 related to disability bias.

This was down from 95 the previous year. The decline in disability-related cases comes as the FBI indicated that the total number of hate crimes rose. Again, it is very clear that is due to mis- or under-reporting.

Overall, the agency documented 5,850 incidents last year, as has been discussed. those hate crime victims, 1.2 percent were people with disabilities. We know from the data that hate people disabilities crimes against with are critically under-reported and have discussed challenges to reporting this type of hate crime, notably, the victim's potential isolation proximity to the perpetrator, the fear that their claim will not be taken seriously, and the risk that law enforcement officers will not recognize the severity of this type of hate crime.

Access to the justice system remains a critical challenge. The Arc urges and challenges the federal government and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to play a central role in ensuring better access to these prosecutions for people with disabilities, from the initial assessment of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 victim's needs to support mechanisms for victims 2 through the governmental or non-governmental institutions. 3 Developing an effective police response 4 5 is something that the Arc's National Center for Criminal Justice and Disability focuses 6 То 7 counter these crimes is dependent on collecting 8 reliable data. 9 states, the general public, As and individuals with disabilities and their families 10 11 recognize hate crimes against people with 12 disabilities and their impacts increase awareness, 13 better reporting by victims and data collection 14 will help reveal the full magnitude of the problem 15 and enable policymakers to identify the appropriate 16 responses. 17 Arc of the United States looks 18 forward to being а partner to improve the 19 enforcement of hate crimes against people with 20 disabilities. Thank you. 21 CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much, 2.2 Jorwic. Ms. Prescott? 23 MS. PRESCOTT: Good morning. My name is 24 Katherine Prescott. Thank you for inviting me to 25 be here today as part of this briefing on an issue

1 of great urgency. It's truly an honor to be here. 2 Author Margaret J. Wheatley wrote, you 3 can't hate someone whose story you know, and I 4 So, let us make it our responsibility to 5 know the stories of those around us and make it our mission to hear one another and share our stories. 6 7 The story I am here to share with you 8 today is unique and individual, but it's also a story that has much in common with the thousands of 9 10 stories that continue to play out all across our 11 nation. 12 In sharing my story, my son's story, I 13 hope to give voice to the thousands of other youth who have suffered and continue to suffer, kids who 14 15 need and demand our support and protection. 16 My son Kyler was a musician, a writer, 17 He had a beautiful spirit full of and an artist. 18 love and compassion for all living things. 19 was also transgender and he bravely tried to be his 20 authentic self in a society that is intolerant of 21 gender nonconformity. 2.2 Kyler came out as trans when he was 13 23 Signs of personal struggle had appeared years old. 24 a few years earlier, but it was at 13 that Kyler

declare

that

his

to

found

the

courage

25

gender

1 identity, his sense of self did not conform with 2 the body he was born with. those of who 3 For us have not 4 experienced gender dysphoria, we can only imagine 5 how this would feel. Anyone who has not personally through this strugale, the emotional, 6 gone 7 psychological, and biological toll that it brings, should not pass judgment or pretend to understand 8 9 what this would be like. 10 But I can tell you that when your own 11 child, whom you love more than life itself, tells 12 you that he can't stand to change his clothes or 13 look in the mirror, you listen. 14 family supported Kyler Our in his 15 transition. Не began the process of 16 transition and received appropriate medical care. 17 We took the legal steps needed to change Kyler's name and gender, and separately, we applied for a 18 19 new birth certificate based on these legal steps. 20 However, while could affirm and we 21 support our child in the safety of our home, it was 22 not so easy in the public sphere. School, in 23 particular, became a particularly menacing place. 24 Kyler had always loved school and student. 25 gifted was а phenomenally Once he

transitioned, however, school became a place where Kyler felt unwelcome, misunderstood, and ostracized.

While it was most comfortable to imagine that this was because of intolerant young peers, in truth, his difficulties stemmed more from teachers and administrators than they did from other students. School records continued to announce his old name and gender, even after he had received a legal name and gender change.

Teachers continued to call him she in front of other students, thus exposing his trans status in front of students who otherwise would not have known. Administrators tried to force him to use the girls' bathroom.

Imagine being a child and being called out every day at school by the wrong name and having teachers use the wrong pronouns repeatedly. Imagine being humiliated every day because the school willfully refused to do what it was required to do.

The classroom, which had always been a place where Kyler could shine as a brilliant student, became a hostile environment. Over time, we came to the decision that Kyler had to leave

2.2

school and do independent study instead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And while this may seem like a solution to some, for Kyler it felt like exile. He felt displaced, unwelcome, and rejected. He was given unspoken his identity the message that was unacceptable, that he was freak who did not а belong with other children.

Kyler struggled mightily to be accepted and understood, but on May 18, 2015, just a few weeks shy of his 15th birthday and almost three years ago today, Kyler took his own life. And in so doing, he took a part of me with him. His new birth certificate with his new name and gender change arrived three days after his death.

This country guarantees a free education to all of its children. It guarantees to protect its citizens from discrimination.

Federal courts have held that transgender students like Kyler, who are entitled to protection under federal law, and many schools live up to those obligations without fanfare and without problems, but Kyler, like so many other youth, was tortured because his school failed in its obligation to protect and serve all students.

Schools are ground zero for prevention

of bias related incidents. They are public institutions where, as a government and as a society, we guarantee a safe environment for our children.

I stand before you as witness to our collective failure to live up to these promises. Kyler's experience is just one among thousands of youth who are made to feel that they do not belong in our classrooms.

And if a child does not feel welcome at school, how can we say that we have guaranteed that child's education? How can a child learn in an environment where he or she does not feel safe, affirmed, and respected? How can we be satisfied with any level of harassment, bias, or hatefulness in our schools?

This is not an issue that applies only transgender youth. Ιt applies to all the children who feel ostracized based on any aspect of their identity, whether it's religion, race, origin, ethnicity, disability, national identity, or sexual orientation.

Schools where bias is expressed by adults are places where students learn to reject and hate their peers. As adults, perhaps no other

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

responsibility is more sacred than the responsibility to provide to our children a safe, supportive environment where they can learn, develop, and reach their full potential.

History has shown us time and time again that hoping for and expecting the best out of people is not enough when it comes to bias, hate, and civil rights. We know that the government can and does play an essential role in ensuring the freedoms, rights, and dignity of all people.

Indeed, over the past decade, we have possible seen what improvements are when the federal government acts to end bias and hate, through criminal just law, but also through proactive efforts to alert schools our obligations and to show them how to live up them.

Over the past decade, years of focused federal action led to a decrease in bullying in our schools, including the bullying and discrimination experienced by LGBT students. It can be done.

Federal action matters. When a school or community or state is failing to live up to our shared promise of justice and equality, it is incumbent upon the federal government to do all

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 that it can to right the course. 2 We have the ability to prevent acts of hate and bias related incidents in our schools, 3 4 whether among children or perpetrated by adults. 5 Kyler was vulnerable and he was wounded by the bias of his school administrators and other students. 6 7 If Kyler had been accepted and embraced at school, he might still be here today. 8 9 since he cannot be here, I stand in his place to 10 ask that we all come together to create and enforce 11 federal policies, rules, and procedures 12 ensure that all of our children, our friends and colleagues are 13 given the respect, honor, and 14 appreciation they deserve to protect the most 15 vulnerable among us from hate. 16 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Ms. Prescott. 17 Ms. Bro, we'll go to you next. 18 MS. BRO: Hi, my name is Susan Bro. Мγ 19 daughter, Heather Heyer, was standing with her 20 friends on August 12 in Charlottesville. 21 she with The crowd that was 2.2 getting reports from other people who were watching 23 on the news to let them know where the violence 24 was, so that they could deliberately stay away from

the violence.

They carried no weapons with them, they only had signs. The four friends, she and her three friends, didn't even have signs, she simply had her keys, her phone, and her billfold in her pockets.

A young man who believed the lies of hate that he had been fed on the internet and who believed the lies of hate that he had been fed by a number of other people in his life chose to drive his car into the crowd.

The evidence that I've seen in his preliminary hearing indicated that he pulled forward towards the crowd, stopped, backed up, sat for a second, and then gunned it into the crowd.

My daughter was crushed between two cars. All the doctors would tell me was that her heart had stopped. I found out later from the medical report and from photographs that I have on my phone that the cause of death was actually blunt force trauma to the abdomen.

Money poured in from around the world for the family and even when we closed the GoFundMe at \$220,000, money continued to pour in. So, nine days within my daughter's death, we filed the IRS paperwork to form a 501(c)(3), which is the Heather

2.2

Heyer Foundation.

Our first goal, because it is -- having been an educator for a number of years was, well, we can give out scholarships, I don't know what else to do. I was still kind of in shock at that time, obviously.

So, we set a goal to give a scholarship at Charlottesville High School, as well as William Monroe High School, where Heather had attended. In addition, we're giving a third scholarship this year.

Because of technicality, we forgot to say that we were only doing those two high schools and so, other people applied, and so, we said, okay, we'll do a miscellaneous scholarship. Our goal is to expand the number of high school scholarships we give.

And we still didn't feel like that was enough, so we are also launching, this August, a program called Higher Voices, which will have teachers trained as facilitators in schools to allow youth to run their own programs.

And the youth that we have talked to around the country are very eager and excited about it and very disappointed that we're not ready to

launch this nationally yet.

2.2

But we're trying to start it out with a summer camp program first in Waynesboro, Virginia, and then, we will move it into the Albermarle County School District. I have a teacher there who's willing to work with me, we'll work out a few of the kinks and then try to roll it out in a more controlled manner.

The third year, I'm looking at perhaps launching a, at least a public access to begin with, television show where people have a chance to speak on TV and explain their situation, because so often, people of diversity, people of color, people of disability, people of gender identity issues don't get a chance to express themselves.

So, if they're brave enough to be seen on TV, because it is risky in this current climate, unfortunately, if they're brave enough to come on TV, we will let them share their story and share some of how they feel as a member of the community, positive and negative.

Our goal is to move social justice forward in a positive, affirming, nonviolent method. That is continually our focus and our work.

1	This past year, we worked in
2	conjunction with the AIDS Healthcare Foundation and
3	they approached us, apparently they do a lot of
4	work outside of just AIDS work and they had a
5	program called Stand Against Hate.
6	And we put an essay contest out around
7	the country, we got in 18 essays, because there was
8	only about a three week period there that people
9	knew about it. And the top three winners of that
10	have a chance to ride in the Rose Bowl Parade with
11	us.
12	And we gave out, with the AIDS
13	Healthcare Foundation, a \$5,000 scholarship, I
14	think there was at least three \$5,000
15	scholarships and then, two \$1,000 scholarships.
16	So, we're trying to move things forward
17	from Heather's death. I say, I got some very
18	bitter lemons there and we're trying to make some
19	very good lemonade from this.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Ms. Bro.
21	MS. BRO: Thank you.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Mr. Fletcher?
23	MR. FLETCHER: My name is Micah
24	Fletcher. May 26, 2017, I and two other
25	individuals were assaulted on a commuter train

heading towards Clackamas. The other two people's names were Taliesin Meche and Ricky Best.

I was the only person that survived this assault, and I'm immensely nervous today because the unfortunate fact of the matter, as far as I'm concerned, is that it is my responsibility to hold onto the legacy of what occurred that day. And the burden of that is not lost on me.

I want to tell you first about who the two men were. Taliesin, despite all accounts, though a very bright, vivacious, and happy young man, was also kind of a troublemaker according to his younger sister, in the most playful of ways. He was always the kind of person that had to get the last word in and he always wanted to make sure that his wit was heard.

Ricky Best was more than just a patriot and a veteran, he was a father of multiple children. And he was a good man. And I was just some kid on the MAX trying to get to work after getting off of school.

I apologize, I don't feel quite qualified to be sitting in this chair and I really do appreciate the time of the Committee today.

Typically, I'm better at these sorts of things.

2.2

The gentleman in question, Jeremy Christian, was a man suffering from severe mental illness, as well as alcoholism.

From what I've seen from the police reports, it has been seen on video record that he was pounding sangria from what is considered a wine bag, essentially, either during or before entering the train, I cannot remember exactly what And was known not only for having report said. multiple incidences of arrests, but also multiple incidences of mental and health.

Now, why this is important is because many times nowadays, what you will see with these incidences of what are considered hate crimes is that the perpetrators are mentally unwell and, as somebody who's mental health is not the best, I can understand how that would cause trouble.

I'm here today to talk about the fact that I do not believe that pursuing hate crimes is going to be an effective methodology for dealing with this problem.

Though the federal government may need to get involved, I do not believe that allocating even more resources to police departments all over across America that are already understaffed and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

overwhelmed with the amount of crime occurring in their cities and trying to deal with their cities' problems is the answer.

I believe that police and federal organizations are already far stretched too thin and that the best course of action would be to institute methodologies of youth intervention, so that youth are able to have a wider range of experiences to different kinds of people.

I took part, for instance, in a program called Caldera, which was an all-year program, after school program, that allowed children access to multiple different art disciplines taught by various professionals. It also put us in the same room as people from all over Oregon once a year for seven days.

People from parts of Eastern Oregon, which would be considered mainly red, people from Portland, which is considered mainly blue, would come together and be forced to work together as a unit and get to know each other as a unit via mentorship and arts projects.

Now, does it necessarily need to be an arts-based program? No. But I believe that at a fundamental level, the only way we're going to be

2.2

1 able to deal with hatred in America is by making 2 sure that we understand each other, making sure the communities talk. 3 And unfortunately, 4 there comes to 5 point at a certain age where you cannot force 6 people to listen any more, but our most pliable 7 asset is our children. I have been lucky enough to be raised 8 mainly by people that did not look like me. 9 I'm 10 not going to sit here and pretend that this is an intellectual debate. 11 Ouite frankly, I could give a damn less 12 13 about politics. This matters to me because most of 14 the people that allowed me to be a semi-functioning 15 human being today don't look like me. That's it. 16 I have a vested interest in this and I 17 interest in pretending that this have no is 18 matter of morality to me, these are my loved ones 19 that are being threatened to some extent by the 20 four, at minimum, known hate groups that exist near 21 and around my city. 2.2 Those groups being American Front, 23 European Kindred, Volksfront, and another, which I cannot remember the name of, and those are just the 24

major players that we know of today.

Now, the only way to combat this is on a communal level. And in a short minute, I hope to explain that.

Essentially, I would like to talk about instituting funding for schools and helping them create programing that allows children from different parts of America, different backgrounds, and different cultures to be able to spend time, bond, and get to know one another in an effort to create more unity amongst communities.

I'm not sure whether me, Taliesin, and Ricky were heroes, but we were trying to do the right thing. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very Thank you to each of the panelists, and I will now open up this panel for questions from my fellow To start us off, if each of you Commissioners. could speak to the ways that hate incidents affect an entire community, not only the individuals directly impacted, we would benefit from that.

MS. RAGHUNATHAN: I'm happy to begin. I think that the wave of violence and of fear and intimidation that our communities are currently experiencing is felt throughout the fabric of a community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

When you have houses of worship that are being targeted with fire-bombing attacks or with arson or graffiti, that has an impact on a place of refuge or a place that is intended to be a place of refuge for a whole community.

Particularly for immigrant communities, these houses of worship and community centers are fundamental to really providing a sense of welcome and refuge in this country.

Similarly, I will also note that the two most prevalent targets of hate violence that we have documented in our reports are women wearing hijabs and youth. And those two individuals are really the anchor of so many of our communities and families. Youth were assaulted not only, or were targeted not only in their schools, but on the streets.

And so, the impact that that has on a community, which, as I mentioned, is incredibly diverse racial, religiously, socioeconomically, is deep and fundamental.

And the impact ultimately on our communities is really questioning the understanding or the belief that our very communities have a place in this country. And I perhaps cannot even

2.2

begin to characterize it in words the impact that that has on a community, or a huge swath of our communities in the U.S.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.

MS. GARLICK: I'll just add briefly to that, all of which I strongly agree, that hate crimes, as we describe them, are unique crimes because of both their special impact on a victim, but also the community.

And the only thing that I would add is that hate crimes, everybody in the community that identifies themselves with the victim, the broader community as we've seen play out on national scale and the local community scale hate incidents are occurring more frequently, they have the potential to cause an isolated incident to explode into widespread community if tension they're not handled correctly.

So, when we talk about hate crimes, we talk about the fact that they can't just be measured in terms of dollars or cents, but they make -- and they're intended to make the targeted communities feel isolated, feel intimidated, and feel suspicious of other groups.

They're intended to divide. And so, if

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

are not trained or enforcement if elected officials if community leaders or are not effectively preventing and responding to those hate crimes when they occur, it can cause that isolated crime explode more widely into hate to community tension as a result.

MS. JORWIC: I sit here as a professional, but I also sit here as a sister of my brother Chris, who has autism, and my other brother Luke, who happens to be a gay man. So, on a personal level, the hate I have seen in different experiences can be suffocating.

And I know that the history of the disability rights movement and the disability community, people were warehoused in institutions because so often, not the families themselves, but individuals with disabilities were seen as less than human.

And I think that the -- when we see that the under-reporting and the not frequent enough appropriate characterizations of hate crimes against people with disabilities as hate crimes, not as pranks, not as things like that, then it shows that that fear continues to escalate.

And it keeps people behind closed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

doors, and that's where dangerous things happen. It isolates people. It makes families, families like my own family, feel that individuals with disabilities may be better off if they're all together somewhere, because maybe they're safe.

And that's the wrong message. And that's the importance of prosecuting hate crimes and looking and really seeing the humanity of everyone else. That's one of the many wonderful things that Micah said, that I think we really have to do more to see the humanity of others.

And I think prosecuting and looking -words matter, calling a hate crime a hate crime,
that's how we begin to come together and see the
humanity of everyone, no matter what their
background is.

MS. PRESCOTT: Yes. So, to speak specifically of the transgender community, the risk of suicide and murder among that community is extremely high, such that the life expectancy of a transgender individual is extremely reduced by many, many, many years.

I cannot express, I don't have the statistics off the top of my head, but the risk of suicide and murder, the murder rate of transgender

2.2

individuals is horrifying. And yet, I don't want to say that I'm speaking only of this group, I'm speaking of all groups that are being targeted by hate and bias.

federal So, it matters t.o have quidance, prevent attitudes in the to these beginning. So, I had the opportunity to meet with the Obama administration about six months after my son's death, and we discussed what schools could do to better serve, in particular, what I discussed was transgender, in our schools.

And the Obama administration had put guidelines in place to help schools understand what their responsibilities are. And I think this was incredibly critical and it immediately had beneficial effects to transgender students across the nation.

Many schools suddenly understood what their responsibilities were simply because there were federal guidelines in place. It wasn't even a new law, it was as simple as putting in guidelines.

And I am devastated to say that one of the very first actions of our new administration, within a couple of weeks of coming into the office, the Trump administration rescinded those

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 quidelines, took away those basic recommendations 2 best protect those students in how to schools. 3 4 And immediately, the situation 5 transgender students in our schools across the 6 nation deteriorated rapidly. Therefore, 7 want to reiterate the importance it is to 8 basic federal quidelines established about what is 9 expected of our administrators. 10 And I don't just mean in schools, 11 that's in particular what my experience speaks to. 12 It matters, it absolutely matters, and it made a 13 difference. 14 current administration And why the 15 chose to take away basic guidelines of protection 16 for those among us who are most vulnerable, 17 student body that's at an extremely high risk of 18 suicide, I will never understand. Thank you. 19 MS. BRO: Micah has indicated I should 20 I addressed my situation, I did not talk Charlottesville's 21 about reality now. 2.2 Charlottesville was a case of a community-wide 23 attack. 24 The statues were brought to the 25 forefront by a high schooler who requested in a

petition that they be removed due to them being brought to the community during the time of Jim Crow laws, into the prominent black neighborhoods.

So, this became a focal point for the white supremacist groups from around the country and the word went out over the internet that a gathering was to happen. So, players from 35 states came.

They got off the buses with shields, they got off the buses with assault rifles, they got off the buses with their fists wrapped, they were ready to fight and they planned to fight. That sort of violence leaves a scar.

Due to previous incidents, when the KKK came to town and the police and the local population had issues, the police chose, for a number of reasons, to step back. Their hands were tied in some ways, when a state of emergency was called and state troops were called in.

I've talked with both the police and local citizenry and there's a great deal of mistrust on both sides, a great deal of pain on both sides. Any outside help that comes in right now is viewed as unwelcome, not helpful, and very bitterly received.

2.2

1 So, I'm here to tell you that the hate 2 crimes not only affect individuals in pain, but 3 they draw tremendous impacts for the can 4 community's health as well. 5 I spoke with the pastor from Ferguson, Missouri just a couple of weeks ago and he said 6 7 that in Ferguson, four years later, they're still 8 having a great deal of pain. 9 it's not that hate crimes So, only 10 affect individuals, they have tremendous impacts on 11 communities and decision making policies and 12 just so many ways. It's just an ever-spreading 13 effect. 14 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Commissioner 15 Yaki, I think you had a question? 16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Going back to 17 a statement made by, I think the official from the 18 Department, said that did Justice who he not 19 believe that you could exculpate anyone who 20 committed a hate crime simply because there was a 21 climate or an atmosphere of hate speech in there. And I think that's right, but I also 2.2 23 believe that we have an issue here, more than any 24 other time in our country, of the acceptance of 25 hate speech in the atmosphere, being part of a new

normal, which cannot be a new normal for this country.

What. like is I'd to get -reaction to this, but what is fascinating, fascinating, shouldn't Ι say that, what is extremely disturbing to me is that I read earlier a series of statements made by the President, and I won't go into them again, but then, the corollary that follows is you have a number of incidents that have been reported by the press and they all follow pattern, similar whether you are whether you are Jewish, whether you are Latino, whether you are African American, where the name of the President becomes a punctuation mark to the, we're going to get rid of you, and then mention the President's name, or the President is going to get rid of you.

This is -- the title of this briefing is In the Name of Hate, but when hate is being spewed in the name of Trump, that's something that is extremely troubling to me.

Micah, I was really moved by what you said and I think what I want to get at from panel here is, is this something that just tracking hate crimes is going to be enough?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

It seems like we need to do more in terms of the kinds of bridge building, the interconnections between people, the things that bind us as a nation together, that is not being said, is not being done, is not being exalted as it should be.

And all of you have views on this and I would just very quickly love to hear what you have to say about it and where you think we can be part of that. And I see Micah would like to go first and I will give you the honor.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you. A lot of my fear comes from the fact that so much of this is tied up in politics and the morality behind it. So very often, we paint issues into a matter of, pardon the pun, but black and white. And I don't mean racially speaking necessarily, I mean in extremes. I'm sorry.

MS. RAGHUNATHAN: Perhaps I can jump in. I can't underestimate, and I think it's critical for us to note that the current normalization of hate speech and divisive rhetoric that is coming from the administration, and in particular from the White House, has been buttressed by a raft of policies that operationalize that climate of

2.2

division and that single out particular communities, either before they enter the U.S. or upon their arrival in the U.S., for disparate treatment.

The list is very long, from the rescission of DACA, to specify only seven largely Muslim Arab nations as fountains of extremism and as threats to the U.S., to the decision on the part of Attorney General Sessions and the Department of Justice to penalize, and indeed target, states that have chosen to protect their immigrant residents, to the targeting of the movement for Black Lives Matter activists.

I think that the list goes on and on and on with respect to the statements that are emanating from the White House being implemented or sought to be implemented by the actual policies that are far more lasting, in my opinion, from the current administration that continue to have a real impact on our communities.

The day after the Muslim ban was announced, we had a huge spike in hate violence incidents targeting our communities. And certainly, the cast of the wide net of violence was not limited to Muslim, Arab, Sikh, Hindu, and South

2.2

Asian communities, right?

2.2

The idea that it was open season, frankly, on most of the communities and survivors represented at this table cannot be underestimated, and it certainly has not ebbed.

MS. GARLICK: So, I'll just add, the federal government, in my opinion, has an essential leadership role to play in confronting hate crimes.

And I've said this a couple of times, but it can't do so effectively if it's scapegoating Muslims, refugees, and other marginalized communities, both through rhetoric and through policies that were mentioned.

Simply put, the well-documented reluctance to addressing the rise in anti-Semitism, Islamophobia by the administration and hate, has helped to create this environment in which extremists have felt emboldened.

And that's what we have seen and what we've tracked with respect to the resurgence of white supremacy and white supremacists, but also the unprecedented outreach efforts that they're suddenly engaged in on places like college campuses, which were relatively low in number until late 2016.

1 also see a clear spike from 2 reports on incidents in anti-Semitic incidents that the quarter of 2017, 3 track in first for instance, 4 and also immediately after 5 Charlottesville, a spike in anti-Semitic incidents. So, as Suman noted, sort of in response 6 7 to these incidents in rhetoric and policies, we do see spikes in incidents. Thank you. 8 9 MS. JORWIC: I think that the inundation 10 that we get on a daily basis of hateful language 11 society, including from all aspects of 12 administration, has a threat to desensitize all of 13 which is why must be steadfast in us, we 14 documenting, prosecuting, and reporting hate 15 crimes. 16 However, we do need to be -- more needs 17 to be done, so that more voices are valued and 18 and that from stunned heard we can move and 19 overwhelmed silence, because it's all so much, to 20 action. 21 I think the way that we tried -- a way 2.2 that The Arc tried to do that in the past year, as 23 Director of Rights Policy, I also cover Medicaid, 24 and for example, there's video that's widely spread

of then-candidate Trump mocking a reporter with a

disability.

2.2

And that's terrible and yes, but we need to move -- we took that and said, okay, well then, what do we need to do to engage Congress? What do we need to do to engage the general public? Because that's what we see as the disability community in general.

It's not the 1980s, when Geraldo Rivera did his big expose on institutions, hey, those are still open. We need to be able to do more, as all communities that are under-served and under-represented need to do more, but we can't just get stuck in outrage, we have to shift that to action.

MS. BRO: I think in my own hometown, which is not Charlottesville, not hometown, but where I've lived the last 25 years or so, when the sheriff there offered four years ago a class on the Muslim threat, and would not allow for anyone who was pro-Muslim to even participate in the classes, and my daughter and he had quite the verbal battle on social media about that.

So, I think that we have to remember that, although the current administration is definitely adding to the problem, the problem existed prior to the current administration.

And dealing with the public and educating the public, allowing people to have a broader understanding of who everyone is and get to know more people outside their own little social But it is difficult when those in charge, as sheriffs or the President or anyone else, fans that rhetoric. But have to remember that the we

But we have to remember that the current administration is in place because a great deal of the American public goes along with that concept. He didn't mince words when he was campaigning, he very clearly laid out who he was, and yet, people supported that.

to deal with the So, we have unfortunate reality that this is still very much a public situation and not just government а And I find that kind of sad, because I situation. thought we'd moved past that.

CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. And thank you to the witnesses, very compelling testimony. We've heard testimony that words matter, and they do, and that the words of the administration officials may have exacerbated the climate in this country.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 review of Bureau of Justice 2 Statistics data shows that, with respect to the commission of hate crimes, certain groups are more 3 likely to commit hate crimes than others. 4 5 like to see if I can get your input as to how we can maybe reduce the number of hate crimes. 6 7 We've heard about this rhetoric, the Bureau of Justice Statistics shows that blacks, 8 9 for example, are five and a half times more likely to commit hate crimes than whites. 10 11 Other intra-ethnic hate crimes are 12 committed, for by example, certain Central 13 Americans against other Central Americans 14 higher rate than committed by other perpetrators. 15 Same with certain Asian groups. 16 What, if any, data, studies, evidence, 17 show that this kind of hate crime can be stopped by 18 a reduction in rhetoric or attachment of a hate 19 crime designation or а federal hate crime designation? 20 MS. BRO: My understanding, and I can't 21 2.2 provide you the exact names of the studies, 23 unfortunately, my understanding as a mother of a 24 white male and a grandmother of white males is that

many of the white males who act out are doing so

because their identity is threatened.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I had been previously led to believe that economic conditions were the primary cause of people acting out in fear and hate. It was, we're losing jobs because of the other, whoever the other might be at that given moment.

of And think that is part the problem, but the latest studies seem to indicate that as gender identity and racial identity, fear being lost in the crowd, fear of marginalized yourself is what causes you oftentimes to lash out at someone else.

But then, there's also the case of the easy target, particularly when it's someone with disability who maybe can't defend themselves or a gender identity child who can't defend themselves.

As with most everything, there's no single answer, it's a complicated issue that needs to be dealt with on a number of fronts. I don't think dealing with speech alone is going to stop it.

I think that, as a classroom teacher where we didn't allow it, we thought that kind of squashed it, but what it does is it forces it underground. It's not okay to force it out into

1 the light, but in some ways, it's easier to know 2 what you're dealing with when it's out in the light than it is when it's underground. 3 MS. GARLICK: Thanks for your questions 4 5 and this is exactly why I say the law is a blunt instrument and it's better to prevent these crimes 6 7 from happening in the first place. And I think, to 8 question, prevention, cross-cultural your understanding, and all of that is key. 9 10 So, some best practices that we 11 forth in our, for instances, Mayors Compact Against 12 Hate, where local mayors are taking the lead in 13 sort of implementing these best practices in their 14 cities across the country, are encouraging schools 15 to implement anti-bias and anti-hate content into 16 their curricula in schools. 17 Promoting advanced partnerships 18 community-based organizations, civil rights, 19 religious groups to build trust amongst groups, and 20 also between law enforcement as well. And also, supporting the successful integration of immigrants 21 2.2 into communities and society and improving that 23 trust too.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

understanding,

So, focusing on education, focusing on

and

24

25

best.

those

cross-cultural

practices, those have to complement anything that our government, our society does, in order to effectively respond to hate crimes, to prevent them from happening in the first place.

MS. JORWIC: I only was able to hear the last little bit of the panel before me, but what I did hear and in reviewing the materials in advance of the hearing today, it does seem that a lot more training needs to be done in order to get a better representation in the data.

So, I don't have a data study to cite to, but I do think that more time does need to come out, so that we get a real picture, we get data that really bears a real picture, particularly for people with disabilities, since that's only been included in data collection in recent years.

But as far as for people with disabilities, what I can say and what we have data to support, is that as attitudes change in societal views of people with disabilities and all people change, that we're able to move.

We have data that supports that people move back into the community once they weren't seen as an other. And I think that that's the broader reason why data is important, but it's not going to

2.2

1 give the full picture when we have to look at the 2 full view of why as a society different groups are seen different ways. 3 And that's also why, as I did state and 4 5 as you mentioned before, words do matter and why it's important that things that are hate crimes are 6 7 labeled as such and that we're continuing to track 8 data. 9 MS. PRESCOTT: For this moment, I'11 10 speak as an educator, rather than as a parent, 11 am also a teacher. because I I teach 12 community college. And I too noticed sort of an 13 increase in biased speech in the last couple 14 years. 15 But how I have dealt with it as 16 educator is to talk about it extensively in 17 classroom and to make everything that we're talking 18 about here today is something that we discuss 19 the classroom on a daily basis. 20 Whether it's race, religion, identity, sexual orientation, all of those things 21 2.2 are things that I think we all need to talk about, 23 in particular, understanding individual stories. 24 I can't say enough that, that's how I

began what I said, my remarks today, but I truly

1 believe that when you get to know individuals, you 2 don't hate them, right? You get to know them as 3 real human beings. 4 One of the books that I consistently 5 teach my class is Bryan Stevenson's Just Mercy, that speaks specifically about the criminal justice 6 7 system and all of our issues. And Bryan Stevenson 8 is quite a remarkable man. 9 of the things that is But one so 10 powerful about that book is it delves specifically 11 into individual stories, to help people understand 12 that we are all people and we are all here and need 13 to support each other and we are all human and to 14 stop being scared of anyone that is different than 15 ourselves. 16 And I think that as a society, we need 17 to take the same approach, no matter what our role is, is we need to talk, we need to be open, and we 18 19 need to hear each other's stories. 20 MS. RAGHUNATHAN: If I can just briefly 21 I think also, we cannot underestimate the level of under-reporting. 2.2 23 National Crime Victimization The 24 Survey, which is an arm of the federal government

itself, estimates itself that under-reporting of

hate crimes to the FBI is at a factor of 40 to 1. So, for every one hate crime that is reported to the FBI, the federal government itself estimates that 40 go under-reported.

And so, onto that layer, I would also add the reality of over-policing and overcriminalization in particular of black men in our society, which I'm sure leads to an overrepresentation, and an extremely small sample of those individuals who are perpetrating hate crimes.

Clearly, any individual who perpetrates a hate crime should be addressed and it should be addressed as such, regardless of the racial or ethnic background of the person who perpetrates that incident.

But I think we cannot underestimate the extent to which in particular black and Latino men in our community, in our society are explicitly being disproportionately targeted by law enforcement officers and law enforcement agencies often, and seen as agents of criminality from the beginning.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm not sure that that really answered the question. I think we've been appropriately directing attention toward

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 the commission of hate crimes by, Ι hope, 2 everybody. But it seems to be focused on just one 3 segment. And when you have five and a half times 4 5 more hate crimes or it's five and a half times more 6 likely that marginalized groups are committing hate 7 crimes, what are we doing wrong? What's going on 8 here? 9 Ιt there's this to seems me 10 presumption, there's this kind of stereotypic view 11 who's perpetrating the hate crime, when 12 of Justice Statistics Bureau shows а 13 disproportionate number of hate crimes being committed by the marginalized groups, 14 which are also the victims of hate crimes. 15 16 MS. JORWIC: With all due respect, the 17 ethnic background of a perpetrator for a person disability, it 18 doesn't is with а matter 19 actually doing those hateful things to them. 20 Just in Chicago, there was a 21 example, it doesn't matter the race of the person, 2.2 when I read about them cutting into the person's 23 skull, the person with the disability. 24 So, I think -- and, again, if we don't

have -- we do not -- I can safely say that we do

1 not have a full scope of accurate data. 2 I don't believe -- I personally am not background 3 casting aspersions on the οf the 4 perpetrator, it's about the crime that's happening 5 and what we're calling it that's so important for the disability community and for, I would imagine, 6 7 all marginalized communities. MS. PRESCOTT: Just to add to that and 8 to try and clarify, not only what I was trying to 9 10 refer to, but I think the other panelists, is that 11 creating an atmosphere of bias and hate, that is 12 something that happens throughout the society. 13 So, who becomes the perpetrator is --14 it's whether -- sorry, I'm trying to clarify my own 15 thoughts. But if you were to look at, for example, 16 who commits domestic violence. Often, those are 17 people experienced who have violence upon 18 themselves. 19 So, people who commit acts of 20 discrimination might have also experienced a lot of 21 biased and hateful incidents upon themselves. 2.2 it's really more of a society-wide thing. 23 I don't think of bias related incidents 24 coming from any specific group. To me that -- who commits the crime is not -- I don't see this as 25

1 only done by white males, for example, I really 2 don't. I think it's more just an atmosphere of 3 4 intolerance that gets perpetuated and then it gets 5 expressed, and that people who have experienced intolerance might also then perpetrate intolerance. 6 7 we need to deal with it as a society as 8 something that impacts all of us. 9 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki --10 oh, sorry. Oh, I'm sorry, I was 11 MS. BRO: just 12 going to say, that is kind of my point, is 13 when white males commit this, it's because 14 feel marginalized. Groups that are marginalized 15 definitely are acting out on that feeling. 16 Whoever is feeling being or 17 marginalized is the one who is acting out. 18 find to lessen that we can way society 19 marginalization of people, whether it's with jobs, 20 training, education, housing, whatever we can do to 21 improve quality of life overall and 22 people for who they are, I think is going to help 23 stop the hate crime. 24 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki? 25 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, I want to thank the witnesses for bringing home that today is not just about an intellectual policy debate, but that we're talking about the lives of real people and real loved ones, so I appreciate that, because I feel bad that we are asking all of you to relive experiences that are very painful. But it is so important and I really thank you.

I also wanted to acknowledge the AntiDefamation League for your long work, both on
moving policy, but also the work on teaching
tolerance, because as we've heard so eloquently
today, laws alone will not solve the problem, we
really do need other interventions that bring us
together as communities, that help us see the
humanity in each individual. So, I just wanted to
acknowledge that, because I learned a lot from ADL
when I started out.

So, there's been this morning some witnesses who've implied that the rise in the FBI data and the various reports that groups are doing may not be actual rises, but may be just a matter of better reporting or changes in reporting. And I wanted to ask you, does that matter and are they right?

MS. RAGHUNATHAN: What I can say, because SAALT has been documenting hate violence incidents that we have sourced, not through the FBI, but through our community members and also through media searches and through the information from our community partners, we've been looking at this data for the better part of a decade, as I mentioned earlier.

What I can certainly tell you is that there has been a steady escalation that has been

What I can certainly tell you is that there has been a steady escalation that has been incredibly troubling. From 2014 to 2015, we saw a 67 percent increase in hate violence incidents affecting our community members. And from 2016 to 2017, we saw a 45 percent increase in hate violence affecting our community members.

Even as we continue to get the word out to community members, we continue to forge partnerships with enlightened law enforcement officers on the need to address under-reporting in particular of hate crimes and hate violence.

So, from our perspective, which I think has been amply bolstered by FBI crime statistics as well as hate crime statistics, is that the problem continues to escalate.

And I think it would be far from the

2.2

reality of our communities or from the data that we have collected for us to say that the issue of hate crimes has been a blip or there has not been a continued, sustained, and troubling escalation of hate violence spanning, frankly, two administrations.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you. So, there's also been, as you can tell from some of the questions coming from some of the Commissioners, a belief by some that federal law doesn't matter, that the federal government doesn't really have a role, that federal hate crimes are somehow displacing state hate crimes.

And I'm wondering whether you can respond to explain how federal law or programs may matter and how they may be complementary to what happens on the state level?

MS. JORWIC: Yes. Federal law, and more importantly, federal law enforcement, plays a large role for the disability community. And it particularly when comes to quidance and additional support, whether it's for federal, law enforcement or stakeholders state, or local themselves, it plays a very important role.

In a meeting that we had with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

acting head of the Civil Rights Division of the DOJ, Mr. Gore, I was very clear that pulling back these guidances is just as dangerous as not pursuing the lawsuits. The lawsuits matter, we have to continue.

We have to continue prosecuting, but we also have to keep the guidance coming from the federal government because, for stakeholders, for families, for administrations when we're talking about the education system, that shows not only the investment, but the commitment, and it's much easier for stakeholders, families, and individuals to access that information and it's an imperative continued role of the federal government.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you.

MS. BRO: I think some of the evidence has shown that, left to their own devices, some states have extremely lax standard when it comes to civil rights, particularly in the Deep South, it's been shown, but perhaps in others.

And I think that by having some federal guidelines, to say the least, although I'm not a big fan of unfunded mandates, but at the very least to have some guidelines that are enforced, would make a big difference in continuity and in

2.2

1	consistency.
2	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you. I
3	note that I'm very disappointed that the Department
4	of Education chose not to send someone to the
5	hearing.
6	I do want to acknowledge that we have a
7	former head of the Office of Civil Rights for the
8	Department of Education, who is the reason why the
9	policies did improve over the last several years.
10	So, Chair Katherine, I just want to acknowledge it.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Very much a group effort,
12	but thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So, I want to
14	ask you, what do you see that the Department of
15	Education is doing well and what do you think the
16	Department of Education needs to do better?
17	CHAIR LHAMON: And we're going to try to
18	be speedy in that response, because there are two
19	other people who have questions and we're past our
20	time.
21	MS. PRESCOTT: Very briefly, again, the
22	Department of Education is critical in this fight,
23	because the most important place to begin to
24	address these problems is clearly in our schools.

This is the place where we educate our

1 children, this is the place where the tone is set, 2 begins in our schools. So, providing schools with clear guidelines of what is expected of them is 3 4 critical. 5 MS. JORWIC: It's the role of the Department of Education to be the resources for all 6 7 local education agencies on how to better serve individuals with disabilities and individuals 8 9 all populations that may be marginalized in the 10 school setting. 11 MS. GARLICK: would Ι agree. The 12 message that was sent when the Title IX quidance 13 was rescinded, I agree wholeheartedly, it can't be 14 overstated. 15 The Department of Education has a huge 16 role -- and thanks for everything that you did, 17 Chair, in your role at the Department of Education 18 to put in guidance -- to not only encourage and 19 promote anti-bullying education, anti-bias but also to reform school 20 education, discipline 21 policies and other things that disproportionately 22 impact students of color, marginalized communities, 23 et cetera. 24 And so, to your previous question, the

government has a huge role to play

federal

25

in

1	preventing and responding to hate crimes, not only
2	on the legal side, where oftentimes states have
3	inadequate hate crime laws, many states still don't
4	protect LGBT communities for instances, five states
5	still don't have hate crime laws, but our other
6	federal agencies also have a role to play in
7	preventing and responding to hate, calling out hate
8	where it happens, and working with other agencies
9	to establish best practices.
10	Which is why our recommendation for an
11	inter-agency task force, I'll again just reiterate,
12	is so important to us.
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you, Madam
16	
10	Chair. I just wanted to clear up, when
17	Chair. I just wanted to clear up, when Commissioner Kirsanow was asking you questions
17	Commissioner Kirsanow was asking you questions
17 18	Commissioner Kirsanow was asking you questions about why minorities could commit these acts, I
17 18 19	Commissioner Kirsanow was asking you questions about why minorities could commit these acts, I just an African American can commit a hate crime
17 18 19 20	Commissioner Kirsanow was asking you questions about why minorities could commit these acts, I just an African American can commit a hate crime against a Muslim, a disabled person, or a Latino,
17 18 19 20 21	Commissioner Kirsanow was asking you questions about why minorities could commit these acts, I just an African American can commit a hate crime against a Muslim, a disabled person, or a Latino, is that correct?

RAGHUNATHAN:

MS.

25

my

was

That

1	understanding of the question at hand, as well as
2	the reality in some cases. Certainly not all.
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: So, I mean, a
4	white KKK person could commit a crime against a
5	white Jewish person?
6	MS. RAGHUNATHAN: They are, with
7	increasing frequency across the country.
8	MS. GARLICK: Right. And I'll just
9	refer to the bomb threats against the Jewish
10	community that Mr. Moossy referenced from the
11	Department of Justice. The identity and I know
12	you have a legal panel later, but it's hard,
13	because I'm a lawyer
14	(Laughter.)
15	CHAIR LHAMON: We sympathize.
16	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Congratulations.
17	MS. GARLICK: Yes, thank you. The
18	identity of the perpetrator doesn't matter for the
19	purposes of hate crimes, as long as the victim was
20	specifically targeted because of who they are,
21	that's what a hate crime is.
22	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I just wanted to
23	clear that up. Thank you very much.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. And our last
25	question will be from the Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank very much, Madam Chair. And I'm not sure how much of this is a question, but I was so intrigued by thought that the best course bluow involve а whole lot. οf financial not resources, but exposing kids to all kinds of people and forcing them to come together and to work as a unit.

And that at a fundamental level, he says, you deal with hatred by talking to one another. And then, I thought, listened to what we've said thus far about the federal government's role in combating hate crimes.

And so, in putting those together, I wonder if perhaps the solution is in not allowing the resegregation of our schools, where young people are going or people, children, are going to come together, be forced to come together each day as they learn and they'll be exposed to all kinds of different people.

And perhaps the solution is not in allowing the resegregation of our public housing. And you have to deal with one another, you have to come together. And so, I'm not sure, Madam Chair, that there's a question in there, but I invite any

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	
2	MS. BRO: Can I make a comment
3	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON:
4	comments.
5	MS. BRO: to that?
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Yes, I was going to
7	reconstruct it as a question, but go right ahead.
8	(Laughter.)
9	MS. BRO: I did learn in education,
10	working with fourth graders and fifth graders and
11	third graders for a number of years that no matter
12	how much I teach at school, the bottom dollar is
13	what's happening at home, because the home has them
14	far longer than I do.
15	And I can teach them and expose them to
16	all kinds of things, but if I'm not also reaching
17	the home and the family, I'm not really making the
18	change that I want to see.
19	So, we have to think broader than just
20	schools, broader than just the children working
21	together. We need to find ways to have families
22	come with other families.
23	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: But might
24	schools be a place to begin?
25	MS RRO: School is definitely a place

to begin, we just need to think in addition to that.

MS. JORWIC: I think that schools are a great -- or unfortunately, we've seen schools have been a breeding ground for hate. But I think that schools are a very fertile ground.

As someone who used to practice special education law myself and someone who ran an organization when I was in high school that was all about people with disabilities and people without disabilities coming together, Ι think it's breeding ground too. And that's why important that we continue to move forward.

The Arc has a case in Georgia, because the same schools that were used to segregate students by their race in the early part of the 20th century are now being used to segregate people with disabilities from their peers. A troubling example of the reality of moving backwards and that segregation.

Housing is another area that people with disabilities are often segregated. So, think between the education system and the service systems that are in place for people government federal oversees, there's а huge

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 breeding ground for coming together and, again, 2 seeing that humanity of one another and learning each other's stories. 3 MS. RAGHUNATHAN: If I could just jump 4 5 would also reiterate that we need many in, different tools to address bias in our community. 6 7 We need strong laws from the federal 8 government, as well as strong state level laws that 9 protect our communities and that enshrine, frankly, 10 the moral compass or the moral compact of 11 society. 12 regulations We need that not 13 required by legislation that will make а 14 difference, either by allocation of resources or by clarifying how specific policies and laws should be 15 16 implemented. 17 fabric need strong between We law 18 enforcement, between community-based organizations, 19 and between communities, to ensure that laws and 20 policies that are already on the books make sense 21 implemented effectively for are 22 members and that the relationship is two-way 23 between community members and those who that 24 implementing and enforcing the laws.

And then, certainly, of course, we need

1 to change the sort of arena of public opinion, to make sure that all communities are welcomed and 2 3 respected. But I think that if you do not have one 4 5 of those many legs of the stool, then you are not able to actually make sure that all communities are 6 7 protected, respected, and that we can all lives of dignity and full inclusion in the nation 8 9 sort of advanced the basic idea of core that 10 unalienable rights. 11 MS. GARLICK: I was going to say --12 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Who's going 13 to follow that? 14 MS. GARLICK: -sounded a that lot 15 better --16 (Laughter.) 17 in MS. GARLICK: But our education 18 programs around schools around the country where we 19 do implement peer-led anti-bias training programs, 20 we actually use a tool called Pyramid of Hate. 21 And what it is is to demonstrate that 2.2 in all sectors of our society, communities, 23 that if we allow discrimination, schools, if 24 allow stereotypes, if we allow prejudice to qo 25 unchecked and to breed, they can escalate to

1	further levels.
2	And so, yes, we need to address those
3	lower levels, if you will, or building blocks of
4	hate, but at all levels as well. And so, that tool
5	goes directly to your comment.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: With that, I thank this
7	very powerful panel for your testimony. I really
8	appreciate it. If there's follow-up, we would
9	certainly welcome it. And for all of us present,
10	we'll take a break until 1:00 p.m. and we'll start
11	promptly at 1:00.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
13	went off the record at 12:11 p.m. and resumed at
14	1:01 p.m.)
15	PANEL THREE: POLICY AND LEGAL EXPERTS
16	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Thank you for your
17	continued attention to this important topic. And,
18	we're going to now proceed with our third panel of
19	policy and legal experts in the order in which they
20	will speak.
21	Our panelists are Lena Masri who's the
22	National Litigation Director and Acting Civil
23	Rights Director at the Council on American-Islamic

Chestnut,

Relations, CAIR.

Shelby

24

25

National

the

1	Organizing and Policy Strategist at Transgender Law
2	Center.
3	Kristen Clarke who is the President and
4	Executive Director of the Lawyers Committee for
5	Civil Rights Under Law.
6	Andrea Senteno, Legislative Staff
7	Attorney with the Mexican American Legal Defense
8	and Educational Fund.
9	And, Aviva Vogelstein, Director of
10	Legal Initiatives at the Brandeis Center.
11	Just as a reminder to all, I will cut
12	you off after seven minutes, so I encourage to stay
13	within the seven minutes and to watch the system of
14	lights that we have going.
15	And, Ms. Masri, please begin.
16	MS. MASRI: Thank you, respected
17	Commissioners.
18	The Council on American-Islamic
19	Relations is America's largest Muslim civil
20	liberties and advocacy organization. Its mission
21	is to enhance the understanding of Islam, protect
22	civil rights, promote justice and empower American
23	Muslims.
24	CAIR is dedicated to the foundational
25	ideal of affording all Americans the freedom and

1 dignity to practice their religion. In fact, CAIR is the only Muslim civil 2 rights organization that provides legal services to 3 all cases reported to CAIR that fall within its 4 5 mission. Nationwide, CAIR employs more than 40 6 7 who provide free legal attorneys and advocacy services to individuals who 8 experience religious 9 discrimination and bias. 10 process of providing its In the 11 CAIR services, also assembles data regarding 12 incidents of harassment against American Muslims, 13 the only report of its kind. 14 In April of 2018, CAIR released our 15 annual civil rights report entitled Targeted, 16 copy of which is attached to the written form of 17 this testimony. 18 report documents that the Trump 19 Administration's Muslim ban has succeeded in 20 stigmatizing Muslims and demonizing Islam leading 21 unprecedented increase in anti-Muslim to an 2.2 activity to never before seen levels. 23 Muslim The American community has increase 24 witnessed an in the onslaught of 25 institutional and individualized prejudice against

American Muslims in 2017.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Since 2014, CAIR has received reports of 16,800 incidents of targeted hate against American Muslims.

Between 2016 and 2017, CAIR's records show a 17 percent increase in incidents of anti-Muslim bias and a 15 percent increase in hate crimes.

Those sharp increases themselves accumulate a top surge in recent years. From 2014 through 2016, CAIR recorded a 65 percent increase in incidents of anti-Muslim bias and a staggering 584 percent increase in hate crimes targeting American Muslims.

In 2017 alone, CAIR tracked 300 anti-Muslim hate crimes.

The incidents are becoming not only more frequent, but also more violent. Mosques burned down to the ground by arsonists, American Muslim's homes and businesses smeared with threatening graffiti, women harassed on the streets for wearing the hijab or the religious head covering worn bу Muslim women, sometimes by aggressors forcibly yanking their hijabs off their heads.

1 In 2017 alone, CAIR recorded 144 anti-2 mosque incidents. The rise of anti-Muslim sentiment has 3 4 cost us lives. Two men were murdered in Portland 5 as they sought to defend a Muslim youth from a knife-wielding aggressor on a train, one of whom we 6 7 heard testimony from earlier today. There have been Muslims threatened 8 9 gunpoint, Muslim children are afraid to to 10 school not only because of student on student 11 bullying, but teachers on student bullying 12 significantly increased in 2017, teachers bullying 13 them as terrorists. 14 The chief culprit for this rise in 15 anti-Muslim hate crimes is the Trump 16 Administration's various efforts to exclude Muslims 17 from the United States. 18 have recognized Courts the Trump 19 Administration's Muslim ban as the fulfillment of 20 then candidate Trump's call for total and а 21 complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United 2.2 States. 23 In the aftermath of this Muslim ban, 24 CAIR recorded a deluge of 464 incidents pertaining

to it in the last year.

1 Even as CAIR has developed its own data 2 set documenting the rise in anti-Muslim activity, CAIR's experience in the community makes clear that 3 incidents of bias are severely under reported. 4 5 American Muslims often do not report incidents either to CAIR or to law enforcement for 6 7 two significant reasons. First, members of the American Muslim 8 community fear mistreatment and retaliation from 9 10 government itself. Thirty-five percent of 11 incidents of bias reported to CAIR last 12 concerned mistreatment by the government, 13 principally by CBP and the FBI. 14 Community members are often afraid to 15 invite the government to probe into the details of 16 private hate discrimination they experience because 17 that very invitation is perceived as making them 18 vulnerable to even worse consequences the 19 government itself. 20 Ιt doesn't help, Buzzfeed as News recently documented that politicians in 49 states 21 2.2 have attacked Muslims openly in speeches and with 23 proposed legislation since 2015. 24 Second, members of the American Muslim

community consider every day harassment to be so

common that they are desensitized.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CAIR staff regularly hear of cases in which individuals are harassed but report the incident to CAIR and not to government authorities.

This often happens because the victim feels that the treatment is expected and normal, that nothing can be done, that they will not be believed or sympathized with by their broader community or constant anti-Muslim harassment is to be expected in the United States today.

and policies, including Programs Muslim ban, the terrorist screening database, vetting initiative and censorship of extreme Palestinian advocacy must be systematically documented and challenged.

Laws aimed at suppressing Islam must be rejected and the fact that politicians, law makers from city councils and state legislatures to Congress and the President of the United States regularly consider anti-Muslim measures is as good an indication as any that anti-Muslim sentiment in this country has run amuck.

The government has a significant role to play in combating hate crimes, but it must first establish trust in the American Muslim community

1 that bias and discrimination will not be embodied 2 by the government itself. sake of time, 3 the our written testimony does include additional recommendations 4 5 to the Commission, our annual civil rights reports also contains additional recommendations. 6 7 Thank you. 8 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much. 9 Just a reminder to all panelists that 10 policy against defamation have а and 11 degradation so we need to be careful to link our 12 statements to fact. Thank you. 13 MX. Chestnut? 14 MX. CHESTNUT: Good afternoon, my name 15 is Shelby Chestnut, а staff member at the 16 Transgender Law Center. 17 Before I begin, I just want to extend a 18 big thank you for convening all of these panelists 19 today. 20 TLC is the largest national trans-led 21 organization in the United States advocating self-2.2 determination for all people. Grounded in legal 23 expertise and committed to racial justice, TLC 24 employs a variety of community driven strategies 25 that keeps transgender and gender nonconforming

1 people alive, thriving and fighting for liberation. In the last decade, transgender people 2 and gender nonconforming people have gone from the 3 shadows to the covers of magazines, courtrooms and 4 5 television. This increased visibility has also come 6 7 with increased public debate, legislative attacks 8 on the rights of transgender people and, sadly, 9 deadly violence. 10 Violence against lesbian, gay, 11 bisexual, transgender, queer people, especially 12 transgender and gender nonconforming people is one 13 of the key civil right issues of our time. And, 14 one that we can no longer ignore. 15 2017, according to the National 16 Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, we lost 28 17 transgender and gender nonconforming people across 18 the United States to violence. A majority of whom 19 are black, transgender women making 2017 the 20 deadliest year on record for transgender people. 2018, 21 To date in this epidemic 2.2 continues with the murders of at least eight 23 transgender people. 24 In a moment where society is seeing the 25 increase in intersections of racism, misogyny,

classism and anti-LGBT policies on the state and federal level, it seems clear that addressing this violence transgender people are facing should be a top priority for everyone, especially the federal government. Yet, no one seems to be hearing the battle cry.

Before we can look at solutions, we must understand some of the sources of this violence.

Extreme discrimination and employment education in housing lead many trans-people to see sex work as their best option to survive. But, the criminalization of sex work and legislation like SESTA-FOSTA make sex work extremely dangerous for transgender people contributing to the fatal violence people face.

We must stop advancing policies that put the lives of sex workers in danger and we must address the discrimination that limits opportunities for trans-people and forces them into situations where they're vulnerable to trafficking and violence.

Violence at the hands of law enforcement remains a persistent issue impacting the lives of trans-people across the country. Law

2.2

enforcement routinely profile transgender people, especially black transgender women and criminalize their survival.

And, worse, add to the violence and mistreatment when handling the homicides of transgender people, and often times misgendering them and perpetuating the narrative that they are criminal and deserving of deadly violence.

Intimate partner violence or domestic violence, while an epidemic in many people's lives in this country, is an issue of grave concern impacting many transgender people.

Stigma and lack of public awareness that IPV can impact people regardless of their gender identify and sexual orientation often time leads transgender survivors with limited option for support despite the fact that federal protections like the Violence Against Women Act includes LGBT survivors.

State sanctioned anti-trans legislation which seeks to dehumanize and limit trans-peoples' access to public accommodations. Much of this legislation is known as the trans-bathroom bills, seeks to limit people's access to public restrooms.

Far being bathroom access, this type of

2.2

legislation targets trans-people's civil rights and opens up the floodgates for broader anti-trans legislation and increases violence towards transpeople.

We've seen it in North Carolina,
Washington State, Texas, Anchorage, Alaska and now,
Montana and Massachusetts.

When we look at the source of violence and we start to think about solutions, it's clear we have a great deal of work to do to ensure that transgender and gender nonconforming people are central to this conversation.

While state and federal hate crime laws were a hard won battle aiming to protect many vulnerable populations, we have done very little to increase public awareness or why LGBT people, especially transgender people, are in need of respect and legal protections.

State and federal hate crime laws and prosecution protecting are not the answer to communities from violence. transgender Charging person with a hate crime does nothing to prevent the next murder or increase public awareness on why transgender people are deserving of respect.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 take this violence seriously, 2 look solutions address country must at to 3 conditions transgender people face, especially federal elected officials 4 and who daily 5 laws executive orders create and that strip 6 transgender people of their rights and dignity. 7 work towards a world must 8 values transgender people and one in which 9 media is uplifting their success and contributions 10 to society when they are alive and not dead. 11 City, state and federal funding must be 12 made available to ensure transgender people have 13 jobs, housing, education and we access to 14 prioritize prevention programs that promote 15 communities to be accepting and welcoming 16 transgender people versus criminalizing people. 17 must denounce the rollbacks and 18 transgender people's rights attacks of 19 ensure protections like the Violence Against Women 20 HUDs Equal Access Rule and all federal Act, 21 protections remain in place. 22 Right now, as we speak, hundreds 23 migrants in a highly publicized caravan wait at the 24 U.S. Mexico border seeking entry into the U.S.

Among the caravan are a number of LGBT

1	migrants, most of whom are trans-women and minors
2	who are fleeing violence in their countries of
3	origin.
4	The group was turned away from the port
5	of entry for several days and experienced
6	harassment and extreme violence in Mexico.
7	This past weekend, the LGBT group was
8	repeatedly turned away from refugee shelters due to
9	transphobia and homophobia.
10	After finally being allowed into a
11	shelter, this group was awoken in the middle of the
12	night by armed men who robbed them, threatened
13	them, and then set the shelter on fire.
14	Where is the public outcry for this
15	horrific violence? Why isn't our government
16	intervening?
17	All of us should demand the customs
18	border patrol and immigration customs enforcement
19	allow the remaining members of this caravan entry
20	immediately or we risk them being killed.
21	I want to close today by offering some
22	of the highlights of the amazing work happening
23	around the country to ensure transgender people are
24	not only protected, but thriving.
25	Last year, TLC represented Ash Whitaker

1	to challenge the Kenosha, Wisconsin school district
2	who denied him access to the boys' restroom in high
3	school because he was transgender. We fought and
4	won.
5	Ash is now a freshman in college and
6	living his authentic life.
7	Last month, in Anchorage, Alaska
8	transgender people worked with their allies to
9	defeat an anti-trans bathroom measure despite high
10	levels of opposition.
11	Recently, national domestic and sexual
12	violence advocates across the country called for
13	the continued support for transgender rights and
14	shared steps advocates can take locally to ensure
15	transgender people have access to services and are
16	respected when seeking services.
17	Right here in our nation's capital,
18	Ruby Corado, a transgender Latino woman runs Casa
19	Ruby and provides housing and services to
20	transgender people 365 days a year.
21	In Montana
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Sorry, the time is up.
23	\underline{MX} . CHESTNUT: Oh, thank you.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much.
25	Ms. Clarke?

1 MS. CLARKE: Good afternoon, my name is 2 Kristen Clarke. I'm here on behalf of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law which is one 3 of the nation's oldest racial justice and civil 4 5 rights organizations. 1963 Founded in at the request 6 οf 7 President John F. Kennedy, our principle mission is to secure equal justice for all through the rule of 8 9 law, targeting, in particular, the inequities 10 confronting African-Americans and other 11 minorities. 12 Over the course of the past year, our 13 work to confront our nation's growing hate crime 14 crisis has been one of our top priorities. We know that the hate crime crisis we 15 16 see today is not new and is rooted in our country's 17 long and tortured history when it comes to racial animus and hatred faced by African Americans and 18 19 other racial minorities. 20 Our work is carried out with sensitivity to the legacy of white supremacy and 21 2.2 the history of racial violence that loom heavy 23 throughout our nation's history. 24 Our Stop Hate project works to

strengthen the capacity of communities to confront

1	hate by connecting them to existing legal and
2	social resources and by creating new resources to
3	fill gaps.
4	Our 8-4-4-9-NOHATE hotline serves as a
5	resource for individuals and organizations who have
6	experienced or witnessed hate.
7	And, our www.8449nohate.org website
8	provides know your rights materials and tool kits
9	to support communities combating hate and includes
10	information on hate crime laws and relevant
11	statutes in all 50 states.
12	I want to use my time this afternoon to
13	talk about the unique challenges that we face in
14	terms of the spike in hate activity online.
15	Violent white supremacists and the alt-
16	Right are using online platforms to plan, incite,
17	promote and generate violence at an unrelenting
18	pace.
19	At the Lawyers Committee for Civil
20	Rights Under Law, part of our work to address this
21	crisis has entailed a concerted focus on how white
22	supremacists exploit racial divisions to reach
23	broader audiences online and, in turn, incite
24	unlawful, hateful activity.

And, I want to be clear that there is,

1	indeed a meaningful distinction between hate speech
2	and hate activity, especially in the context of the
3	internet.
4	Hateful activity is inciting or
5	engaging in threats, harassment, violence,
6	defamation, intimidation or other illegal action
7	with bigoted animus.
8	Unlike mere speech these forms of
9	unlawful conduct are not protected by the First
10	Amendment. They cause tangible and real injury to
11	victims and communities.
12	We believe it is critical to hold
13	private service providers accountable. And, I want
14	to talk about some examples of the work that we
15	have been doing in this space.
16	Richard Spencer's altright.com stands
17	as one of the darkest examples of websites that
18	celebrates and encourages racial violence.
19	In the course of our investigation into
20	altright.com, we observed that Go Daddy was
21	providing domain registration services for the
22	site.
23	Alright.com was, in our view, in clear
24	violation of Go Daddy's own terms of service which
25	clearly prohibit violence, particularly against

Go Daddy's universal terms of services 2 their require that 3 agreement consumers not use 4 in а manner that is illegal that 5 promotes or encourages illegal activity. Yet, we observed countless examples of 6 7 published content and postings on the site that 8 directed people to, for example, use live 9 the border with the ammunition at substantial 10 chance that they, they being immigrants crossing 11 the border, might lose their life in the process. 12 There were other postings on this site 13 which encouraged violence against women and 14 violence against people the basis on of their 15 religion. 16 We went after Go Daddy and pushed them 17 to enforce their own terms of service, which they did and altright.com went dark last week. 18 19 Wе took similar action against 20 Stormfront, the oldest largest white and 21 supremacist hate site online. For more than 25 22 years, this is a site that has been tied to the 23 deaths of individuals and other violent activities. 24 The Southern Poverty Law Center aptly 25 describes this site as, quote, "the murder capital

racial and ethnic minorities.

of the internet."

2.2

Following our action, Network Solutions enforced its own terms of service agreement and pulled Stormfront offline.

Stormfront eventually was resurrected by a private services provider, Tucows, and we urge this company to closely examine how its services are being manipulated by Stormfront today to incite violence in the U.S. and abroad.

In addition to these hate sites, Daily Stormer is a site that has had a particularly devastating impact on young people.

In 2018, we filed a law suit against the publishers of the Daily Stormer for actions that led to the targeting of an African-American student at American University who had been recently elected as student body president.

In this instance, the publishers of the site facilitated a massive campaign of racist trolling activity that disrupted the student's life, impeded her educational experience, made her fearful for her safety and caused significant physical and emotional trauma.

The vicious targeting of this student incited unlawful activity by others online.

1	Using local human rights law here in
2	D.C., we are now pursuing a legal challenge against
3	the Daily Stormer and other online trolls for
4	denying the student an equal opportunity to
5	participate in the very aspects of life we take for
6	granted, including taking full advantage of
7	educational institutions right here in D.C.
8	Where do we go from here? We believe
9	that action must be taken to encourage more victims
10	to report, to push law enforcement to do a better
11	job investigating hate incidents that arise in
12	their community and that the Justice Department
13	must play a critical role here as well.
14	Fifty years after the tragic
15	assignation of Dr. Martin Luther King, we are still
16	working to fulfill the goals which animated his I
17	have a Dream speech.
18	We know that nonprofit organizations
19	can't do all of the work on its own and we thank
20	the Commission for focusing on this very important
21	issue today.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Ms. Clarke.
23	Ms. Senteno?
24	MS. SENTENO: Good afternoon and thank
25	you for having me.

1 name is Andrea Senteno and I'm a Μy legislative staff attorney with MALDEF, the Mexican 2 American Legal Defense and Educational Fund. 3 Founded in 1968, MALDEF is the nation's 4 5 leading Latino legal civil rights organization. MALDEF has worked for almost 50 years to confront 6 7 discrimination and bias where ever they occur. 8 Wе know intimately how an agenda motivated by hate creates the space for anti-Latino 9 10 laws, policies and practices. 11 The rhetoric and messaging that cast 12 Latinos and other underrepresented communities as 13 outsiders and threats are the root of the policies 14 and actions that MALDEF challenges every day. 15 This briefing on the role of the 16 federal government in responding to hate crimes 17 comes at a critical time. 18 In 2016, reported hate crimes reached a 19 five year high. The rise in anti-immigrant 20 sentiment and the efforts by state local and 21 immigration governments to enforce laws create hostile environments for 2.2 immigrants 23 the Latino community to attack and make it more 24 difficult for our community members seek

protection.

Time and again, our community and others have warned the impact that hate rhetoric it can have and how lead to violent can consequences.

The federal government and local law enforcement must work investigation to and prosecute hate crimes when they occur and must send a powerful message to those who might perpetrate actions hate crimes that these will not be normalized.

The continual depiction of Latinos as criminals, rapists and drug dealers and as threats to the American workforce and the dominant culture provide those who wish to do us harm the cover that they seek to carry out these biased attacks.

The rise in hate crimes against Latinos is certainly motivated by the anti-Latino and exclusionary laws and policies that have long marked a political discourse and that are gaining new steam today.

According to the federal government, reported hate crimes in 2016 -- of those reported hate crimes in 2016, approximately half were motivated by racial bias and one-third of those -- one-third motivated by ethnic discrimination.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 However, you all know, federal as 2 reporting of hate crimes provides an incomplete picture of the problem that we are dealing with. 3 4 law enforcement are encouraged 5 required to report hate crimes annually to the FBI. 6 But, since these law enforcement 7 agencies are the largest source of information, 8 their nonparticipation presents a real barrier to 9 truly understanding the scope of this problem. 10 addition to underreporting, many 11 times hate crimes are incorrectly identified which 12 adds to the limitation that this data -- that is 13 current collected. 14 example, if police officer For а 15 arrives to the scene of а location and 16 vandalism with a slur or a hate image, they may 17 report that incident as vandalism but not as a hate 18 crime. 19 It's important that everybody does 20 better to ensure that the jurisdictions and the FBI 21 correctly identifying hate crimes our 2.2 communities. 23 There have been some outside efforts to 24 track and document these hate crimes by 25 outlets and others. However, this presents many

1 limitations as many crimes are not reported in the news or made viral on social media. 2 As hate crimes are going up for many 3 4 racial and ethnic minorities, we must also discuss 5 how race intersects with gender, gender identity, 6 sexual orientation disability and and the 7 heightened risk that certain members of our 8 community face. 9 For instance, Los Angeles County noted 10 that after the 2016 presidential election, there 11 were 31 anti-transgender hate crimes, a 72 percent 12 increase and that 97 percent of those were violent 13 crimes. In 2012 and 2016, hate crime rate of 14 15 violence rose by 96 percent against transgender 16 people and by 76 percent against LGBTQ individuals. 17 Transgender women of color 18 particularly vulnerable and are disproportionately 19 targeted with deadly violence. 20 order to have inclusive In an 21 discussion about anti-Latino hate crimes in 2.2 America, we must also recognize and talk about how 23 discrimination intersects racial with sexism, 24 homophobia and transphobia in our society which can

for

members

results

to

deadly

lead

25

οf

our

community.

2.2

MALDEF is also particularly concerned with hate crimes and hate rhetoric in our schools. Immigrant and Latino and other underrepresented students are particularly susceptible to bullying based on their identity.

One recent study from 2016 revealed that immigrant youth in the U.S. experience greater rates of bullying than do native born youth. Even when controlling for other factors like age, gender, race and ethnicity, grade level and family affluence.

The Latino students who experience bullying in high school also suffer from significant GPA drops compared to other students.

There have been numerous reports of anti-bullying incidents during and after the presidential election. After then candidate Trump called Mexican immigrants racists and criminals, Latino students in Sioux City, Iowa reported being harassed and bullied during school hours as other students changed Trump's name in their presence.

Students at the Rosa Parks Elementary
School in Berkeley, California reported statements
like -- reportedly made statements like, you live

1 in a Taco Bell and you'll get deported to other 2 students. And, the day after the election, middle 3 4 students in Royal Oak, Michigan chanted, 5 "Build wall," referencing the President's the desire to build a border wall between the U.S. and 6 7 Mexico, bringing several Latino students to tears. 8 ASBLC reported 201 incidents of 9 harassment and intimidation two days after that 10 presidential election alone with anti-immigrant 11 sentiments being the second most reported 12 motivation. MALDEF has created a resource material 13 14 to educate students, teachers, administrators and 15 parents about anti-immigrant and anti-Latino 16 bullying and what their rights are. 17 critical this time, is Αt MALDEF 18 prepared to provide leadership and to work 19 oppose discrimination and hate against the Latino 20 community living in the United States. 21 We bring cases across the country to 2.2 resist the tide of anti-Latino sentiment that 23 infiltrates our communities. We have brought litigation on behalf of 24 25 Latinos that were violently assaulted and detained

e and local level and we remain committed to
fight.
MALDEF is ready to meet that challenge
re us and to give to work with you to end
in our communities and to realize a vision for
ica that protects that protects every
vidual from being targeted because of who you
Thank you very much for the opportunity
peak today.
CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Ms. Senteno.
Ms. Vogelstein?
MS. VOGELSTEIN: Chair Lhamon and
inguished members of the Commission, it's an
r to appear before you today.
I'm Aviva Vogelstein, I'm the Director
Legal Initiatives at the Brandeis Center, an
pendent nonpartisan institution for public
rests, advocacy, research and education.
Our mission is to advance the civil and
n rights of the Jewish people and promote
ice for all.
In the course of my work as a civil
ts lawyer, I've closely studied religiously
I'm Aviva Vogelstein, I'm the

1 motivated hate and bias incidents with a particular focus on anti-Jewish incidents. 2 Religiously motivated 3 hate is 4 undeniably on the rise in our country and 5 religiously motivated harassment is infiltrating 6 nation's schools. Some recently reported our 7 incidents help illustrate the problem. 8 Last May, а Muslim student was assaulted at a New York City public school. 9 The 10 assailant spit on her and attempted to pull off her 11 hijab. Last November, in Washington State, a 12 13 14-year-old Sikh boy wearing a turban was punched 14 and knocked down by a classmate. 15 Just two weeks ago, two members of a 16 Jewish fraternity at a Maryland university were 17 followed by suspects shouting "F" the Jews and 18 calling them an ethnic slur. 19 The suspects then followed the victims and began punching one of the victims in the face. 20 21 Brandeis Αt the Center, have 2.2 assisted students who've been physically assaulted, 23 spit on, verbally harassed and harassed on social 24 media because of their actual or perceived Jewish 25 identity.

Significant data as many panelists today have mentioned demonstrate that the numbers anti-religious hate incidents of are high and potentially rising. It's also important to remember the likelihood that many incidents are not even reported.

This problem in our schools has been almost entirely ignored until very recently. last month, the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights did not collect data on motivated religiously harassment and bullying, although it amassed data on sex, race, national origin and disability.

The Brandeis Center has long encouraged data gathering on hate against religious We explained how it's a tremendously minorities. important first to provide step an accurate portrait of the problem and necessary to compel an effective governmental response.

In 2016, under the leadership of then Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Catherine Lhamon, the Department of Education announced that they would be expanding their mandatory civil rights data collection of American's public schools to include religious based bullying.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 OCR's new report just released proved importance of this collection. An alarming 2 10,848 incidents, 8 percent of the total incidents 3 4 in 2015 through 2016 were harassment or bullying 5 based on religion. Now that OCR has finally gathering this 6 7 information, it has provided us with over 10,000 reasons to take action. 8 It's unconscionable that 9 this category of hate averaging approximately 30 10 incidents per school day, 150 per school week and 11 602 incidents per school month has, up until now, 12 been largely unaddressed. 13 Our federal civil rights laws do 14 properly protect students from harassment based on 15 religion. 16 Harassment and bullying is likely 17 have lasting psychological and emotional effects on 18 Bullying has linked students. been 19 negative outcomes. Kids who 20 are bullied can experience negative physical, school and mental health issues. 21 2.2 And, kids who bully others can engage in violent 23 and other risky behaviors into adulthood. 24 The federal government needs to take

action to better protect Muslims, Sikh, Jewish and

1 all students from religiously motivated harassment. Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 2 prohibits discrimination on the basis of 3 which 4 race, color or national origin in federally 5 and activities has assisted programs а glaring 6 omission. It does not prohibit harassment based on 7 religion. 8 The Department of Education has made 9 incremental improvements. In a 2004 Dear Colleague 10 Letter written by then Assistant Secretary 11 Civil Rights, Ken Marcus, is who currently 12 President of the Brandeis Center, OCR clarified 13 that Title 6 protected students from certain 14 religious groups that also have ethnic or ancestral 15 component such as Judaism, Islam or Sikhism. 16 guidance was largely unenforced This 17 for about six years but, in 2010, it was reaffirmed 18 Department of Justice the bу both the and 19 Department of Education. Though this guidance is currently 20 effect, there are several concerns. 21 2.2 As it's informal guidance, it may not 23 endure through subsequent administrations. 24 Further, OCR could achieve a clearer, 25 more transparent understanding of what is permitted

1	and what is not through providing more guidance.
2	By properly defining what
3	discrimination based on ethnicity or ancestry
4	entails, OCR could more easily identify address and
5	prevent such incidents from recurring.
6	OCR should also discuss in guidance as
7	recommended by the Commission in 2011 the First
8	Amendment implications of anti-bullying policies.
9	The guidance should include that the
10	Department's Title 6 policies should not be
11	construed in ways that will limit free speech.
12	Moreover, OCR's policies do not protect
13	students from harassment based on religion alone.
14	They require an ethnic or ancestral component.
15	By prohibiting religion by
16	prohibiting discrimination based on ethnicity or
17	ancestry without also banning purely religious
18	based discrimination, Title 6 extends greater
19	protections to members of religious groups with
20	shared ethnic or ancestral characteristics than to
21	groups without.
22	All students deserve the same
23	protections.
24	Congress must pass legislation to
25	protect religious minorities from harassment.

The new data on religious harassment reveals the extent of the problem. Now that OCR has taken this important first step, we urge OCR to the new data for its intended purpose, technical assistance provide where there are of harassment, to assist with patterns investigations in response to complaints and to compel an effective governmental response. To do so, OCR must both disaggregate the data that has been collected and collect more particularly with regards to data, individual religions, type of harassment or bullying religion, where the incidents are occurring and the context behind each incident. This data could be useful for federal investigations and NGO research, but only if more details are added. To help curb religious harassment bullying, we urge the Commission to make the following recommendations.

Perhaps most importantly, Congress must act to prohibit religious harassment in federally assisted programs and activities. This could be achieved through amending existing legislation such as Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act or the Higher

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Education Opportunities Act or, alternatively,
2	Congress could introduce new standalone legislation
3	to protect students from harassment based on
4	religion.
5	For OCR, OCR should disaggregate
6	existing data and collect additional data on what
7	types of harassment and bullying are occurring by
8	religion, where the incidents are occurring and the
9	nature and severity of each incident.
10	OCR should also provide clarification
11	and more definitions. And, in lieu of time, we
12	urgently need more data, federal legislation and
13	strong enforcement.
14	With over 10,000 incidents of religious
15	hate in our public schools, the federal government
16	must act. Religiously motivated hate is
17	unacceptable and should be combated just as
18	vigorously as all other forms of bigotry.
19	I thank you very much for your time.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you to each
21	panelist. I'll open it up to my fellow
22	commissioners for questions.
23	Commissioner Yaki?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you, Madam
25	Chair and thank all of you for your very powerful

testimony.

2.2

We had a lot of discussion earlier in the day about the need for better data collection, for greater participation in that data collection.

And, of course, I'm not going to talk about any of that.

I'm going to -- I have been more concerned about how the -- how our country has treated both the media and the politicians, the whole notion of what constitutes hate crimes and what helps cultivate the environment for that.

And, I have a question for you and it has a legal and it has a, I want to call it, it has a public connotation.

When there's an organized pattern of action against a protected group, whether it's the folks at the Daily Stormfront or whatever the heck it's called and/or other organizations, it seems like the media has difficulty in calling it -- they call it a hate crime but part of, to me, it seems like it's a form of domestic terrorism.

Now, we don't have a domestic terrorism criminal part of the statute. It's in the Patriot Act defined for other reasons, but we've been quick -- we've only really called, I think, maybe Timothy

1	McVeigh a domestic terror.
2	But, there seems to be some reluctance
3	to use that in the context of hate crimes
4	perpetrated against protected classes.
5	And, I'd like to get the opinion of Ms.
6	Masri and certainly Ms. Clarke about what you think
7	about using that nomenclature more readily for the
8	kinds of activities being perpetrated against
9	protected individuals as well as whether or not the
10	law the criminal law itself is sufficient to
11	bring all the tools of the federal government to
12	bear on these sorts of activities?
13	MS. MASRI: Thank you, Commissioner, I
14	appreciate your question.
15	It is true, let's take a step back,
16	terrorism is any violent activity whose purpose is
17	to terrorize a community.
18	And, what we do know is the way that
19	the word terrorism has been used has been
20	disproportionately used against the Muslim
21	community, both in the media, by politicians, but
22	also it's resulted in disproportionate prosecutions
23	against the Muslim community.
24	And, what that has done is it has fed
25	into the narrative that the false narrative that

all terrorism is committed by Muslims.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

We also have a larger problem and that the federal government has, in essence, criminalized the Muslim community by created a Terror Watch List whose standard in being included List into the Terror Watch is low so that suspicion alone is reasonable enough to land somebody on the Terror Watch List.

We do know that over 1 million people are on the Watch List and thousands upon thousands of Muslims potentially are on the Watch List.

And, having Muslims being named as known or suspected terrorists without even having ever been charged or committed -- or convicted of a crime related to terrorism, that also feeds into the public perception that terrorists are all committed --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Whereas, hate groups, as defined by the Southern Poverty Law Center don't get that in Appalachia they're just called hate groups.

MS. MASRI: Yes, and the problem is, is that when terrorism or violence against a community is committed by a non-Muslim, there tends to be a focus on the actual reasons behind that crime.

1	What are the mental health issues that
2	might be in play? The way under that particular
3	individual grew up in his home and his
4	neighborhood, whether he's been bullied in school.
5	Those are the types of discussions that
6	we really should be having if we want to combat
7	terrorism, if we want to combat hate crimes is to
8	really look at the root cause as opposed to wanting
9	to fall into a false narrative.
10	MS. CLARKE: Thank you for this very
11	important question, Commissioner Yaki.
12	Hate crimes are unique. They have a
13	devastating impact on the individuals targeted and
14	on communities as well.
15	And, for that reason, domestic
16	terrorism feels like an appropriate way to
17	categorize the level of impact and harm that flow
18	from hate crimes when they occur.
19	The challenge, however, is that, in
20	this era, we have seen domestic terrorism, the
21	
	concept conflated with other things.
22	concept conflated with other things. By way of example, the FBI's domestic
22	

This appears to be an effort that takes

aim on the work of civil rights advocates. It appears to be an effort that harkens back to the era in which the FBI and our federal government placed a target on the back of Dr. Martin Luther King and other activists.

So, we need to make sure that, if we

So, we need to make sure that, if we have an agreement that domestic terrorism is an appropriate way to describe hate crimes that are playing out in our country, that we are very clear and have a shared understanding about what we're talking about.

And, what we should be directing our administration's limited resources to focus on is the rising tide of violent white supremacy in our country and the increase of hate incidents that are perpetrated against historically protected minority groups like African-Americans and Latinos, immigrants, religious minorities and others.

And, we need to make sure that we have agreement that we are not talking about African-American activists and that we put rest this black identity extremism designation which really should have no place in our democracy today.

CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you,

2.2

Madam Chair.
Hello, Ms. Clarke, your testimony noted
that the FBI can support efforts to increase
reporting by engaging special agents in charge.
What would that look like?
MS. CLARKE: Law enforcement must do
more to more effectively combat, investigate and
address hate incidents when they arise.
One of the things that we've done at
the lawyers committee is we forged a partnership
with the International Association of Chiefs of
Police to help strengthen the way in which local
police and sheriffs offices go about combating hate
today.
But, to your question, we think that
training, better training for FBI and our federal
law enforcement agencies that are tasked with
investigating hate incidents when they arise in our
country is key.
COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Great, thank
you.
Also, there's been a debate all morning
about whether the federal government should have a
role or has a role in addressing hate crimes either

in the education space or in the general space.

1 And, I'm interested in hearing what you think the federal -- whether there should be a 2 federal role and, if so, what is that federal role? 3 4 MS. CLARKE: So, Commissioner Narasaki, 5 just, to amplify my prior response and 6 address question, talk your second very 7 specifically about the role of federal agencies from A to Z. 8 9 The U.S. Attorney should be supporting 10 the Civil Rights Division to address and clamp down 11 on hate incidents, whether they are in plain sight 12 of our nation's schools or in our college campuses 13 and universities. 14 The FBI should be supporting these 15 efforts as well and there should be a special agent 16 in charge tasked to respond to hate incidents when 17 they occur. The FBI's Criminal Justice Information 18 19 Services should also be supporting U.S. Attorneys 20 Offices in this effort, the DOJs, the Justice 21 Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics plays an 2.2 important role here as well. 23 But, we are at а moment where we 24 observe the federal government retreating from this 25 space, not bringing enough cases and not activating

1 vast resources of the federal government address these incidents, whether they play out at 2 schools, on campuses or elsewhere in our country. 3 4 MS. SENTENO: I just wanted to add to 5 while I, you know, understand that question to mean what would be the role of 6 the prosecuting 7 government in perhaps federal 8 reviewing cases against hate crime and certainly 9 echo the remarks by Ms. Clarke. 10 I also would, you know, encourage there 11 to be some discussion about the role of funding to 12 encourage prevention of hate crimes in schools and 13 in other areas of our community to make sure that 14 enforcement offices make sure that federal law 15 agencies are equipped to provide that 16 support at the local level to prevent these types 17 of crimes from occurring or the type of behavior 18 that can lead to those types of crimes occurring. 19 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you. 20 Ms. Voqelstein? Is it Stein or Stein? 21 Sorry. 2.2 unfortunately, the Department 23 Education didn't -- Office of Civil Rights didn't 24 send a witness. So, we don't have an opportunity

to explore from them what's going on.

1 I'm wondering if you have some thoughts about what they're doing well and what they need to 2 do better? 3 4 And, also, what the impact is of the 5 closure of education. civil reported numerous 6 rights education complaints on addressing and 7 preventing bias motivated bullying and harassment 8 in schools might be having on the issue? 9 MS. VOGELSTEIN: Sure, thank you, 10 Commissioner. 11 So, the OCR just released their data 12 about two or three weeks ago. And, we were so 13 pleased that for the first time, they included 14 their data collection, a mandatory data collection 15 on religious harassment and bullying in public 16 schools. So, this is great. 17 Office for Civil The what the 18 Rights, what we're recommending they do now is they 19 take this one step further and disaggregate the data that they have collected and also collect more 20 21 data. 22 So, right now, there was a question on 23 the form that said, you know, was there religious 24 harassment or bullying based on religion. 25 then, the respondees wrote how many incidents.

1 But, it wasn't separated by religion. 2 So, percentage don't know what of those incidents were anti-Jewish, anti-Muslim, anti-Sikh, 3 4 anti-Christian, any type of breakdown like that. 5 We also -- we don't know by the report 6 that released what incidents types of 7 occurring by religion. So, we don't know, for example, if they 8 violent assaults or verbal 9 harassment were or 10 assault with a weapon or whatever it was. 11 We also don't know the context behind 12 the incident. 13 So, these are all important things for 14 our federal government to be able to use to take 15 this a step further and fully address the problem. 16 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Have they given 17 a reason for why they didn't ask the question in a 18 more disaggregated way? 19 MS. VOGELSTEIN: There was -- I think 20 that because this was the first year that they did 21 they were just collecting on religious 2.2 incidents in general. And, I believe there was 23 some debate when they were asking about whether 24 they were going to be collecting data in 2013,

disclosing

was

about

whether

it

25

private

the

1	information of individuals to be asking these
2	questions.
3	Chair Lhamon would probably
4	CHAIR LHAMON: I can speak to that if
5	you would like.
6	(LAUGHTER)
7	MS. VOGELSTEIN: So, what I would like
8	to say is that, it's really necessary for our
9	government to be disaggregating by religion and
10	providing this additional information.
11	It's not a question about necessarily
12	what the religion is of the students, but on what
13	religious grounds they were targeted. And, that's
14	a really important clarification for proper
15	guidance and enforcement by the government.
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Well, I'd also
17	like to ask that throughout the day, those who
18	oppose hate crime laws, particularly on the federal
19	level, have been questioning whether hate crimes
20	are actually on the rise.
21	In your testimony you said it's
22	undeniably, at least anti-religious is undeniably
23	on the rise.
24	Some people have said, well, maybe it's
25	just that there's more people reporting because of

1	all the good work that's being done trying to
2	encourage people to report as opposed to there's an
3	actual rise or if they've looked at, oh gee, other
4	crimes are rising and this is rising too. And,
5	unless it's rising at a faster rate, then I guess,
6	apparently, we shouldn't be worried.
7	I don't really quite understand that
8	because I think then you should be worried about
9	any crime that's on the rise.
10	But, I wanted to get your take on that.
11	MS. VOGELSTEIN: Yes, thank you.
12	So, I've looked at a whole bunch of
13	studies on this across the board. And, you are
14	absolutely right that since there is so much that's
15	unreported, we don't necessarily know 100 percent.
16	But, I can say that based on the date,
17	the FBI data, I believe, this year there was I
18	think someone said earlier there was a 5 percent
19	increase in hate crimes overall.
20	There was about a 13 percent increase
21	on hate crimes by religion.
22	There was there were 50 I think
23	it was 54 over 54 percent of these hate crimes
24	were anti-Jewish. I think 24 percent were anti-
25	Muslim, the rest were against everyone else.

1	The anti-Jewish and anti-Muslim
2	incidents have risen significantly since the
3	previous year.
4	I have also looked at surveys by the
5	ADL, by the Sikh Coalition and it appears that the
6	numbers are rising, whether it's if it's because
7	there's more reporting than previously, I think
8	it's, you know, it's a good thing that there's more
9	reporting.
10	But, every survey that I looked at
11	shows that the numbers are on the rise.
12	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Madam Chair, am
13	I allowed to ask
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead.
15	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So, when I
16	looked at the data, I have to say I was a little
17	surprised at what the data was for Latinos, given
18	what's going on in the world.
19	But then, I was thinking I'm
20	wondering how much of that is maybe attributable to
21	the increase in fear of the community, not just
22	undocumented but those who live with undocumented.
23	Because, we know many live in mixed households.
24	So, I'm wondering if you could tell me
25	whether my instincts are correct or am I totally

off base?

2.2

MS. SENTENO: Well, I think that is correct. And, I think that to, you know, go to the earlier point when we're looking at whether or not there's a rise in reporting of hate crimes, you know, when you're looking at a population like Latinos and those individuals who live in a mixed status family, a decrease in hate crimes being reported isn't necessarily going to mean that there is a decrease in crimes overall.

But, rather, as you've pointed out, there is a very, very probably sense of fear running through our community everywhere. Part of that is attributed to the broader attacks on Latino and immigrant communities across the country, the attacks on sanctuary jurisdictions.

In Texas in the wake of SB-4, there were drops in reporting to police of all crimes in Latino communities.

And so, because people are afraid to come forward for fear of either -- of some sort of negative retaliation from the federal government that they might be subject to removal, that a family member may be subject to removal or, in other instances, that are probably very common for

many other communities not wanting to report a hate incident in the workplace for fear of losing your job which might have different repercussions for you and your family.

We are going to see depressed levels of reporting. I think not just of reporting crimes overall, but also of reporting hate crimes.

But, I think that, you know, looking at the reports that MALDEF has seen, particularly in the wake of the election, the type of violence that's being perpetrated against Latinos certainly indicates and is consistent with the reports that we have seen that, you know, in certain areas, Latino hate crimes are being reported are increased, inconsistently reported.

And so, I think that, you know, seeing those incidents across the country where someone is targeted because they're Latino and the rhetoric that is used is -- used to cast them as an outsider because they may or may not be perceived to be an immigrant and that is, you know, unpopular from our federal government.

I think certainly it contributes to all of that.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.

2.2

1 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: And, one more? 2 CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, this is your last 3 one. 4 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Okay, sorry. 5 MxMs. Chestnut, so, I'm struck by your 6 very strong statement that, from your perspective, 7 a hate crime law doesn't help. And, anti-Asian 8 violence is something that actually brought me into 9 the movement. 10 And, one of my frustrations was that, 11 really, it was hard to get people to see those 12 kinds of crimes committed against Asians as a hate 13 crime. Because, at the time, Asian Americans 14 weren't really being even thought about because it 15 was a small population. 16 And, on top of that frustration was the 17 media did not cover those hate crimes. You would 18 not see it on Good Morning America, you would not 19 see it on nightly news. At best, you would see it 20 local probably in paper and not on television. 21 22 I worked very hard to get those crimes 23 seen because I thought it was very important for 24 people to understand that, in fact, you're being 25 Right? targeted as a group. It's not you being

1 targeted as an individual. 2 And, to force people to see, in fact, that that was happening and to get those stories 3 told. 4 5 wanted to kind $\circ f$ better So, Τ understand because I will say that, having worked 6 7 with victims of anti-Asian violence I do feel that, 8 you know, it's more important to work on trying to stop it from the beginning because I learned that 9 10 even if you prosecute someone and put them away, 11 you can't put the family back together. Right? 12 community is That family, that irretrievably 13 broken. 14 So, I get the fact that laws enough are 15 not enough alone. But, I just wanted to probe a 16 little bit more sort of where that comes from. 17 CHESTNUT: Yes, I think that's a MX. 18 great question and it sounds like a lot of our work 19 had similarities. 20 And, I think, from a trans perspective, it's important to note that like we don't even know 21 2.2 how many trans-people exist in the United States, 23 and certainly the media is doing very little to 24 sort of cover trans people in a healthy manner. 25 You ask sort of most Americans what

1 they think, how they've seen trans-people 2 portrayed, it's a sex worker, it's when they're dead, it's as a criminal. 3 You know, and much of our work at the 4 5 Trans Law Center is, how do we make sure that society understands the value of trans-people and 6 7 sort of what they're adding to this society as a 8 whole. 9 You know, and that said, it's -- it needs to come from an abolitionist framework. 10 11 for me, something that I think really shifted 12 personally for me in my mind was, a number of years 13 ago, there was a young woman, her name as Islan 14 She was a 20-something transgender woman Nettles. 15 in Harlem, New York and she was killed because she 16 was trans. 17 She had been on the street at night, a 18 young man, Islan Nettles was African-American as 19 was the man who killed her. 20 He saw her on the street, he cat called her, thought she was really cute. He didn't know 21 2.2 that she was trans. She died. 23 He started getting made fun of by his 24 friends and he pushed her to the ground and she

died of a trauma to her head.

1 You know, the police arrived. They 2 didn't realize that she was trans. So, the hate crimes unit wasn't called at all immediately. 3 Thev 4 figured out she was trans by the time they got her 5 to the hospital. 6 This woman, young woman, was on life support and it took about six months to find the 7 man who had harmed her and ultimately killed her. 8 9 And, Ι remember sitting in the 10 courtroom with the victim's mother the day that the 11 sentence came for this young man. He's 24 years 12 old, he's going to spend 12 years in prison. He was not charged with a hate crime, 13 14 charged with second degree he was murder, 15 believe. 16 You know, and some of the communities 17 outraged, they're like why isn't this a hate crime. And, in my mind, I'm thinking, this young man's 18 19 going to go to prison for 12 years. 20 He's known to have killed a trans-21 person so he's not going to be targeted that he 22 killed a trans-person, he'll be targeted that he 23 was attracted to a trans-woman and he got busted 24 for it.

They'll probably get raped in prison.

He'll get harassed the whole time he's there by other inmates and he'll get released and he'll, one, not think any differently of trans-people to value them.

His friends will probably taunt him for the rest of his life. And, if anything, escalate violence when they see another trans-person in their neighborhood.

So, for me, I think what was most devastating of that, is that it was a community that was impacted by it. It wasn't, you know, it wasn't a white man attacking a community of color, it was a young black man attacking another young black woman.

And, what are we doing as a whole, and I don't want to target at one specific community, this is an epidemic. How do we think about that education and, you know, make people understand that violence against trans-people is harming us all and that trans-people, they're not making national news at all, I mean, anywhere.

And, it's kind of our responsibility to start talking about that and at a very young age. Young kids who are trans should be able to go to school and be safe and they're not. And then,

2.2

1	they're living up to be, you know, to grow up and
2	be killed.
3	So, I guess, to me, it's all very
4	connected in how do we start that early
5	intervention?
6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile?
8	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes, thank you
9	for your testimony. This question is open to
10	anybody who wants to take a cut at it.
11	I'm trying to understand what the root
12	cause, what we understand the root cause or causes
13	of underreporting to be. Because, I don't think
14	that we can really move the dial until we have a
15	deeper understanding about why it is that
16	jurisdictions don't report these types of crimes.
17	And so, if you all can help us
18	understand what those causes are, we might be
19	better able to recommend things that can move the
20	dial.
21	But, if we don't know, if we don't have
22	an understanding of what those root causes are, I
23	think the pattern is probably going to continue.
24	MX. CHESTNUT: I mean, I can quickly
25	just say this, I think there's fear of reporting to

1 law enforcement or official government agencies of 2 not being believed or being mistreated as you're 3 reporting. But, I think the reality of it is, 4 5 find me an LGBT person who hasn't at some time in their life been called an anti-LGBT epithet 6 7 worse and just normalized it and started to sort 8 say like, well, you know, at least I wasn't like 9 beat up today, I was just called like an anti-LGBT 10 epithet while walking to work. 11 So, I think part of its shifting how 12 society wants to think about these things but also 13 encouraging people not to normalize constant 14 harassment. 15 MS. MASRI: And, I can add to that as 16 well. From the Muslim community's perspective, a lot of the hate crimes that are occurring are a 17 direct response to a lot of the sentiment that's 18 19 been pushed by politicians and elected officials by 20 the government. 21 And, there's also а perception 2.2 government policy specifically targeting the Muslim 23 community. 24 And so, as a result, there is a genuine 25 fear among Muslims of reporting any hate crime that

1 occurs because they fear additional consequences 2 from their interaction with government officials. other hand, 3 On the anti-Muslim 4 sentiment and hate crimes, harassment, intimidation 5 has become so commonplace that people underestimate 6 they set it aside as a common occurrence. 7 don't think t.hat. their individual Thev 8 circumstances are important enough to report it or 9 to bring it to anybody's attention. 10 So, it is important that the government 11 first establish trust in order to increase 12 is also other mechanisms of reporting. There 13 getting reports and that is through state and local 14 agencies that do reporting but are not -- their 15 records are not being transferred into any type of 16 central database. 17 There should be a focus on the federal 18 government to create a central database from all 19 the rights commissions, state agencies that 20 collecting that will at least increase the numbers 21 that are coming in. 2.2 MS. VOGELSTEIN: I can add to that. 23 So, our federal civil rights laws don't properly 24 protect students from religious harassment. 25 OCR has extended the protections of

1	Title 6 to protect students based on ethnicity or
2	ancestry, but not specifically religion.
3	So, through clearer guidance from the
4	Department of Education and through legislation
5	that protects religious students from harassment,
6	there could be better reporting as well as better
7	enforcement of incidents.
8	MS. CLARKE: Yes, thank you for that
9	question, Commissioner Adegbile.
10	I think that this is a very important
11	issue that requires work from a few different
12	angles. Building trust with communities that tend
13	to be targeted by hate crimes is key.
14	And, one way for law enforcement
15	agencies to build that trust is to ensure that
16	their ranks reflect the diversities of the
17	diversity of the communities that they endeavor to
18	protect and serve.
19	They should meet and convene regularly
20	with communities. Hear from them, understand them,
21	understand the ways in which they are impacted. Law
22	enforcement stands to learn a lot from communities
23	through meaningful and real engagement.
24	I also think that it is important to be
25	very intentional about wanting to hear from

victims.

2.2

Through our work with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, we've had law enforcement share that they had not done enough to make fighting hate crimes a priority.

And, last summer, through our work with that group, they passed a resolution that made fighting hate crimes a priority which, by itself, sends a strong message to the communities that you care about hate crimes and want to hear from people when they are victimized.

But, a more micro level, I think it's important when we're talking about hate crimes inflicted on undocumented and immigrant communities to have a very clear and unmistaken policy that someone's status will not be used against them if they call to report a crime or an incident.

So, there are many ways that we can work to attack this issue, trust is paramount but policies, training and engaging with communities I think are equally important parts of the strategy as well.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Ms. Clarke, if I could follow up for a moment. Earlier, I think the DOJ representative shared some of this notion

1 about engaging with communities as did some of the other law enforcement officers. 2 But, my understanding is, and I don't 3 4 know if I have this right, but my understanding is 5 that the future of the community relation service and DOJ is in some doubt at this point. 6 7 I'm wondering if that is And, 8 consistent with this notion that in order to 9 discharge the duty of connecting with communities 10 taking apart an apparatus that was established as 11 part of the 1964 Civil Rights Act for purposes of 12 having outreach into communities and providing a 13 mechanism for positive discussion that is not just 14 treating DOJ as only an enforcement tool. 15 I'm trying to figure out how this lines up with that professed need of law enforcement? 16 17 MS. CLARKE: The U.S. Department 18 Justice is our nation's largest and most important 19 federal law enforcement agency. And, for sure, the community relation services the one part of 20 vast agency that has been tasked for decades with 21 connecting with communities, resolving conflicts, 2.2 23 bringing communities that are divided together. 24 We deemed it devastating to hear that 25 the budget has been wiped out for this critical

1 part of DOJ. And, we think that it turns the clock back decades and efforts to ensure that the Justice 2 Department is able to step into communities that 3 4 have been impacted and devastated by hate crimes 5 and really get in there and work together to bring 6 people together to promote unity in a way that is 7 so needed on the heels of a hate crime. 8 This is the peacekeeping arm of 9 Justice Department and we hope that in the weeks 10 ahead, we'll see Congress working with DOJ 11 reverse the decision to wipe away what truly is one 12 of the most critical parts of our U.S. Department of Justice. 13 14 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you. 15 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney? 16 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you, Madam 17 Chair. 18 question only because Ι have a 19 talked a lot about data in the last couple of years 20 and the reporting going up in the last couple of 21 years. 2.2 What do those numbers and reports look 23 like say for the last 10 years or 20 years? Have 24 they been on the increase or have been on

Was the -- are you talking about the last

decline?

1	two years because there was such a tremendous
2	percentage increase?
3	If I could have some answers, I'd
4	appreciate that if you know what the numbers are or
5	what the percentages have been or if you can lay
6	your hands on those numbers?
7	Okay.
8	MS. SENTENO: So, I'll just say, you
9	know, from our review, according to BJS statistics
LO	from 2004 to 2015, the average number of hate
L1	crimes reported was about a quarter of a million.
L2	And that
L3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Annually?
L4	MS. SENTENO: Annually, each year.
L5	Wait, that can't be.
L6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Sounds like a
L7	lot.
L8	MS. SENTENO: I'll review if that was
L9	actually annually.
20	But, we saw that it looked as though,
21	you know, from 2004 to 2015, there were changes.
22	There were fluctuations up. Our understanding is
23	that hate crime reporting didn't dip significantly
24	or there were no significant kind of decreases, but
25	rather there were changes particularly for Latinos

1 that there were periods of increased reporting but 2 never kind of dramatic drops. And so, we were always looking at a 3 4 rate of either a steady level of reporting for hate 5 crimes against Latinos or an increased level for 6 the past 10 years. 7 And, we're certainly able to follow up 8 on that one statistic. 9 And then, our other understanding 10 that for the period between 2011 and 2015, the most 11 common motivation for hate crimes was racial bias. 12 Vogelstein, CHAIR LHAMON: Ms. it 13 looked like you maybe took out some data. 14 MS. VOGELSTEIN: I'11 Yes, just 15 something. Well, I took out the FBI data and I do 16 that hate crime what know FBI reporting, was 17 reported, there were something like 500 more victims in 2016 than in 2015, 7,615 victims in 2016 18 19 and I don't have the 2015 data right in front of 20 But, it was about 500 less. me. will 21 Ι also say with anti-Semitic 2.2 hatred specifically, the ADL released a study in 23 January. And, I believe that they found that anti-24 Semitic incidents increased by 59 percent from 2015 25 through 2016, or sorry, 2016 through 2017.

1	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right. Well, I
2	understand that. I was just trying to see what the
3	results were the last ten years.
4	MS. VOGELSTEIN: Oh, so, I don't know
5	all of the data but I do know that this past year
6	of the ADL's report was the second highest number
7	since they started reporting in the 1970s.
8	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Ms. Masri, I'm
9	sure you have something to say.
LO	MS. MASRI: Yes, in terms of our
L1	internal statistics, I can't give you the numbers
L2	off hand, but I can tell you that generally what we
L3	saw was a spike and an increase of hate crimes
L4	post-9/11. And, a second spike was post-election
L5	last year.
L6	Post-election last year, we saw a
L7	significant spike in bullying as well. And, as I
L8	mentioned earlier, specifically teachers on
L9	students bullying has spiked in the last year.
20	Generally speaking, since 9/11 hate
21	crimes has been pretty much steadily increasing
22	with the exception of the spikes that I just
23	mentioned.
24	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I was wondering
25	if, because we're running out of time and I know

1	that the Chair is very strict.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: True, and I have some
3	questions, too.
4	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: So my question
5	is, do you have charts for your individual groups
6	that you represent in this regard that you can
7	submit?
8	Because I think it a chart,
9	especially if we could put it in the report of say
LO	10 or 20 years of reporting for like religious or
L1	Latino or African-American, transgender, Muslim
L2	would be very effective in terms of seeing what
L3	exactly is happening because everybody's been
L4	talking about data all day and it would be nice to
L5	see it.
L6	Thank you.
L7	MS. SENTENO: Can I just, you know,
L8	just to go back to the earlier point, the statistic
L9	that I cited, it is indeed 250,000 average each
20	year from 2004 to 2015. The data is based on BJS
21	statistics as well as the National Crime
22	Victimization surveys and other data that the
23	federal government pulled together. And, we'd be
24	happy to provide this information.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much.

Ms. Clarke, you testified earlier that we are at a moment where we observe the federal government retreating its hate crime enforcement work and bringing up cases and not addressing hate crimes.

At an earlier panel and also in written testimony that we received from DOJ, we heard that combating hate crimes is among the highest priorities for the Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department commitment the and а Department to use all of our investigative prosecutorial authority to bring perpetrators justice.

also heard touting Wе that since 2017, the Department has brought charges against dozen crimes more than two defendants and obtained 22 convictions.

I note that that does contrast with the prior administration's record with respect to hate crimes charges, on average about 32 and a quarter charges per year. So, it does look like there may be some decline but -- in those in one year.

I'm just curious from your perspective from this work that you've been doing if you could characterize what you mean about seeing the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 Department of Justice now retreating from 2 crimes enforcement. 3 Because that stands in pretty 4 contrast to the testimony received. 5 Thank you very much for MS. CLARKE: 6 that question, Commissioner Lhamon, and for your 7 leadership and focusing the Commission's attention on this crisis. 8 9 Words must be backed by action. And, 10 perspective, many of our the new hate 11 incidents and hate crimes that have been happening 12 across our country over the past year, past year 13 and a half have been ones in which we've 14 silence from the Justice Department and silence 15 from our Attorney General. 16 I think that these moments are moments 17 really require leadership, require that 18 have an Attorney General prepared to stand up and 19 use the bully pulpit of the office to condemn hate, 20 to condemn the impact that hate has on communities. An Attorney General who can sympathize 21 2.2 with the victims and communities that have been 23 targeted. 24 Ιt is mу observation that General Jeff Sessions has not done enough to use 25

1 the bully pulpit and unique powers of the office to 2 speak out, confront hate and to support local law enforcement in investigating these incidents when 3 4 they arise or in taking concerted action to have 5 federal government lead and spearhead investigations at the federal level and to 6 hate 7 incidents that are taking place in our country. 8 That said, I will give credit to the 9 Justice Department for completing investigations 10 that were initiated and started during the prior 11 administration. 12 And, I think that those have provided some moments for this administration to essentially 13 14 take credit for work that was already well underway 15 before the clock started on this new 16 administration's efforts. 17 It is our goal and intention to bring 18 this Justice Department pressure to bear on 19 stand to hate. And, we feel that it is up 20 important for the Justice Department to do 21 than it has presently. 2.2 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much. 23 Mx. Chestnut, you made, I thought, a 24 very compelling argument for focusing on prevention

could

give

you

Ι

wonder

if

and

25

some

us

1 recommendations for what kinds of prevention areas 2 you think are most fruitful or most necessary? 3 There's been a number of MX. CHESTNUT: 4 campaigns that have started ahead of sort of states 5 pushing anti-trans ballot measures and really just public education. 6 7 Because, most of Americans when polled, anti-discrimination 8 thev aren't against 9 protections, but when they go to vote, they don't 10 they're voting know what on and they 11 understand what transgender people, who they are 12 and what they mean. 13 So, simply like public education 14 And, I know a number of years ago, D.C. campaigns. 15 ran one that was quite successful and it really was 16 just like putting trans-people sort of in the day 17 to day life like, hey, I'm trans and I work with 18 you. California has run a very 19 successful 20 campaign thinking that they were going to have a 21 ballot measure called Transform California and it 2.2 was about educating local business owners on like 23 who transgender people are, what they might 24 like and that it doesn't really matter that they're

transgender just like don't violate their rights.

You know, and I think part of it is pushing the media around these narratives and moving away from this like only talk about transpeople when they're dead. You know, certainly people like Janet Mock and Laverne Cox have done wonders to sort of bolster this like image of trans-people.

But, the reality of it is, not everyone is a Janet Mock or a Laverne Cox and understanding that you might have trans-people working at Bank of America or at McDonald's or right here at the Commission.

And, educating people, you know, like asking peoples pronouns at work is a huge step. I was impressed when coordinating this, a staff member was like, can I ask your pronouns? You know, that's uncommon in my experience.

So, things like that which are just simple and actions that people really overlook, the healthcare component is huge. You know, like, what we might lose with healthcare for trans-people, it's like, never mind transition related care, it's like people's ability to go to the doctor and be safe is what's the priority here.

So, you know, general education that

2.2

1	can start in elementary school and go all the way
2	up. And, frankly, young people are leading the
3	charge here right now. There's amazing young
4	people around the country organizing and adults
5	need to catch up to them.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much.
7	Commissioner Kirsanow, you're the last
8	question.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Great, thank
10	you.
11	Thanks to everybody. Just one quick
12	question. Is there any better database for
13	assessing the rate and number of hate crimes than
14	the FBI's Hate Crime Statistics database?
15	Or, putting it another way, the Bureau
16	of Justice Statistics database?
17	Either from a quantitative or
18	qualitative perspective?
19	MX. CHESTNUT: I mean, an initiative
20	that a number of groups in this room are part of
21	with the Communities Against Hate which was an
22	initiative that started right after the election, I
23	think did a much better job at bringing groups
24	together.
25	I mean, I'll be frank, that the FBI

1 statistics don't include trans-people so we don't 2 have any idea how many trans-people are harmed. like 3 And, part of it's including 4 communities that might otherwise be excluded from 5 this information. So, I don't know the website but I'm 6 7 sure one of these groups, which I'm sure, I think, 8 all of these -- some of groups would know the web 9 address. 10 MS. VOGELSTEIN: I'11 just add 11 OCR's mandatory civil rights data collection could 12 be tremendously helpful, especially if more data is 13 added for religious harassment. 14 CHAIR LHAMON: I'm certainly a fan of 15 that database, I will say. But, Mx. Chestnut, if I 16 could, having said that was going to be the last 17 question that was I'm going to ask you one more. 18 Moossy, Ι think testified Robert 19 earlier today about the regular receipt of data 20 about trans hate crimes or potential hate crimes 21 coming in, I think, on a quarterly basis to 2.2 DOJ. 23 if And, Ι wonder you have any 24 information about whether the DOJ then collects and 25 reports out in way that is accessible to others or

1	usable for the DOJ itself?
2	\underline{MX} . CHESTNUT: I can't speak to how it
3	is, but my guess is that it's coming from local law
4	enforcement agencies. And, the problem with it is,
5	is one, I there's grave concern that law
6	enforcement should be collecting information on
7	gender identity or sexual orientation to some
8	matter give that the nature in which trans-people
9	are targeted by many different aspects of the
10	community.
11	But then, two, often times, they're not
12	collecting information on gender identities. So,
13	like, it might be a bias crime related to their
14	LGBT identity, but we have no sense of knowing how
15	it's then broken down.
16	So, the data, when you start counting
17	trans-people in the first place before like in
18	other areas of the world before we can then assume
19	that that information's actually making it because
20	it's not.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much.
22	Thank you, again, to this very powerful
23	panel. We really appreciate it.
24	We are going to come back in ten
	· ·

minutes at 2:30 for our next panel today.

1	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
2	went off the record at 2:20 p.m. and resumed at
3	2:30 p.m.)
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. I'm getting us
5	started on time for our fourth panel of the day.
6	PANEL FOUR: CURRENT AND FORMER FEDERAL OFFICIALS
7	CHAIR LHAMON: It's a panel of current
8	and former federal officials in the order in which
9	they will speak. Our panelists are Dr. Lynn
10	Langton, Chief of the Victimization Statistics Unit
11	at the Bureau of Justice Statistics, at the U.S.
12	Department of Justice.
13	Roy Austin, who's a Partner at Harris,
14	Wiltshire & Grannis, LLP, and a former Deputy
15	Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights
16	Division at the U.S. Department of Justice.
17	Cynthia Deitle, Programs and Operations
18	Director at the Matthew Shepard Foundation and
19	Former Civil Rights Unit Chief at the Federal
20	Bureau of Investigation.
21	Debbie Osgood, who is a Partner at
22	Hogan Marren Babbo & Rose, and former National
23	Enforcement Director at the Office for Civil
24	Rights, at the U.S. Department of Education.
25	And Olabisi Okubadejo of Counsel at

Ballard Spahr and former Supervisory General Attorney at the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights.

Dr. Langton, please begin.

MS. LANGTON: Good afternoon. Thank you for inviting me here today to discuss the Bureau of Justice Statistic's efforts to understand the level and nature of hate crime experienced by residents of our country.

As Deputy Assistant Attorney General Robert Moossy noted in his earlier remarks, the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics have long recognized the importance of having accurate and reliable data on hate crime. And we continually work to improve our efforts to provide better and more timely data.

As you know, the Department of Justice administers the country's two primary collections of statistical data on hate crime. The first is the FBI's hate crime statistics program which of course is part of the UCR.

And these data are compiled by local law enforcement agencies and reflect crimes that are known to police. And recorded as hate crimes by police.

2.2

The second source of statistical data, which I'll focus more on today, is the Bureau of Justice Statistics National Crime Victimization Survey. The NCVS is a nationally representative household-based survey that asks residents age 12 or older about their experiences with crime, including crimes motivated by hate or bias.

Both of these collections, the NCVS and the UCR define hate crime according to the Hate Crime Statistics Act. Including crimes motivated by bias against the victim because of his or her race or ethnicity, gender or gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, or disability.

Now the way this is operationalized in the NCVS is that when а respondent affirmatively that they experienced a violent or a property crime, that respondent is then asked a of questions the of series about nature the incident. Including whether they believe the incident was motivated by bias against them.

The survey also asks victims whether they had any evidence that the crime was motivated by hate. And in order to be classified as a victim of hate crime in the NCVS, the victim has to state that the offender either used hate language, left

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

hate symbols at the scene of the crime, or that police investigators confirmed that it was a hate crime.

Next. The NCVS and the UCR are designed to be complementary but different. So, despite the fact that they're both aligned with the Hate Crime Statistics Act, there are differences between them in the types of crime that they cover, in the types of victims that they cover, in the fact that the NCVS is based residents' on perceptions of hate crime.

Which may be a different standard of proof than what's required for law enforcement to record a crime as a hate crime. And another major difference is that the NCVS captures hate crimes both reported and not reported to the police.

And we can see the impact of these differences in the data. So, this figure here compares the annual average number of hate crimes according to the NCVS with those captured by the UCR.

So if you start on the left with the light blue column, based on NCVS data there were over 210,000 hate crimes occurring annually from 2014 to 2016. Slightly different than the number

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that was cited by the earlier panel just because of the difference in the time frame.

those 210,000, 211,000 of 110,000, crimes. about about 50 percent, were reported to the police. So based on NCVS data collected from the victims, 110,000 we have reported to the police.

Now of those about 14 percent were confirmed by police investigators to be a hate crime. So about 16,000, which gets us much closer to the UCR annual average for this same period. Which is about 7,000, that last bar there at the end.

So this figure illustrates that the hate crimes captured in the UCR data represent a small portion of the total number of hate crimes occurring annually. Because the NCVS is capturing a substantially larger number of hate crimes than the UCR, the two collections also show a somewhat different picture of the types of bias motivating these crimes.

In both collections, as you can see on the far left, the largest proportion of hate crimes are motivated by racial or ethnic bias. However, the NCVS shows a larger proportion of hate crimes

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

motivated by gender bias, sexual orientation bias, or disability bias.

This figure shows the number, trends in the number of hate crimes reported, the red line, and not reported, the darker line, to police from 2009 to 2016. Overall during this period, there was no statistically significant change in the number of hate crimes occurring each year.

But the estimate does appear to be trending downward. This is particularly true among hate crimes not reported to the police. Which seem to be driving any apparent decline in the total number of hate crimes during this period.

Using NCVS data, we can also examine trends in the type of bias behind the hate crimes. So from 2009 to 2016, the percent of hate crimes believed to be motivated by gender bias, that's the purple line, the second line there, doubled.

The percentage of hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation bias, that's the light blue line, also appeared to increase. But was not statistically significant.

And then the other thing to note here is that from 2009 to 2015, the percentage of hate crimes motivated by religious bias declined. But

2.2

1 appeared to tick upward in 2016. And it remains to 2 whether it will continue be seen on that trajectory. 3 through the NCVS and the UCR the 4 5 Department of Justice provides important indicators 6 of the patterns and trends in hate crime 7 victimizations. But I mentioned earlier, as 8 efforts are underway to build upon and improve 9 those efforts. For instance, in 2016 the NCVS shifted 10 11 to a sample design that will eventually allow for 12 estimates of crime to be generated not just at the 13 national level, but also for the 22 most populous 14 Which account for about 80 percent of the states. 15 population. 16 Both the NCVS and the UCR are also 17 focused on increasing the timeliness of data and 18 reporting. typically data NCVS estimates are 19 reported, released eight to ten months after the 20 year ends. 21 So, we anticipate releasing 2017 data 2.2 in the fall of 2018. And part of that lag is due 23 to the complexity of the survey and the work that 24 the Census Bureau had to do to process the files.

of

that

And

part

25

BJS

for

is

1 statisticians to analyze the data, verify the 2 results, produce the report. So, those aspects of the processing time are difficult to reduce. 3 4 But BJS is exploring other options for 5 the data available sooner. Such as making publishing preliminary half year estimates based on 6 7 the first six months of the year. These efforts are also just one part of 8 9 the work being undertaken by the DOJ hate crimes 10 statistics working group, which was established 11 through the attorney general's task force on crime 12 reduction public and safety to improve the 13 compilation aggregation of crime and hate 14 statistics. 15 So, in summary hate crime 16 identification, enforcement and prevention is а 17 priority for the DOJ. 18 CHAIR LHAMON: Ms. Langton, I have to 19 stop you. I'm sorry. I wasn't paying enough 20 attention. And we're way over time. 21 MS. LANGTON: All right. 2.2 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Mr. Austin? 23 Well, thank you and good MR. AUSTIN: 24 afternoon. I come to you as a former hate crime's 25 prosecutor and а supervisor of hate crime's

prosecutor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I personally prosecuted a cross burning in Illinois, and a pistol whipping in Mississippi.

I was a supervisor at the time that the first prosecutions under the Shepard/Byrd Hate Crimes Prevention Act were being brought.

A major problem with respect to hate crimes statistics is quite obvious. We do not have the slightest idea how many hate crimes there are in America. And we have never known.

The numbers currently kept by the FBI, and I'm speaking primarily of the FBI and not to insult my former colleague, Lynn Langton, the numbers currently kept by the FBI are largely useless.

While a small handful of states and law enforcement agencies seem to take the collection of seriously, the crime numbers majority hate states and the vast majority of law enforcement agencies do not seriously report hate crime's And the handful of numbers numbers. that reported are released late and unaudited.

Basically the FBI has little choice but to get whatever it gets from jurisdictions. And they put those number out publically without any

1 meaningful analysis. 2 But what do these numbers mean? What. decisions 3 policy be made based on these can 4 numbers? What enforcement decisions can be made 5 based on these numbers? Sadly, the all these 6 answer to 7 questions is, almost nothing. The importance of 8 collecting good data could hardly be overstated. 9 While every crime is significant, the 10 harm can be exponential when the subject targeted 11 the victim based on his or her actual or perceived 12 race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, gender, 13 sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability. 14 fear from hate The pain or crime 15 reaches a broader community. The act is anathema 16 to who we are as a nation built on diversity. 17 Now my criticism of the numbers is not meant to criticize the individuals who work for the 18 19 FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services 20 Division, CJIS. As someone who worked with this team, both when I was at the Department of Justice 21

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

is

willing

and at the White House, I know it to be a team of

smart and hardworking individuals who cared deeply

about their work collecting crime data.

team

The

2.2

23

24

25

provide

to

1 individualized training to any agency that 2 that needs help reporting hate crime it.. But few take them up on this offer. 3 numbers. 4 The problems are structural. 5 is under-resourced for work this important. And where there are no incentives for providing 6 7 data, their task is largely impossible. 8 This problem would be relatively easy to fix. 9 Make federal government funding contingent on 10 providing accurate hate crime data. 11 But where we do not even mandate that 12 enforcement agencies provide general 13 statistics, it will require serious leadership to 14 move the ball in this direction on hate crime 15 statistics. Now what exacerbates the problem is the fact that the federal government does not even 16 17 publish its own hate crime numbers. 18 The FBI works on hate crimes' 19 across the country with the Civil Rights Division 20 and the U.S. Attorneys' Offices. And none of those components regularly publishes in an easily 21 2.2 accessible location any data about those cases. 23 understand that Now I Robert Moossy 24 here and testified earlier. very

familiar with Robert.

25

And very familiar with the

work that was done by the Civil Rights Division.

And I know that we did not regularly publish those numbers in the Obama Administration.

Now, how can the federal government expect state and local law enforcement to publish data when it does not do so itself?

Now it only requires a quick look at the FBI hate crime statistics to realize just how unhelpful they are. The first thing one might notice is that the most up to date statistics are from 2016. We are now almost half way through 2018 and we still do not have national statistics for 2017.

There are approximately 18 thousand law enforcement agencies in the United States. And almost three thousand agencies did not even bother to respond to the FBI request for hate crime information. And they suffer no consequences for not doing so.

Now from the 15 thousand agencies that at least responded, there were only 6,121 reported incidents. Of these incidents, California reported 931, New York reported 595. But Alabama reported just 14 incidents. And Mississippi reported just seven.

2.2

Now for reasons unknown to me, the state of Hawaii doesn't participate at all. And then what also stands out are the number of large and good sized cities that report that they did not have a single hate crime in 2016.

Mobile, Alabama, Corona, California, Wilmington, Delaware, Savannah/Chapman metropolitan Georgia, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Evansville, area, Indiana, Topeka, Kansas, Shreveport, Louisiana, Springfield, Missouri, Patterson, New Jersey, Winston Salem, North Carolina, Fargo, North Dakota, South Carolina, Columbia, Charleston South Caroline, Corpus Christi, Texas, Laredo, Texas, Texas, Provo, Utah, Roanoke, Virginia, Lubbock, Kenosha, Wisconsin, and Cheyenne, Wyoming, I guess did not have a single hate crime in 2016.

Here are just some thoughts on ways the federal government could improve that the current system. One, make reporting mandatory. Congress could pass a law that made law enforcement provide agencies that do not hate crime ineligible for law enforcement grants from the Department of Justice or any other federal agency.

Two, audit reports. The FBI should have a team that audits the reports provided by law

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 enforcement agencies to ensure accuracy. 2 Three, publish the data quarterly. I'm happy to hear that Lynn noted that there's thoughts 3 about publishing the data at least twice a year. 4 5 But there's no reason why it shouldn't hate 6 be reported quarterly. The FBI's crime 7 statistics are collected quarterly. Τf 8 the FBI actually published quarterly, it would not only provide data in a more 9 10 timely fashion, but it would give more transparency 11 effort. publishing to the Ву quarterly, 12 individuals who are aware of hate crimes would be 13 better equipped to force their jurisdiction 14 correct mistakes. Fourth, work with affinity groups 15 16 encourage reporting. Hate crime collection can be 17 challenging because it requires with work 18 communities often distrustful of that are law 19 enforcement because of bad prior experiences or 20 lack of language access. 21 Affinity groups may be better positioned to collect the information and report it 2.2 23 law enforcement even in situations where the 24 victim does not want to participate in prosecution.

It is sad the numbers that Lynn put up

1 there showing that probably less than 10 percent of 2 t.he hate crimes that reported to law are enforcement even show up in the UCR. 3 Number five, get federal agencies 4 5 Number six, just have better reports. report. Ιf you try to look at this time at the paperwork that 6 is presented by the UCR, it is unbelievably hard to 7 8 read in this day and age. Thank you. 9 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you Mr. Austin. 10 Ms. Deitle. 11 MS. DEITLE: Good afternoon. I'm 12 grateful to the U.S. Commission for inviting me to 13 participate in this discussion with such 14 distinguished panelists. 15 From 1995 until 2017 I was employed as 16 Special Agent with the Federal Bureau of 17 Investigation. I was extremely fortunate to be 18 to the civil able to devote my career 19 program as a street agent in New York City for 12 20 years, as the Chief of the Civil Rights Unit, and 21 as a Supervisor in Boston. 22 specifically joined the Bureau to 23 investigate allegations of police brutality 24 violence motivated by hate and bias. As a civil 25 rights agent, I was honored to use the power of the

FBI protect those most vulnerable in to our communities, investigate the police officers who excessive and unreasonable force, and hold use accountable those individuals who target certain folks for violence based on race, religion, ethnicity, disability or sexual orientation.

Upon retirement, I ioined the mу Matthew Shepard Foundation to continue their mission to erase hate through law enforcement community outreach, training, and youth The Foundation was founded 20 years programming. ago by Dennis and Judy Shepard whose son Matt was targeted, attacked and murdered because he was gay.

As you are aware, they fought for passage of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crime Prevention Act of 2009 which greatly expanded the jurisdiction of the FBI and the Department of Justice to investigate bias crimes.

In my 22-year career I learned a few things along the way, which I'd like to share. Street credibility is imperative. If you're a law enforcement official, prosecutor, or victim's advocate, or community leader, you must be a believer and a doer.

You must believe that hate crime laws

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

are necessary to keep communities safe. You must believe that enforcement of these laws is mandatory. And you must believe that reporting hate crimes to your state and to the FBI is one of the most effective ways to mitigate hate fueled violence.

If you are not a believer and you are not experienced and passionate about eradicating bias crimes, your law enforcement and special interest partners will not have confidence in your commitment to join them in their quest for equality and justice.

Spend the time to learn about hate crimes. Investigate a good number of them. And earn some street credibility.

You must be honest and transparent. The federal government actors tasked with the responsibility of investigating and prosecuting hate crimes must be honest and transparent when they carry out their mission.

While everyone understands that there are some well-established laws and policies requiring confidentiality in the law enforcement arena, agents and prosecutors must keep an open line of communication with the victim and the

2.2

community. And share what they can. Timely transparency builds trust. And trust leads to safe communities.

the players must start from the Building trust place. between minority same communities and law enforcement officers was one of my goals as Chief of the Civil Rights Unit in the FBI, as well my mission as а Program as for Operations Director the Matthew Shepard Foundation.

If officers trust civilians to report crimes in an honest and timely manner, and the victims have confidence that the officers will conduct a thorough and professional investigation, everyone is safer.

This symbiotic relationship however, assumes that each player starts at the same place. This equation takes for granted that the officers have been trained to recognize a hate crime, how to collect evidence of bias, and how to use that evidence to successfully prosecute the perpetrator.

It also assumes that law enforcement agencies believe that their jurisdiction should enact and enforce hate crime laws. If the bias motivation of the crime is ignored, the victim will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

not feel validated, safe, or protected in her community.

Accept and acknowledge the past. We are all aware that it wasn't that long ago that law enforcement officers were some of the very people who initiated and facilitated lynchings of African-Americans, targeted LGBTQ community members for harassment and violence, and intentionally failed to protect many other minorities from hate crimes.

If the FBI agents working civil rights violations do not accept and acknowledge these facts, they will not earn the trust and respect of the children of these victims, some of whom are facing the potential for the same victimization.

Be a leader in the fight for equality and justice. As an FBI agent or government actor involved in eradicating hate, you must be a leader in the fight for justice and equality.

Not only must you uphold the rule of law and the Constitution, but you must find new and innovative ways to build relationships, earn the trust of community leaders and minority groups, and you must promote professionalism and integrity.

For countless people I met in my career, I was the first and only FBI agent they

2.2

ever encountered. I had the honor and duty to ensure that they were left with the belief and the impression that the FBI was an honorable and honest institution.

No one wins. Hate destroys everyone it touches, the victim, the perpetrator, their families and the community. When a hate crime is traumatized, committed, the victim is hurt, fearful, and is forever changed.

The perpetrator and his family however, are often overlooked when it comes to examining the fallout from a bias incident. In many cases I investigated, the family of the perpetrator was forever changed as well as they learned that they would be seen as bigots regardless of their claims of innocence or tolerance.

Oftentimes the perpetrator acted in a violent and biased manner because of their own trauma, their upbringing, and their substance addiction. Federal investigators and prosecutors mindful of be these factors. And appreciate that the ripples of hate extend far beyond the targeted victim.

Thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts. I look forward to hearing from the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

others today.
CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much Ms.
Deitle. Ms. Osgood?
MS. OSGOOD: Thank you. Good
afternoon. I had the privilege of serving for the
Office of Civil Rights for 25 years, both in
Headquarters with the current Commission Chair, and
in the Chicago Regional Office.
And I <u>am</u> very proud of my service,
public service for the federal government. And
very proud of OCR'S long stated mission of ensuring
equal access to education, and promoting
educational excellence throughout the nation
through the vigorous enforcement of the federal
civil rights laws.
What I'm going to focus on today, given
my background, is the critical role that OCR and
the Department of Education must continue to play
in preventing and addressing the harassment of
students in our schools.
I strongly believe that OCR has made a
tremendous impact in this area both in its
leadership and in the comprehensive approach it has
taken to preventing and addressing harassment.

Through regulations, policy, guidance,

investigations, and technical assistance, we have seen progress and greater compliance by educational institutions in the area of harassment.

And one example I want to give is that I think that because of OCR's policy guidance and strong robust enforcement work in the area of sexual harassment and sexual violence, we have a totally different culture at our schools.

And the expectations of parents and students and the communities, <u>are</u> different. People expect that schools will comply with Title IX, that they will prevent and address sexual harassment, sexual violence, when it occurs.

And they view that as part of the educational package, what they're getting from their schools when they go to that school. I think that's a tremendous sign of progress in our efforts to address harassment in our educational systems.

I have some specific recommendations for how I believe the department and OCR should provide leadership and guidance in this area going forward. And I make these remarks recognizing that we are in an important period in the history of civil rights educational law as the department is currently reviewing all of its regulations as part

2.2

of the administration's regulatory review and reform initiatives.

And the department itself plans to issue in September, a notice of proposed rulemaking regarding Title IX and sexual misconduct. I know, and I fully expect that the debates over possible changes to OCR's regulations will be exceptionally heated and raucous, and deservedly so given the stakes involved.

I think that as we go forward, my first recommendation is that we should use the current upcoming debate opportunity for as an federal government and the entire education community, including students, parents, advocates, teachers, faculty members, administration to address harassment officials, issues in а reasonable, collaborative, and equitable way.

As we move forward, and I do view us as moving forward, we need to recognize that regardless of what policy regulatory the and changes may be, the obligation and responsibility of schools at all levels to address harassment, is Schools must continuously affirm not going away. that they will not tolerate harassment and take the necessary steps to address harassment effectively.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 Our discussions need to focus on how to 2 get better from this fundamental principal forward. And one of the ways to get better is to heed the 3 4 lessons learned. 5 OCR, the Department of Education, and educational institutions across 6 the country 7 learned a lot in the last 10 years, 20 years, about 8 how to develop and implement effective anti-9 harassment policies and procedures. 10 should also be looking to OCR's 11 guidance as OCR has been working through the facts 12 specific and cases alleging harassment, and 13 becoming, in my view, more sophisticated, 14 nuanced in assessing the compliance issues related 15 to harassment. 16 Ι think this body of administrative 17 case law, including past and current OCR cases is 18 very valuable and should be considered closely 19 forward -- going forward. 20 In the spirit of continuous 21 improvement, I really do believe that we should use 2.2 this public debate as an opportunity to heed the 23 lessons learned by our educational institutions and 24 by OCR so that we can all assess what has been

working, what has not been working, and get even

better at addressing these difficult roles.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

As part of this conversation, I think it's critical that OCR provide clear and reasonable And in my experience at the Department and always felt that we were OCR, Ι our effective as a federal civil rights agency when we were clear through our and through cases quidance what compliance is, what compliance not.

I encourage the Department to continue to provide clear reasonable rules going forward. I also recommend that we take greater advantage of what I refer to and what I view as kind of a treasure trove of guidance from OCR.

OCR has been doing these cases for a long time. The racial harassment guidance came out in 1994. The sexual harassment guidance in 2001. We're looking at decades of cases where OCR has looked at the specific facts of a case and said, yes, this is a violation, or no, this is not.

I recommend that OCR consider publishing, with all appropriate redactions, all of its compliance information that's related to harassment. Right now the website only includes resolution agreements and resolution letters, but

it does not include letters where the agency has 1 2 said there was no violation. Again, if our goal, our common goal is 3 to increase compliance with the civil rights laws 4 5 that OCR enforces, and reduce harassment of our greater understanding of the compliance 6 students, 7 requirements will. in my view, promote 8 compliance. 9 Another recommendation is that OCR 10 provide more technical assistance. This to 11 seems almost like a no-brainer. Helping schools 12 understand, helping communities understand what the 13 federal laws require, I think has always been very 14 effective. 15 Agencies should continue to 16 technical assistance and provide more than it has 17 been in the past year. 18 specific suggestions Some were to 19 update what was affectionately known as the NAAG 20 guide, a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional guide developed by 21 that was OCR and National Many schools 2.2 Association of Attorneys Generals. 23 found that guide to be very useful. 24 Developing a model grievance 25 This has been sort of a pet project that's been in

1 the works at the agency for many years. And I think that it would be very helpful to schools. 2 And again, just providing more local 3 assistance. Working directly with schools in the 4 OCR region to help them come into compliance. 5 And then finally, I believe that the 6 7 Department itself should take greater advantage of own resources and data at the Institute 8 9 Educational Science and its National Center for 10 Education Statistics. Thank you very much. 11 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you Ms. Osqood. 12 Mr. Okubadejo? 13 MS. OKUBADEJO: All right. Thank you 14 much for inviting me today. Ι appreciate 15 everything that we've heard today about statistics. 16 But I think like Debbie, I'm coming 17 from a place where I was actively investigating discrimination 18 complaints of and harassment. 19 Actively investigating hate crimes and enforcing 20 some of the laws. 21 And currently I work with colleges and 2.2 university and educational institutions across the 23 country to craft compliance programs. And I think what I'm seeing is that schools are really hungry 24 25 for help and wanting to comply in this area.

And are looking for guidance. Sort of the how to respond appropriately under the various civil rights laws.

You know, some of the cases I worked with have involved incidents like nooses being placed outside students' lockers or dorm rooms. They've involved sometimes really awful situations where LGBTQ students are harassed in schools and ultimately end up taking their own lives.

helping schools rebuild And something like that happens, and helping students within those schools understand how, you know, a behavior that maybe wouldn't be called a crime, was just one more building block that may or have contributed to pushing somebody really, really and difficult towards а fatal decision.

know, that's of So, you sort the context in which I'm working. And at OCR we had a variety of civil rights laws, you know, Title VI, Section of the Title IX, 504 Rehab prohibited discrimination and harassment broadly.

And that required schools to respond promptly and appropriately when they were incidents

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

at schools. One of the things that always struck me is that under Title VI it was less clear in terms of requirement for a grievance procedure.

And so sometimes that raised reporting issues at schools. And you know, unfortunately under Title VI, you know, the discrimination prohibited is based on race, based on national origin, based on color.

And these are some of the areas that we've heard people talk about throughout the day. And what we're seeing sometimes is that students and employees may not know what the process is for raising their hand and saying, this awful thing has happened to me on campus.

And if the statute itself, and the regulation, doesn't require that schools have in place a grievance procedure that's published, just like these other laws. So, you know, Debbie just talked about Title IX where there are clearly requirements about what needs to be in place and what's expected to be in place.

I think that there's less clarity around that under Title VI, which raises some issues, I think for schools in responding to serious incidents like this. I think it would be

2.2

1 really beneficial for schools to have more guidance 2 documents about how to respond to incidents on First 3 campus where there Amendment are 4 implications. 5 So know, schools sometimes we, you 6 aren't really aware that much student speech or 7 employee speech may be protected. Particularly in public institutions. 8 9 institutions And private have many 10 language in their policies and procedures that 11 protect speech and expression in ways similar to 12 protections that public institutions the are 13 required to adhere to under the First Amendment. 14 And I think what would be helpful for 15 schools, is if there could be some guidance that 16 helped paint a little bit more of a picture of what 17 to do when there are these incidents involving 18 protected expression where the conduct is tearing 19 the community apart. 20 you may have students of color 21 Feeling like they don't belong feeling targeted. 2.2 on a campus. Feeling excluded. At the same time

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

are having

that the conduct at issue is protected under the

schools

And

First Amendment.

23

24

25

to navigate

1	these issues as they happen. And I think are
2	looking for help in doing this.
3	So, I think it would be helpful if it
4	were possible for agencies like OCR, like the DOJ
5	to flesh out some of these issues. Give examples.
6	You know, what do you do? How do we
7	expect you to respond when an incident like this
8	occurs?
9	And then another piece is when there
10	are incidents that don't quite rise to the level of
11	a hate crime. But if you leave them and ignore
12	them and let them fester, that's essentially where
13	you'll be headed.
14	And in some schools there may, you
15	know, if you do a close analysis, it may not appear
16	to trigger an obligation to respond under Title VI
17	or Title IX. But the absence of a response could
18	lead to a more serious incident that could
19	constitute a hate crime.
20	So I think also helping schools
21	understand how to handle those types of incidents.
22	So, you know, do you conduct an investigation? If
23	you do, what does that look like?
24	How quickly are you doing it? Is the
25	fact of your investigation chilling protected

speech? Is there a way to structure that differently?

And I think if there could be guidance around those types of areas, it would be incredibly beneficial to schools. And I see the clock ticking. So, I'll just raise one more point that I think is really important.

And I think in thinking about how schools and how agencies are interpreting what it means for conduct to be based on sex under Title IX, I think it would be helpful to be able to do that as broadly as possible.

I think getting some of the changes and the withdrawal of guidance that we've seen under Title IX, some schools may start to wonder the extent to which conduct involving LGBTQ students is protected. And I think if agencies, if OCR, if the DOJ can make clear that it's continuing to cover conduct aimed at students based on their -- based on sex stereotyping and gender non-conformance.

And the types of issues that OCR historically has covered, even as far back as 2001 in that guidance, we're seeing language around sex stereotyping. And so I think if it can be made clear that those types of harassment and issues

2.2

1	continue to be covered.
2	And continue to be a priority, it would
3	be really helpful in preventing some of the climate
4	issues that we see for LGBTQ students on campus,
5	where we're seeing really high suicide rates and
6	students feeling excluded on campus.
7	And so those are the main points I
8	wanted to raise. And I thank you for inviting me
9	and for giving me a chance to hear the other
10	panels.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much to all
12	the panelists. We'll open it up for the
13	Commissioners' questions. I understand
14	Commissioner Kladney that you are.
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you Madam
16	Chair. My questions actually revolve around most
17	of what you've spoken about and I think Mr.
18	Austin's experience. And of course, anybody else,
19	please chime in.
20	But, you said that schools need some
21	guidance. And of course First Amendment
22	implications are very important.
23	I believe one of our other witnesses on
24	the Panel before said something about speech that
25	leads to worse conduct. And I think you just

1	almost said the same thing.
2	Are there any procedures or model
3	programs or regulations that can be used to help
4	schools in this regard? Because all we've heard
5	about, to me, today is I've heard a lot about data.
6	So, I'm data'ed out.
7	(Laugh)
8	MS. DEITLE: No disrespect.
9	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I'm looking for,
10	I'm actually looking for a few solutions because I
11	know First Amendment is important to a lot of the
12	Commissioners here. And
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: All.
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: We've had cases
15	thank you Commissioner. We've had cases, we've
16	seen cases lately where someone wears a tee shirt
17	to school that's got inappropriate sayings on it.
18	And then the parents take it to court. And you
19	know, there's a whole thing.
20	So, can you give us any guidance? Or
21	do you know where we can look to find some of these
22	types of regulations or approaches that are
23	Constitutional yet helpful?
24	MS. OKUBADEJO: I mean, I think in
25	truth this is what schools are asking for help

1 Because I think there isn't a lot of clear 2 quidance and direction in this area. And it would be incredibly helpful if 3 4 there were examples of what to do in the instance 5 where a student wears a tee shirt that another student thinks is offensive or a student feels 6 7 micro aggressed by. 8 You know, how does а school handle And how do you balance, you know, the needs 9 that? 10 and the rights of both students? 11 And what schools are doing right now 12 essentially is navigating really carefully through 13 crucial conversations. And putting on educational 14 programming at the beginning of the school year and 15 at various points during the school year. 16 To help students understand yes, there is the First Amendment, but you know, 17 we 18 really value certain students on campus. 19 But, you know, in terms of a particular 20 program or a particular regulation, not that I have seen employed regularly. 21 2.2 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And that's the 23 problem. Right? 24 MS. OKUBADEJO: In my mind that's one 25 of the issues.

1	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And in the cases
2	that you've tried, how has speech interacted with
3	conduct or hate crimes?
4	MR. AUSTIN: So, respectfully I don't
5	see this as even close to an issue in the criminal
6	conduct that I'm talking about. I don't think that
7	the burning of a cross is a First Amendment Issue.
8	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right.
9	MR. AUSTIN: It's a crime.
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: That's right.
11	MR. AUSTIN: I don't think that the
12	assault of a person based on their race, religion,
13	national origin, sexual orientation, is a speech
14	issue. It's a crime.
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: It's factual.
16	MR. AUSTIN: It's factual. Yeah, I
17	mean, I don't this isn't a close call for me
18	over whether or not you and I think it may be
19	different in the civil context or in the school's
20	context.
21	But, for the numbers that I'm talking
22	about, and I'm sorry that you're data'ed out. But
23	that's kind of something that I feel very
24	passionate about, is that
25	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: No, no. It's

Ι	ine. I mean.
2	MR. AUSTIN: No. But I'm just saying
3	that it's not this isn't an issue. It's already
4	been determined, I think, by the Constitution, by
5	the Supreme Court that when you actually injure
6	someone, or do violence to someone, or you threaten
7	someone based on their race, religion, national
8	origin, sexual orientation that it is in fact a
9	crime.
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Great. Thank
11	you very much. That's actually an answer I had to
12	another question.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: And we'll turn to
14	Commissioner Kirsanow.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well thank you
16	Madam Chair. And thanks to the witnesses. I'm not
17	data'ed out. In fact I could use a lot more data.
18	So, the question I have to Ms. Langton
19	is, in your PowerPoint, you have in there that
20	approximately 50 percent of the National Crime
21	Victimization Survey of crimes, hate crimes, are
22	reported.
23	Compared to, I guess you've got a
24	couple of different databases. How does that
25	compare to overall crimes, the number of which are

•	
1	reported?
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow,
3	do you mind just moving your microphone up closer
4	to you?
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yeah. I think
6	I broke it.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Oh, okay. <u>You</u> can
8	switch with Commissioner Heriot.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yeah.
10	MS. LANGTON: That's a great question.
11	And it's actually pretty consistent with what we
12	see for violent crime in general.
13	The percentage that's reported gets
14	higher when you talk about serious violent crime.
15	Which we define as rape, sexual assault, robbery,
16	and aggravated assault.
17	Bu that is fairly consistent with what
18	we see overall for violent crime.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. And then
20	the second question is, in employment
21	discrimination jurisprudence there's a concept
22	known as mixed motive. That is, someone can make
23	out a prima facie case that they were discriminated
24	against or discharged on the basis of race.
25	The employer says no. He was

1	discharged because he burned down the warehouse.
2	In other words, there could be two reasons.
3	But if the employer can establish that
4	the person would have been discharged anyway, then
5	that doesn't amount to racial discrimination.
6	Okay?
7	In determining whether or not there's
8	been a hate crime, you said there was corroborative
9	evidence. Let's say somebody steals an iPhone, and
10	in the midst of doing that utters a racial epithet.
11	How do you determine whether or not
12	it's a hate crime or primarily motivated by
13	economic crime?
14	MS. LANGTON: So, we're not making any
15	determination. The NCVS classifies crimes based on
16	their attributes.
17	So, if the victim says their phone was
18	stolen, which and stolen from them physically,
19	which could be a robbery. And they believe that
20	the offender was motivated by a racial bias, and
21	they say the evidence for that is that the offender
22	used derogatory or hate language, we would classify
23	that as a hate crime.
24	So, we're not making a judgement call.
25	It's simply based on the attributes of the crime

1	based on the questions that we're asking.
2	I mean, to your point it is based on
3	the victim's perception. So again, that may not
4	rise to the level of evidence required for a law
5	enforcement agency to record it as a hate crime.
6	But I think that there's still
7	intrinsic value in understanding that that victim
8	perceived that crime to be motivated by bias.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Third, we've
10	got victimization data. Do you have perpetrator or
11	suspect data?
12	MS. LANGTON: So that would be on the
13	FBI side, where they would collect. Especially
14	through the NIBRS Program, the National Incident
15	Based Reporting System, more detailed information
16	about the offenders.
17	But the National Crime Victimization
18	Survey is really focused on the victims. We do ask
19	the victims about their offenders and their
20	perceptions of the offenders.
21	But those can't be used to generate say
22	rates of offending for particular groups.
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And last, I
24	posed this question to another Panel. Are there
25	any studies, data, evidence that shows that

1 designating something а hate crime deters, prevents, or reduces the incidents of that crime? 2 And a subset to that is whether or not 3 4 designating some as a federal hate crime reduces, 5 deters or prevents such crime? So, I don't have anything 6 MS. LANGTON: 7 in my survey data that I could point to, to answer And I'm not sure of particular data 8 that question. 9 would address sources that be used to that 10 question. 11 Certainly the NCVS is a longitudinal 12 So we go back to victims or to respondents 13 seven times over the course of three and a half 14 years. 15 So, it would actually be an empirical 16 question to see whether someone reports a 17 crime in one wave of the survey. And whether they experience a hate crime in later waves of 18 the 19 survey. 20 I'm not sure you would be able to say 21 reporting that actual of that and 2.2 discussing that as a hate crime sort of 23 impact their behavior perhaps, or the preventative 24 measures they would take personally. 25 I'm not sure you could go that far with

1	it. But, that's about all you could say with the
2	NCVS data.
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is there any
4	evidence that it assists in the apprehension of a
5	suspect? Designating something as a hate crime?
6	MS. LANGTON: We don't have any
7	evidence of that from the NCVS that we could speak
8	to.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you. I
LO	don't have any other questions.
L1	CHAIR LHAMON: All right. So I also am
L2	not data'ed out. I saw that last month the BJS
L3	published a Federal Register Notice of a request to
L4	OMB to revise the NCVS to raise the minimum age
L5	from 16 to 18 in which respondents will be
L6	administered questions about their sexual
L7	orientation and gender identity.
L8	And I wonder if you could explain to
L9	this Commission, what would be the value of knowing
20	less about when youth are subject to crime based on
21	sexual orientation or gender identity?
22	MS. LANGTON: So, just to be clear, we
23	are not making any changes to the questions about
24	hate crime and the questions about whether the
25	crime was motivated by sexual orientation bias.

1	Those questions will continue to be
2	asked of all respondents age 12 or older. We have
3	proposed raising the minimum wage oh, the
4	minimum wage. The minimum age.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: The minimum wage also.
6	Yeah.
7	MS. LANGTON: Different conversation.
8	The minimum age at which we're asking respondents
9	about their sexual orientation.
10	And the comment period on that Federal
11	Registry Notice closes today. And we'll be
12	reviewing the comments and assessing those and
13	making a determination from there.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. But that was
15	non-responsive. So, my question is, what is the
16	value of knowing less about the sexual orientation
17	of victims of crimes? Or the gender identity?
18	MS. LANGTON: Well, the concerns are
19	more about the sensitivities of the data and the
20	sensitivities of asking respondents that are minors
21	and maybe in the presence of their parents, those
22	questions.
23	Less about the utility of the value
24	of the data, trying to balance potential
25	sensitivity issues with collecting this data.

1 CHAIR LHAMON: And I think you were present during the earlier panel when the earlier 2 panelists were talking about the civil rights data 3 collection, which as you may know, also collects 4 5 that same data and manages the sensitivity while also getting the information. 6 So it's again, a surprise to me to see 7 the suggestion to change it, which would diminish 8 9 the value of the data that we've heard all day is 10 substantially less valuable then it could 11 already. 12 MS. LANGTON: We'll be reviewing the 13 comments that are received and taking those into 14 consideration certainly. 15 CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. I see that there 16 are more questions. But I'm just going to take the 17 microphone while I have it and ask my long list of 18 questions. Because I still can, we have another 19 half an hour. 20 former education folks, So, to our 21 thank you for coming. In your time the 22 Department, are you aware of any times when 23 Department took particular steps focused on bias 24 incidents in schools?

Maybe creating a task force, or taking

1 steps to try to address those incidents? And if so, 2 could you describe what those steps were, whether they were effective, and what your views were about 3 4 them? 5 MS. Osgood: I think there have been a Obviously the issuance of the 6 number of steps. quidance 7 racial harassment, policy in 8 harassment, disability harassment, those have all 9 been helpful. 10 After 9/11 the Department also issued a 11 quidance or a letter reminding schools to take 12 action not to discriminate against Arab-American 13 students. I think that was helpful. 14 Ιt very forceful leadership was а 15 statement from the Department. So, I think that 16 that was helpful. 17 I mentioned the NAAG Guide, which was a 18 really remarkable accomplishment to get all of the 19 National Attorney Generals and the OCR to publish 20 this six hundred and something page document which provided some very specific guidance for schools 21 2.2 about how to address this issue. 23 We also worked collaboratively with the 24 Department of Justice, including one of the 25 panelists here on a number of harassment cases

1	including a case in Anoka Hennepin, Minnesota
2	involving gender stereotyping and the University of
3	Montana sex harassment and sexual violence case.
4	So, there were those initiatives as
5	well, which were part of the Agency's enforcement
6	package.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: And am I to understand
8	that those were particular targeted efforts? Or
9	were they just part of the regular enforcement
10	package?
11	And the distinction I'm trying to draw
12	is whether you think that there's value in the
13	Agency affirmatively focusing on a particular area
14	in its enforcement efforts.
15	MS. OSGOOD: I think that any time the
16	agency has focused on a particular area we've seen
17	progress. We've seen I mentioned in the sexual
18	violence area, we've seen schools handling this
19	issue better.
20	So, I would say following that, <u>in</u> my
21	experience, yes. Any type of increased attention
22	generally leads to better compliance and better
23	results.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
25	MS. OKUBADEJO: I agree.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Succinct. Thank you.
2	Okay. In that same vein Mr. Austin, I worked with
3	you in our prior lives on some joint interagency
4	task force work, in particular, focused on AAPI
5	harassment in this area.
6	And I wonder if you could describe that
7	work, the value that you saw in the work, if any,
8	and whether you know of a continuation of those
9	efforts, and whether you think they should continue
10	or not?
11	MR. AUSTIN: Yeah. And let me just
12	start by, and I apologize for this, but I do want
13	to address
14	CHAIR LHAMON: That's fine.
15	MR. AUSTIN: Commissioner Kirsanow's
16	questions and whether or not there's any deterrent
17	effect or assist in the apprehension.
18	I would say, absolutely. First of all,
19	in a country where we believe that greater
20	sentences have a deterrent effect, the fact that
21	there is usually an increased sentence, an
22	enhancement based on the fact that something is a
23	hate crime, certainly has a deterrent effect to the
24	extent any of our laws provide a deterrent effect.

Whether it assists in the apprehension,

1 absolutely. I had a chance to work with Cynthia 2 Deitle, Agent Deitle on a number of investigations. 3 if can bring the FBI And in Ι 4 investigate а hate crime, the likelihood 5 apprehending the individuals who were perpetrating that crime has increased dramatically. 6 7 Not mention iust having the to 8 knowledge that a federal agency is going to 9 sitting on top of a local agency and demanding that 10 that local agency actually do proper 11 investigation, is going to increase the 12 apprehension or the likelihood of apprehension of 13 the subjects. 14 And can't understate just, you the 15 importance of public awareness over hate crimes. 16 The condemnation, the shame that goes with that. 17 And how that impacts whether or not someone 18 going to commit one in the future. 19 So I just want to be clear that I think 20 that without question, calling something a 21 actually crime matters. And in my personal 22 experience it matters. 23 And sorry Chairwoman Lhamon --24 CHAIR LHAMON: That's totally 25 thank you.

1 MR. AUSTIN: But, with respect to the 2 work that we did in Anoka Hennepin, I mean, we were -- it was incredibly important because not only did 3 we identify a problem, but there was actually work 4 5 Department of Education between the and the 6 Department of Justice on fixing that problem. 7 On going into the school and working 8 with the different communities that were impacted by it. On working with the teachers, the parents, 9 10 everybody who was impacted by this. 11 By making a statement to schools around 12 the country over what was permissible and what was 13 not permissible, and what would be acceptable in 14 this country and not acceptable in this country. 15 think the work that we did 16 incredibly important, was noted by communities 17 around the country. 18 And I haven't seen that work continuing 19 today. That's really my answer. 20 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Separate and 21 from the enforcement work that you 2.2 described, which I appreciate, I know you also led 23 interagency task force focused on actual AAPI 24 bullying and put out guidance and materials about

it.

1 But also that followed many, many 2 listening sessions and interagency work together about understanding the scope of the problem and 3 4 then trying to assess what appropriate next steps 5 would be. And in an earlier Panel we heard from 6 7 Bob Moossy about intra-DOJ work toward those same 8 ends now, which sounded very impressive and 9 laudable. 10 He was not familiar with interagency 11 work now continuing. And I wonder if you have a 12 view about how valuable that work has been and whether it should continue? 13 14 MR. AUSTIN: And let me give credit to 15 Jocelyn Samuels in large part. Because she was the 16 head of a lot of the education work that 17 And I had the opportunity to work very happening. closely with her. 18 19 You know, having a group of people from 20 inside of a particular agency meet to discuss an 21 important issue is a meeting. Okay. That's the meeting we could have every -- any day at any time. 2.2 23 It is so important to bring in, first of all, others who have a different expertise, a 24 To bring in the community, 25 different experience.

1 to bring in the public to those meetings. 2 Because we don't know everything. Τf we're sitting in DOJ as important as we thought we 3 4 were in DOJ, not working with the Department 5 Education, not working with the Department 6 working with all these other Labor, not 7 departments, that we weren't meant getting 8 possible information. 9 It meant that we weren't doing the job 10 that needed to be done. You must bring in other 11 agencies and their expertise and their knowledge 12 and their employees who are working so hard. 13 Or you're just not doing what needs to 14 And so having a meeting among DOJ people be done. 15 to congratulate DOJ people on the great job DOJ 16 people are doing, is not really a useful adventure. 17 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'm going to 18 hold my other questions for the moment because I 19 understand that other Commissioners have questions. 20 Commissioner Narasaki? COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: 21 Thank you Madam 2.2 Chair. So my first question is about data. And 23 I'm -- I get a little lost in all the acronyms and 24 the different studies and who's doing them, 25 what.

1	But one of the issues that came up in
2	an earlier panel is the fact that many immigrant
3	communities may not be reporting on hate crimes
4	because particularly if they're undocumented, or
5	someone in their family or life is undocumented,
6	they may fear the risk of that.
7	My understanding is that potentially in
8	at least one of the three databases, there's the
9	NCVS, the ECR, and then NIBRS, or whatever that's
10	called, they may actually have, because of the
11	Patriot Act, the civil detainers.
12	Which is basically the list of people
13	who should be deported if they're caught because
14	they have violated the immigration laws.
15	Is that a correct understanding? Does
16	that exist in any of the databases? Or is that
17	just a rumor?
18	MS. LANGTON: I can't speak to the
19	NIBRS data, which is the National Incident Based
20	Reporting System, that's the FBI's. But not in the
21	National Crime Victimization Survey, certainly not.
22	CHAIR NARASAKI: Mm-hmm. Does anybody
23	know about the other ones?
24	MS. <u>DEITLE</u> : I do not. But I would
25	make one point, which is if someone who's

1	undocumented goes to a non-governmental agency, so
2	Catholic Charities or Bridge Refugee Services, and
3	says, I was a victim of a hate crime, and that
4	agency has a solid relationship with the FBI or the
5	Department of Justice for example, and that's
6	reported then to the FBI or DOJ, unless we initiate
7	a case, that's not counted as a hate crime.
8	So, the FBI would never report that as
9	one hate crime. We might agree that a crime was
10	committed and write a report about that.
11	But if that's not investigated or
12	prosecuted by DOJ, that's not even one. That
13	doesn't go anywhere.
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: No, no. But
15	I'm saying that the concern is that immigrants may
16	not be going to actually report to the police.
17	MS. <u>DEITLE</u> : Right.
18	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Because they're
19	afraid that if they do, A, they'll be detained
20	because the police will ask.
21	Or B, if it ends up in a database, and
22	it gets matched against a DHS list, they'll be
23	deported. I'm just trying to understand the
24	interaction between the various lists that exist in
25	law enforcement land.

1 MS. DEITLE: The only thing I can say 2. is that if that scenario happened when I was still with the FBI, there was no cross-pollination with 3 4 Homeland Security. 5 So, if an undocumented immigrant came to the FBI and said, I've been a victim of a hate 6 7 and that went into our database, crime, 8 information was not submitted, or had access 9 Homeland Security that then would act the on undocumented status of the victim. 10 11 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Great. That's 12 helpful to know. Then the second thing is, so 13 several people have remarked upon the fact that the 14 federal government itself is not reporting data on 15 hate crimes, but asking the states to. 16 And you were candid enough to note, Mr. 17 Austin, that even in your administration that 18 didn't happen. So, why is it not happening? 19 Are there barriers? What needs to 20 happen to try to make that happen? 21 MR. AUSTIN: There's not a barrier that 2.2 I'm aware of. I actually used to get monthly 23 reports of the hate crime investigations that were 24 being conducted by the FBI and the prosecutions 25 that were being done by the Civil Rights Division.

1	Those reports I would assume are still
2	being done. Someone decided not to make those
3	things public.
4	But, people will come and testify on
5	the Hill, before a Commission such as this. And
6	they will say what the numbers are.
7	But, we go all the way back, I want to
8	say, like 15, 20 years of having these numbers
9	across every piece of work that's done by the Civil
10	Rights Division. I know that the FBI also has
11	similar numbers.
12	But they are never released publically.
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So if our staff
14	went and asked for the data, we wouldn't be told
15	that there's some sort of privilege over it that
16	would keep us from getting it?
17	MR. AUSTIN: I am unaware of any
18	privilege that would prevent you from getting it.
19	But, I don't know what they might say.
20	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Great. Thank
21	you. Oh, I just have one more question
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Oh, I'm sorry.
23	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: About the
24	interagency, sorry.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead.

1	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So, one of the
2	things that struck me about the interagency task
3	force that has existed in the past on hate crimes,
4	and particularly, I believe it also was part of the
5	effort to address bullying against Asian-American
6	and Pacific Islander students, is the involvement
7	of HHS.
8	And particularly their mental health
9	agencies. And I was intrigued by that, and I would
10	like to understand why that's an important
11	component of that kind of task force.
12	MR. AUSTIN: DOJ knows how to prosecute
13	people. HHS is much more in the world of mental
14	health.
15	You want those experts in there. You want
16	that expertise in there. Just like again, DOJ is
17	in the business of prosecuting people.
18	And you want the Department of
19	Education to say, well what makes a good
20	educational environment? This is why we have
21	what's called crisis intervention training for law
22	enforcement.
23	The idea that law enforcement officers
24	shouldn't be the ones necessarily always dealing
25	with people who are in some kind of mental health

1	crisis. You actually want a social worker. You
2	want someone who knows it, to save lives.
3	So, you want people's expertise. And
4	that expertise does not sit in any one agency. It
5	doesn't sit in any one body.
6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: And is there, I
7	mean, we heard also from a couple of witnesses,
8	particularly some of our witnesses who were
9	personally victims or connected to victims about
10	the intersection of mental health issues, both in
11	terms of being a victim but also being a
12	perpetrator.
13	How much work is being done in the
14	federal government to understand that? And to look
15	at how can you address where the mental health
16	issues are in terms of trying to help those who
17	so you can avoid an action coming in the form of a
18	hate crime because you have failed to address the
19	mental health issues?
20	MR. AUSTIN: I would actually pass to
21	my education panelists. Because
22	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yeah. No, I
23	was asking everyone. It's not just
24	MR. AUSTIN: Yeah. Okay. Sorry.
25	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I'm not just
	NEAL D. ODOGG

1 picking on you. 2 MR. AUSTIN: Sorry, sorry. No, I just think that that's where so much of this work can be 3 4 Not from a law enforcement officer, but by 5 an educator. MS. OKUBADEJO: And I agree. I think 6 7 that's one of the critical pieces that's missing 8 is, you know, focusing on mental health issues 9 among students. 10 And you know, as you know, many schools 11 provide effective mental struggle to health 12 services to students. Many are under-resourced. 13 You know, that's a topic that comes up 14 And part -- from what I saw at OCR and even often. 15 now, you know, part of an effective institutional 16 response to hate crimes on campus or bullying or 17 harassment on campus is making sure that students 18 have resources. 19 So students on both sides of the issue, 20 the person who's the target of the harassment or discrimination and then also 21 the person 22 perpetrating. 23 And schools -- for example this is one 24 way that Title IX I think gets it right, is that 25 schools are actively offering to students, as soon

1 in the door, employees, as they come or to 2 connections to on campus and off campus resources to address mental health issues and to target that. 3 4 And I think that happens to a lesser 5 degree under other statutes. So when there are issues of racial, or disability harassment coming 6 7 up, we're seeing less of that. 8 But, I don't think there is the type of 9 targeted thoughtful response that and you're 10 talking about where, you know, educators 11 various groups at the government or at schools are 12 getting together to think through how to address 13 this systematically. 14 I don't think that's happening. But 15 it's hugely needed. 16 I would say I agree, but MS. OSGOOD: 17 also add that there has been talk for a number of 18 years of the Department providing some guidance, 19 perhaps with DOJ, on direct threat, students that 20 pose a risk to themselves or others, and how should 21 schools handle it: What type of accommodations? 22 What type of leave policy should be in place? 23 really came And that never to any 24 formal fruition. And so I would add that to the 25 list of items that BZ mentioned in terms of where

1	greater clarity would be helpful.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Thank you so
3	much. So for example if that guidance were
4	written, it would be good if it were released?
5	MS. <u>OSGOOD</u> : Yes, ma'am.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile?
7	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Dr. Langton, I
8	have a question for you, understanding that you
9	don't have this absolute power.
10	But, first I want to ask, what is your
11	view about the quality of the data? Your former
12	colleague had a view about the data not being of
13	the highest quality.
14	I'm just wondering, you, as a
15	statistician, what is your view of the quality of
16	the data that you have to analyze?
17	MS. LANGTON: So, are you asking me
18	about the quality of the FBI data? Or the quality
19	of the National Crime Victimization Survey data?
20	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Well, both.
21	MS. LANGTON: So, I'll speak to the
22	quality of the National Crime Victimization Survey.
23	And you know, I think it's considered the gold
24	standard in victimization surveys.
25	And plays a really important role. And

the Census Bureau is our data collection agent, and we, BJS and the Census Bureau have policies and procedures in place at every stage to try to ensure that we're collecting data that are accurate and reliable.

So, starting from even the development of the questions and the process that we go through, working with folks with expertise to make sure that we're developing questions that are understood and are capturing the concepts that we're trying to measure.

The testing process that we go through with those questions, to then administer them to potential respondents and ensure that respondents can answer the questions in the way that we think they're going to answer them.

they're comprehending And that the question the way that we're intending. And then we have extensive testing that we do with our interviewers to ensure that they are administering the survey in a manner that's consistent for all respondents.

We have all sorts of data quality procedures and cleaning procedures that are put into place to ensure that the final data are high

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 quality and accurate and reliable. 2 obviously, the National Crime And Victimization Survey captures much higher counts of 3 4 hate crime victimization than what you see in the 5 UCR data. And there are a number of reasons for 6 7 And that's part of the reason that we have 8 the National Crime Victimization Survey, to serve 9 as that sort of complementary measure and to get at 10 both the dark figure or the hidden figure of crime. 11 And also to collect data that is not filtered 12 through any sort of lenses. Police data are filtered. 13 Whether it's 14 filtered at the law enforcement level, or it's 15 filtered in what law enforcement agencies report to 16 the UCR. 17 There is some potential there for that 18 filter. And we're collecting information directly 19 from residents. 20 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: you think Do 21 there is under-reporting in that data nevertheless? 2.2 MS. LANGTON: Absolutely. There's 23 And there's absolutely error in every data source. 24 going to be some under-reporting in the National 25 Crime Victimization Survey.

1	You're asking people about very
2	sensitive topics. And so that's absolutely a
3	problem.
4	But, you know, we try to put measures
5	in place to ensure confidentiality, privacy of
6	interviews. Putting all these procedures in place
7	to encourage respondents to report on what
8	happened.
9	But that's always a possibility.
LO	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you. Mr.
L1	Austin, you suggested that perhaps one way to
L2	improve the FBI data, I take it, was to have
L3	mandatory reporting. Is that right?
L4	MR. AUSTIN: That is correct.
L5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Now, would that
L6	stand in contrast to general crime reports that the
L7	FBI gets? Meaning, aren't all of the crime reports
L8	voluntary?
L9	MR. AUSTIN: They are.
20	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: So, what would
21	be the policy, how would we think about this as a
22	policy justification to say that hate crimes are so
23	important that they should be mandatory, and other
24	crimes should be voluntary?
25	MR. AUSTIN: So, I actually wouldn't

1 make that distinction. And so my feelings 2 actually across all of our crime data. think most of our crime data 3 Т is 4 really bad. And we should be doing better. And 5 for a country that values public safety as much as we do, it is actually embarrassing how bad our 6 7 crime numbers are across the board. 8 And so, and I think it's just as easy to collect your hate crimes data at the same time. 9 10 And I think that's what NCVS does, is collects 11 their hate crimes data along with their regular 12 crime data. 13 That's how the census does it. The 14 thing should be done with law enforcement same 15 agencies when you're seeking UCR data. 16 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: So, are you 17 making a larger point then that perhaps the extent data overall 18 which our crime suffers the 19 deficiency of being based on voluntary reporting, 20 our criminal justice policies and investments may not be well put because they're based on garbage 21 2.2 in, garbage out data? 23 Absolutely. MR. AUSTIN: But I would 24 say the hate crimes data is particularly laughable. 25 When you have, you know, states where you know more

1 than seven hate crimes have occurred reporting 2 crimes, and using that to make seven hate decision, I think is a real problem. 3 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: 4 Thank you. Ms. 5 Osqood and Ms. Okubadejo, I definitely need to 6 pronounce that name correctly with a name like 7 Adeqbile. 8 So, my sister here. So, my questions to you go to the impact in the higher ed space in 9 10 particular, of having quidance and certain policy 11 pronouncements put in place, and then taken away as 12 they're starting to take root. administrations 13 Obviously have the 14 opportunity to have their own view about their 15 policy pronouncements. But particularly in 16 areas where the law is starting to become 17 established or to bring greater protections communities that have been found to be particularly 18 19 susceptible to certain dangers in our schools. 20 I'm just wondering what the policy --21 or forget the policy. What are the real world 2.2 implications of that whipsaw effect for our kids? 23 MS. OSGOOD: So Ι do lot of 24 presentations where I talk about the protections 25 for transgender students and the changes in federal

policy, changes in federal law. 1 I always remind schools that they can do more than is actually 2 required by the laws. 3 4 That they can protect even if it's not 5 specifically with -- protected under OCR guidance or the like. 6 7 I think you're suggesting that there's kind of almost a whipsaw effect of when a policy is 8 9 issued, it's starting to sort of blossom and we're 10 seeing some progress. And then it's withdrawn. 11 I think that's a fair observation. Ι 12 do think with the withdrawal of even the 13 transgender quidance and the issuance the 14 interim guidance for sexual violence, we have made 15 progress. 16 I think students are better protected 17 than they were. And now in my view we're in this kind of period of recalibration where there's an 18 19 agreement as to principle maybe, but how we get 20 there, we're going to have pretty robust debates 21 about it. 22 MS. OKUBADEJO: Ι mean, Ι think 23 really depends on the context. And for some 24 I would say withdrawal of the --25 employees also, withdrawal οf the transgender

guidance in particular was devastating for some.

And in some cases dangerous. Because I think the message that some heard was that it is now okay again to discriminate and to treat people differently.

And to, you know, impose discipline if somebody uses quote unquote the wrong restroom. And so I think those types of changes can be really difficult.

Luckily though, I think what Debbie is saying is true that schools for the most part, and none of the schools with which I work made any kinds of changes to their internal policies or procedures when that guidance was withdrawn.

Because I think they were recognizing that all students are important members of their communities. And all students will be protected. And the rights of all students will be respected.

And you know, Ι didn't see so, immediate changes. But, you know, I can imagine circumstances, in, you know, cases where maybe I wasn't involved in a rural school district where a school district made maybe a different decision than they would have made pre-withdrawal quidance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 So, I think that can be challenging and can be confusing to schools sometimes if there's a 2 lot of back and forth. 3 4 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you. 5 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you for that also. COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: One last 6 7 question to Agent Deitle, or former Agent Deitle. 8 I want your view of the relationship between the 9 federal government and local law enforcement. 10 You're somebody who had a long career 11 enforcing some of these laws, investigating these 12 laws, shall I say, in the context of the federal 13 power and the federal law. 14 And obviously there are many laws, as we all know. 15 And as a general matter, 16 very often the states go first. But sometimes 17 there is a helpful, as we've heard from Mr. Austin, collaboration and a federal presence. 18 19 So I'm wondering, for example, had you 20 been at the FBI at the time of Charlottesville, how would you have understood the relationship between 21 2.2 the federal government and the local officials that 23 were responding to the events that we all witnessed 24 and some of our earlier witnesses in very tragic

ways?

1 MS. DEITLE: Thank you for your The FBI would not be able to do its job 2 question. without information and intelligence. 3 We would also fail miserably without 4 5 having relationships in place, not just with local law enforcement, but with so many people in the 6 With community leaders, with education 7 community. leaders. We would fail miserably. 8 9 I think one of the things the FBI does well in all of our field offices is to establish 10 11 and strengthen the relationships with local 12 enforcement. So, every special agent in charge has a very solid, healthy, strong relationship with all 13 14 of the police chiefs and sheriffs, the state police officers, school resource officers oftentimes, too. 15 16 То make that there sure when is 17 something like Charlottesville, or another tragedy, there's already those relationships in place to be 18 19 able to have a very quick conversation. To have a 20 dialog very quickly about Mr. Police Chief, 21 Police Chief, what do you need? This is what we can do to help you, do 2.2 23 you want us to hang back for a little while? Just 24 tell us what you need.

Because this is what we can help you

1 If those relationships are all -- if they're 2 already established, it makes it not really difficult to respond effectively to, whether it's a 3 4 hate crime tragedy or а police misconduct 5 it's very difficult to respond with situation. trust and transparency if those relationships are 6 7 not already solid. 8 So I think the FBI does a really good job with partnering with local law enforcement and 9 10 establishing those relationships before there's a 11 problem. 12 I think what we can always offer is, 13 we're here. And I think that Roy talked about that 14 We're here, we can help. 15 We have a lot of tools. We have a lot 16 of resources. We have a lot of money and a lot of 17 very committed and passionate people that are here 18 to help in a variety of ways. 19 But we like it to be collaborative. Wе 20 don't want to impose the will of the FBI on a local 21 law enforcement agency without it 22 collaborative partnership. That just works 23 effectively. 24 So, I do think we do a good job with

And especially if those relationships are

that.

1	already set, I think we respond more effectively.
2	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Are there ever
3	circumstances where the feds go first?
4	MS. DEITLE: There are. So, I've had a
5	number of cases when I was an agent and a
6	supervisor and unit chief that, for a particular
7	hate crime situation it was the decision not just
8	of the FBI, but also the Department of Justice that
9	the interests of justice were to be served if the
10	FBI and DOJ went first.
11	Those are very rare circumstances. And
12	I think Roy and I have had numerous conversations
13	about this, I think the power of the federal
14	government in this area is most effective if we
15	serve as that backstop.
16	So we are here if you need resources.
17	We are here if maybe we need to go first. But we
18	like all those decisions and discussions to be
19	again, collaborative.
20	We certainly don't want to make a
21	decision with DOJ to go first in a hate crime
22	situation without the agreement and participation
23	of that local law enforcement agency. And the
24	victim too.
25	We want it to be a very transparent

decision-making process with the victim and 1 the 2 community as well. So, we do go first. But that's a very rare circumstance. 3 4 Sure. Thank you. 5 Thank you. Commissioner CHAIR LHAMON: Yaki? 6 7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you 8 much. Thank you all, the panel for your discussion 9 today. 10 To me there seems to be two sort of 11 under-reporting issues that we're talking 12 today. One is on the victim's side. 13 And as much as, since we are almost out 14 of time, I'm not going to go into that other than 15 to say that part of me believes that when you have 16 rhetoric from policy leaders that diminishes the 17 would worth of those groups who want, or 18 individuals who want to report because they 19 Mexican-American, because they are an immigrant, 20 because they see that the consent decree for the 21 police department is no longer in place, 2.2 diminishes the confidences of people to do that. 23 But I'm not going to talk about that. What I want to talk about, because we have very 24 little time, is that there is -- one of the persons 25

1 this morning said, I'm going to direct this at Mr. 2 Austin and Ms. Langton. When I asked the question about, how do 3 you get at the issue of under-reporting by state 4 Which is a different issue than the 5 agencies? under-reporting by victims, which can be, you know, 6 7 impacted by outside factors. 8 The answer this person gave was, That they have antiquated, for lack of 9 resources. 10 a better word, it sounded like antiquated computers 11 that couldn't process data and get the data to DOJ 12 in the appropriate form or whatever. 13 I want to know whether or not A, believe that's -- how believable that is. 14 I'm not 15 saying it isn't believable. 16 But, in terms of importance, is it lack 17 Is it lack of interest? Or is it lack of of will? 18 capital infrastructure? 19 MS. DEITLE: I'm just going to make one 20 quick point to answer your question. had I've 21 those conversations with police chiefs and sheriffs 22 in my career, the ones that do not report. 23 And I've asked them, why don't 24 And I get every answer that you just gave 25 just now. I get answers of, I don't have time for

1	that.
2	I don't have an intern that can do
3	that. My computer broke. Why do I have to do
4	that? My state agency doesn't mandate that I do
5	that.
6	I've gotten every response you possibly
7	can think of.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: My canine unit ate
9	the paperwork, or something like that.
10	MS. <u>DEITLE</u> : Right. I don't have
11	paperwork that can I've heard many. And I think
12	I gave this answer right before the hearing
13	started.
14	But, I think one way to address that,
15	the answer of, I just can't get that done, is to
16	put to continue to put the onus back on the FBI.
17	To say, look FBI, you collect all the data.
18	This is your data. You put out the
19	data. You analyze the data. You collect the data.
20	The FBI has to do a much better job getting the
21	data. And convincing sheriffs and police chiefs to
22	put their information into a system that then the
23	FBI and that Lynn can access.
24	But in response to the questions of, I

just can't get that done, there's always an answer.

1 And the answer could be, what do you need? 2 Do you need an intern? Well, let's the local community college and get 3 look at 4 justice intern to help you, Mr. 5 Chief. And she can take that data down and enter 6 it into your system. 7 Do you not have the money to upgrade 8 your computer system? We're going to go back to 9 DOJ and we're going to get you a grant. It's going 10 to fund your system and make it better. 11 Do you not see value in reporting? 12 Well, let's talk about that too. There was always 13 But the issue is, you had to have that an answer. 14 conversation. 15 the special agent in charge, 16 that I ever was one, but the FBI had to have that 17 conversation with local law enforcement to 18 out, why are you not reporting? Help us. 19 We want the data. And we want the 20 information. If you're having a problem, going to help you fix it. 21 2.2 MR. AUSTIN: And just really quickly. 23 First of all I need to correct Cynthia. She kept speaking of the FBI and DOJ, because she's an FBI 24 25 agent.

1	DOJ is actually over the FBI. But,
2	sometimes they forget that.
3	(Laughter)
4	MR. AUSTIN: The only other thing I
5	would point out is just the fact that really,
6	there's not a law enforcement agency in this
7	country that is worth its salt that does not
8	collect data on the crimes that are happening.
9	For them to say they can't release it
10	is actually, usually it's pretty silly. Okay?
11	They have it. They know their homicide
12	numbers. They know the vandalism numbers. They
13	know the shoplifting numbers. They have those
14	numbers.
15	It is really in most cases, a lack of
16	will. And a decision not to have their agents,
17	their agents, their officers, their deputies ask
18	the question, you know, why do you think this
19	happened to you?
20	Well, I think it happened to me because
21	of the color of my skin. I think it happened to me
22	because of my sexual orientation.
23	And then checking a box to say that
24	that is the reason. And then putting that
25	information into whatever system they currently

use.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

There certainly isn't a major law enforcement agency in this country that doesn't collect data across the crimes and then sit down and tell everybody what that is.

Because if they didn't, the sheriffs wouldn't be elected, or the police chiefs wouldn't be appointed.

And just to take this in MS. LANGTON: a slightly different direction, moving away from the infrastructure issues, I think you know, big improvement that we're making to the National Crime Victimization Survey right now, which is a major undertaking beginning in 2016, is to change sample design so that we can collect state level, produce state level estimates or of including hate crime, 22 victimization, for the most populous states as I mentioned earlier.

And that gives the ability to at least then triangulate at the state level between the FBI data and the NCVS. And potentially even local law enforcement data too, to be able to piece together this picture of where there are these discrepancies in terms of, we have 110,000 victims saying that they're reporting to police that they experienced a

1 hate crime. When we drill down then at the state 2 level, what does that mean in terms of how many 3 4 victimizations are getting recorded and reported by 5 law enforcement. CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. So we are past 6 7 But the Vice Chair is going to take us home 8 with the last question of the day. 9 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: All right 10 Thank you very much Madam Chair. then. And I 11 thank our panelists for being with us today, it's 12 been absolutely wonderful. 13 Through the materials that I read 14 for this hearing, preparation and from the 15 testimony that I've received, at this point 16 been convinced that the collection of good data is 17 absolutely imperative to combating hate crimes. 18 And yet we've heard repeatedly today 19 information that causes us to question the validity 20 and the value of the data. Through other panelists and through you, Mr. Austin, we've heard ways to 21 2.2 improve the system of collecting data. 23 One of our earlier panelists said that

us

we

to

can

have

improve

our

the ways that

for

is

collection

24

25

communities

the

1 require that our law enforcement agencies, or their local law enforcement agencies are accountable. 2 So hold them accountable. 3 You send up 4 the information saying there wasn't a single hate 5 crime committed in your jurisdiction, folks in the community ought to be up in arms saying, huh? 6 Or7 how in the world could you possibly come up with 8 that? 9 I'd like to get your thoughts 10 anyone that wants to offer, on whether that is in And if there 11 fact a valid way to approach this? 12 are any other ways that communities, that we can 13 bring our communities into this so as to improve 14 our data collection? 15 MR. AUSTIN: Sure. Ι very much 16 appreciate your question. And that was part of the 17 reason why I read the lengthy list of large 18 communities that do not report. 19 Because the millions of people who 20 watch CSPAN, hopefully at least one of them is in one of those communities, and heard that, and will 21 22 say, I need to make a move on this. 23 Look, I think communities drive most of 24 our change. And communities are the ones who can 25 decide who's going to be the next mayor, the next

1	police chief, the next sheriff and what not.
2	The problem is that, you know, some
3	things the federal government is just better at.
4	And it needs to take ownership of this problem and
5	do something about it.
6	And our Congress needs to take
7	ownership of this problem and do something about
8	it. Yes, I would love if our communities stepped
9	up and forced their jurisdictions to do so.
10	But, our communities are worried about
11	getting their kids to school and their health care,
12	and the food on the table. And just, you know,
13	making sure that their kids are all right.
14	Data about hate crimes is not
15	necessarily in their top ten list. And I think it
16	is something which a federal government needs to
17	step forward and take ownership of.
18	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you.
19	Do you want to say something?
20	MS. <u>DEITLE</u> : I always hate when I agree
21	with you.
22	(Laughter)
23	MS. <u>DEITLE</u> : So, I would just where
24	I thought you were going with that was where you
25	went. So, I hate to put that responsibility on a

Τ	community.
2	I hate to make people have to think
3	about, is my kid safe in school? Do we have
4	healthcare? And then also, I think the hate crime
5	stats are inadequate.
6	I hate to put that on them. But, I
7	would love someone to take up that cause in every
8	community. And make Honolulu, who doesn't report
9	anything, I would love to make the community in
LO	Honolulu report their data or force their law
L1	enforcement agency to report.
L2	But, I do think that at the end of the
L3	day it is the responsibility of the FBI. They
L4	collect it. I think they have to do a much better
L5	job to go out and get it.
L6	And I hope that that's something that
L7	changes in due time.
L8	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much to
L9	this panel for the day. This is amazing testimony.
20	We really appreciate it.
21	We are going to break and reconvene at
22	5:00 p.m. for the open public comment period. All
23	participants in the open public comment period
24	should report back at 4:45 p.m.
25	And this is a brief reminder that

1 registration for that open public comment period is 2 still open. So we'll recess now until 5:00. Thank 3 you very much. 4 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 5 went off the record at 3:58 p.m. and 6 resumed at 5:00 p.m.) 7 OPEN AND PUBLIC COMMENT So, 8 CHAIR LHAMON: welcome back, 9 We're now going to proceed with the open 10 public comment session. 11 A few opening instructions which have 12 been provided to each participant already, please 13 tailor your remarks to the topic of today's 14 briefing which is hate crimes and bias-motivated 15 incidents. 16 Please state your name for the record. 17 Please note that the U.S. Commission on Civil 18 Rights has a policy not to defame, degrade, 19 incriminate any person. 20 Also, this comment period is a time for 21 listen, not to the Commissioners to engage 22 questions or discussion with presenters. we 23 appreciate your testimony, we're very eager to hear 24 and we will not take your short time with

questions or with dialog.

1 You'll have three minutes to speak, 2 which will be measured by a timer. The box with the three lights here reflects that time and when 3 4 the light turns from green to yellow, that means 5 that one minute remains. And when the liaht turns 6 red, you 7 should conclude your statement, and if you do not conclude it, I will conclude it for you. 8 9 If you've not finished or would like to 10 submit additional information, we encourage you to 11 emailing do by mailing or your written 12 submission to us at the address provided on your 13 information sheet. And that should be provided by 14 June 11, 2018. While waiting for your turn, please sit 15 16 in the numbered chair that corresponds with your 17 you ticket. Thank all for coming up 18 microphones already. 19 And if you need to step out briefly 20 before it is your time to speak to use the restroom or otherwise, please let a Staff person know. 21 2.2 doesn't seem like a very good idea in three 23 And if you have any questions, please ask minutes. 24 a Staff Member.

At least one of our Commissioners has a

1 flight to catch and so might have to step out a few minutes early, but I hope we will all be here. 2 So will now begin public comment with our first 3 4 speaker. 5 MR. ESTRIN: Hello, my name is David I'm here with you today because all four 6 Estrin. 7 of my grandparents survived the Holocaust. 8 I'm the grandson of Jew Number 67245 and when I was 13, my grandfather brought me to the 9 10 Mauthausen Concentration Camp in Austria to show me 11 what that truly meant. 12 That day, he sparked a fire in me which 13 would go on to reveal my responsibility to fulfil 14 the promises of never forget and never again, not 15 just for the Jewish people but for all people. 16 After founded he passed away, Ι 17 Together We Remember, a nonprofit that combines 18 technology, activism transform art, and to 19 remembrance into action to end identity-based 20 violence around the world. 21 April, genocide Each awareness and 22 prevention month, we organize interactive vigils 23 victims that commemorate the οf genocide and 24 atrocities throughout history and celebrate the

stories of heroes who have saved countless lives

time and again.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This past April, we organized over 40 vigils across nine countries and high schools, universities, museums, houses of worship and public spaces.

Charlottesville, In Virginia, we across together city leaders identity brought groups to build relationships of trust solidarity which will be critical to keep the peace in August, the one-year mark of the Unite The Right rally.

In Brooklyn, New York, we united survivors, activists, and tech innovators to explore immersive technologies like virtual reality and portals by shared studios, which can foster empathy, empower vulnerable communities and inspire collective action.

In Boca Raton, Florida, an interfaith coalition and the ADL organize an evening of art, activism, and dialog on the meaning of never again, and commemorated the victims of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas school shooting.

And here in Washington, Congresswoman

Ann Wagner led a series of bipartisan floor

speeches in honor of genocide awareness and

prevention month. The list goes on, including communities in Zambia, D.R. Congo, Rwanda, Cambodia, Canada, Germany, France, and the U.K.

One of the most common pieces of feedback we've heard from participants is that they don't have many opportunities to connect face to face and work alongside people from across the fault lines in their communities.

In countries with a recent history of mass atrocities, networks of non-political peace-building organizations often emerge to mend racial, religious, and political divisions. That sort of network needs to be more fully developed here in America.

Our experience has revealed that we already have the technology, know-how, and willpower to end bias-motivated violence, but we need more opportunities to connect, collaborate, and put these puzzle pieces together.

Now imagine peaceful rapid response vigils wherever white supremacists seek to achieve silence or violence. Imagine a global counternarrative campaign every April, in partnership with Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube to amplify inspiring voices standing up to hate across

2.2

the globe.

2.2

We believe that if we can create enough of these opportunities to unite, we will turn the tide to rising extremism in the U.S. and make never again a reality worldwide by 2048, the 100-year anniversary of the UN genocide convention.

By remembering humanity at its worst, we can inspire humanity to be its best one community at a time. Thank you.

MR. WATKINS: I am Devin Watkins, attorney at law. First of all, I wish to inform the Commission that pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1975(d), it appears that the statutory authority of this Commission has terminated.

Returning to the topic of hate crimes.

I wish to speak today to oppose the violation of my civil liberties. The Hate Crimes Prevention Act was passed under the purported authority of the Thirteenth Amendment. That amendment prohibits slavery and involuntary servitude.

Violence based on a person's race, color, religion, national origin are not slavery nor are they involuntary servitude. It demeans those that had to live in slavery to say otherwise.

Slavery legally allowed people to beat,

rape, and murder other human beings. Slavery was an evil beyond anything we experience today and thank God we stopped it in this country.

Congress has the power to stop slavery using any reasonable means, but this is not even intended to stop slavery. Does anyone really believe this is the purpose of the law? It isn't even claimed to be doing so.

The only valid use of the Thirteenth Amendment is for the end of prohibiting slavery and the involuntary servitude. Slavery and involuntary servitude are already illegal and there is no fear of them occurring again.

It is wrong to do violence based on a person's race, color, religion, or national origin, which is why those acts are prohibited in every state. But there is no basis in our Constitution for a Federal prohibition.

Our civil liberties are based on the respect of the rule of law, especially the supreme law of the land, the Constitution. It violates everyone's civil liberties to threaten people with an unconstitutional law beyond the enumerated powers of the Federal Government.

The reality is these acts are already

2.2

1 prohibited under state law. This statute is instead being used to subject politically disparate 2 minorities to double jeopardy, in violation of the 3 Fifth Amendment. 4 5 This is done by prosecuting them twice for the same act, once at the state level and again 6 7 at the Federal level. Justice properly understood 8 requires that all people be given a fair trial in 9 which they are to be released if they are found not 10 quilty. 11 I will leave you with the words 12 George Washington: the best and only safe road to 13 honor, glory, and true dignity is justice. 14 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Next 15 speaker? 16 Hello, MR. LEVIN: my name is Jake 17 Levin and Ι speaking behalf am on of the 18 organization Shared Studios. 19 Wе are а collective of artists, 20 community organizers, and former lawyers who 21 working to connect diverse communities around the 22 world through live, full-body video environments 23 When you enter a portal, you come called portals. 24 face to face with someone in a similar portal

somewhere else around the world and can speak as if

1 standing in the same room. 2 Participants have expressed feeling as though they are breathing the same air as someone 3 4 who may be thousands of miles away. 5 We are working to create a world where people from a tech hub in Rwanda and a community 6 7 center in Milwaukee can engage one another 8 intimate dialog, collaborate on new ideas, create 9 art, and play. 10 More than 150,000 portal participants 11 have experienced a connection over the last three 12 Conversations have ranged from the deeply 13 personal to the every day. 14 Here in Washington, a drone pilot for 15 the U.S. Air Force met an Afghan man for the first time through the portal, only days after flying 16 17 drones through Afghan air space. 18 A group of Palestinian women shared a 19 portal conversation with an Israeli entrepreneur 20 and an Iranian artist discussing their inability to receive proper cancer care in Gaza City. 21 2.2 Iragi students and their teacher 23 with Members of Congress before a scheduled vote on the Education for All Act, which directed funds to 24

and emergency zones.

education

25

those

All

οf

Members of Congress voted yes.

2.2

For the last two year, portals have also connected heavily police communities across America and Mexico. Residents in a number of cities have come together in portals to strategize about how to improve police community relations.

And on the ground in Milwaukee, our portal curator used his position to bring together rival gangs to create local truces, which led to the creation of a neighborhood watch coalition.

While polarization seems to be on the rise, study after study reinforces the idea that hate is reduced through deliberate dialog between diverse groups. Individuals and groups on opposing sides of conflict rarely find opportunities to connect face to face, let alone collaborate.

We believe that if we can create enough opportunities for different individuals to share the same physical space, they will quickly realize that their similarities outnumber their differences.

We have allowed social media and new technologies to drive us deeper into our own tribes. In these insulated social groups, hatred can thrive but portals created spaces for dialog

1	outside our tribes that challenged stereotypes and
2	brought in world views.
3	Portals demonstrate how technology, if
4	constructed well, can thrive as a vehicle for
5	peace. Innovations and immersive technology are
6	fundamentally reshaping how we counter hatred and
7	violence, and I hope you'll remember portals as we
8	all seek new solutions to these enduring problems.
9	Thank you.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Our fourth
11	speaker?
12	MS. KIM: Good evening.
13	My name is Jiny Kim and I am the Vice
14	President for Policy and Programs at Asian-
15	Americans Advancing Justice, AAJC. Our mission is
16	to advance civil and human rights for Asian-
17	Americans and to build and promote a fair and
18	equitable society for all.
19	For over 25 years, we've served as the
20	leading civil rights voice for the Asian-American
21	community, the fastest-growing population in the
22	U.S., fighting for our civil rights through policy
23	advocacy, education, and litigation.
24	Following the disturbing rise in
25	hateful rhetoric and hate incidents across the

country leading up to and following the 2016 election, the Asian-Americans Advancing Justice's affiliation national launched. standagainsthatred.org, a website to track report hate incidents against Asian-Americans.

Since a significant number of Asian-Americans have limited English proficiency, approximately one in three, we've ensured that this site is accessible in multiple languages, including Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese.

We've also partnered with the Lawyer's Committee on Civil Rights Under Law to provide assistance through their stop-hate hotline in Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, and Vietnamese.

Since the launch of this site, we have received more than 200 reports from across the country, covering anti-Asian and anti-immigrant incidents that range from hateful slurs, bullying, harassment, and violence.

Asian-Americans have been the targets of violent hate crimes and one widely reported incident that was also shared with our site was the shooting in Olathe, Kansas, which killed Srinivas Kuchibhotla. And the shooter reportedly yelled get out of my country as he attacked.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

It is also important to document and share stories of every day hate, including racial slurs and street harassment. While these may not meet the definition of a hate crime, such incidents are still harmful, not only to the impacted individual but also to the community at large.

We have received many reports to our site of people being told to go back to your country or you don't belong here, often with curses and racial slurs.

We already know that hate crimes are under-reported and the Federal Government must do more to incentivize better collection and reporting of this data.

We must do more to invest in outreach and education to encourage reporting and at the same time, ensure that this is accessible, that our communities are not fearful of those whose job it is to keep them safe, and that translations and inlanguage assistance are available.

And in this political climate, we face even greater challenges with assuring immigrants that they should feel safe reporting hate crimes and hate incidents, community safety and community trust suffer when local law enforcement officials

2.2

1	are also tasked with immigrant enforcement.
2	We'll continue to work to report and
3	raise our communities' voices. Thank you.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much. Our
5	next speaker?
6	MR. STACY: Thank you. I'm David
7	Stacy, Government Affairs Director for the Human
8	Rights Campaign, the nation's largest LGBTQ
9	organization working on civil rights.
10	Matthew Shepard lost his life to
11	violence in the fall of 1998. He was brutally
12	beaten with the butt of a 357 magnum, tied to a
13	fence, and left to die in freezing temperatures
14	because he was gay.
15	This October will mark two decades
16	since Matthew's murder and the public reckoning
17	that followed culminated in the passage of the
18	Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes
19	Prevention Act. This law has served as an
20	essential Federal tool to combat and prosecute
21	bias-motivated crimes.
22	However, it's far from a cure-all.
23	Since 2016, we have seen a significant increase in
24	violence against LGBTQ people, particularly
25	transgender people and in communities of color.

In 2017, it proved to be the deadliest year for transgender people on record. At least 28 transgender people lost their lives to violence.

Ally Steinfeld was a 17-year-old transgender girl living in rural Missouri. Her lifeless body was found partially burned with stab wounds to her genitals and with her eyes gouged out. Mercedes Williamson was also only 17 when she was stabbed multiple times and beaten to death by a hammer while trying to flee. Her attacker admitted to killing her because she was transgender. This extreme violence is often seen with hate crimes.

There are also survivors who must live with the emotional and physical scars like Anthony Gooden and Marquez Tolbert. Anthony, who had recently come to his family, out as gay was sleeping next to Marquez after working a long day.

A family friend staying at the house saw them sleeping together, boiled a pot of water, poured the scalding water of the couple while they slept, screaming get out of my house with all that gay. Anthony was placed in a medically-induced coma for weeks; over 60 percent of his body burned.

Although we know the reported incidents

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 hate are on the rise, we also know that 2 statistics are drastically under-counted. State and local police departments are 3 4 not federally mandated to record hate crimes and 5 many lack the training necessary to recognize them and to work with survivors and their families. 6 7 17 percent of jurisdictions across the 8 country had not reported a single hate crime to the 9 FBI for the last 6 years. 10 means that major cities 11 Mobile, Alabama, Savannah, Chatham, a metro area in 12 Georgia, and Irving, Texas, report they 13 consistently had zero hate crimes within 14 Those numbers are just not credible. borders. 15 Violence against any member the 16 community sows a culture of fear and otherness that prevents them from living full lives. 17 However, 18 members bear the disproportionate brunt of 19 this unspeakable violence. 20 The intersection of racism, sexism, 21 homophobia, and transphobia have conspired to drive 2.2 too many of these women -- employment, housing, 23 transgender housing, healthcare and otherness, 24 it making this transgender community

vulnerable to fatal violence.

1 In addition, people living in the 2 intersection of marginal communities feel less safe going to police. 3 No one should have to fear for their 4 5 safety because of who they are or who they love. also believe that 6 Training is essential and we 7 mandatory reporting of hate crimes should 8 required across the country. 9 Thank you. 10 CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much. Our 11 next speaker? 12 MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon, and I want 13 to thank the Commission for allowing me to be here this afternoon to comment on hate crimes and other 14 incidents that are bias-related. 15 16 name is Juan Thomas and I'm the МУ 17 President of the National Bar Association. The 18 National Bar Association is the largest association 19 of African-American lawyers, judges, and law 20 students in the country. 21 We represent a network of over 65,000 2.2 across this country and we historically have been 23 opposed to the proliferation of hate crimes and 24 bias-motivated cases. And in many instances, we 25 continue ineffective, to be unfortunately

ineffective, in our responses.

2.2

Today I come before you as many of my colleagues have already spoken to bring attention to the issue of hate crime nationally, as well as in my home city of Chicago.

The NBA believes that the protection of fair housing rights and -- I'm sorry, the NBA believes in the protection of fair housing and fair housing rights.

We defend against complaints of discrimination based upon the 16 protected classes including race, sex, religion, sexual orientation, discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations, credit, and bonding.

The NBA stands united with our collaborative bar associations, the civil rights community, and the community at large in condemning hate crimes, white supremacy, and bigotry in every form. And we stand in solidarity with people of color who find ourselves targeted by hate speech and hate crimes.

Congress and all civic-minded individuals and entities must explore how our Government is investigating the rooting out of hate crimes and those violent white supremacist groups

that are perpetuating these heinous crimes.

2.2

As we examine the Federal Government's role in responding to hate crimes, we should also urge Congress to oppose the introduction and19 the co-sponsorship of the Protect and Serve Act of 2018, which would extend hate crime protection to law enforcement officers.

We believe it is imperative and counterproductive to consider this legislation as it would further erode police and community relationships.

I respectfully submit this statement, urging the Commission to diligently examine best practices for preventing, investigating, and prosecuting, including reporting practices by local law enforcement officials, and efforts by the U.S. Departments of Justice and Education and institute all mechanisms to bring forth a more timely and accelerated remedy to the victims of hate crimes. Thank you.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much and thank you to all of our public speakers. This will close our public comment period. We appreciate your time, thank you.

And that will bring us to the end of

1	our briefing; I thank all of our panelists, all of
2	our public participants, and today has been
3	tremendously informative.
4	Just to be clear, as I said earlier,
5	the record for the briefing remains open until
6	Monday, June 11, 2018.
7	Panelists and members of the public who
8	would like to submit materials for Commission
9	consideration, which we welcome, can mail them to
10	the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Office of
11	Civil Rights Evaluation, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue
12	Northwest, Suite 1150, Washington, D.C., 20425, or
13	email them to hatecrimes@usccr.gov.
14	If there's nothing further, I hereby
15	adjourn our briefing. Thank you very much.
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
17	went off the record at 5:19 p.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	