INDIANA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
BRIEFING FORUM
THE RISE OF HATE CRIME IN INDIANA

ORIGINAL

The hearing before the Indiana Advisory

Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

was reported by me, Marjorie A. Addington, Notary

Public in and for the County of Hamilton, State of

Indiana, RPR/CP, CM, CSR: KS, OK, CA, on the 8th

day of August, 1991, in Indianapolis, Indiana, at

9:00 a.m.

ACCURATE REPORTING OF INDIANA
William F. Daniels, Prop., RPR/CP, CM
12922 Brighton Avenue
Carmel, Indiana 46032
(317) 848-0088

1	COMMITTEE	MEMBERS:
2		
3	Chairman Hollis Hughes	_
4	Ms. Doris Parker	
5	MS. DOITS TAIRET	
6	Mr. Michael Gradison	
7	Ms. Julie Schmitt	
8	MB. Bulle Bonnie	
9	Mr. Irwin Rose	
10	,	
11		
12		
13		•
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

-

1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE:
2	m	8
3	David Arland	6
	William Crawford	28
4	Karen Freeman-Wilson	47
5	nhil you	65
6	Phil Hoy	
7	Arthur Jordan	91
	Samuel Jones	116
8	Amos Brown	145
9		
10	Robert Epstein	167
	Stephanie Turner	186
11	Marla Stevens	211
12		243
13	James Taylor	243
14	Patsy McCormick	250
14	Phyllis Bartleson	270
15	Gary Romine & Jeff Heck	284
16	<u>-</u>	
17	Donald Burger	312
	Alvin Sykes	319
18	Gregory Dixon	326
19		
20	Maya Neely Maina Jackson	
20	Nicole Norton	
21	Kisha Barnett	347
	Ramon Neely	
22	Achebe Lateef	
23	Dehaven Butts	
23	David Boone	357

is the meeting of the Indiana Advisory Committee.

We'd like to call our meeting to order. For the benefit of our audience, I will introduce myself and my colleagues. My name is Hollis Hughes, Jr., and I preside in South Bend, Indiana. I am chairman of the Indiana Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

1 1

With me today are some members of the advisory committee. To my far right is Ms. Doris Parker of Indianapolis, Mr. Michael Gradison of Indianapolis. To my left, to my immediate left, Julie Schmitt of Indianapolis, and to my far left Mr. Irwin Rose, also of Indianapolis. Not present today are two additional members of this committee, Ms. Judith Hawley of Indianapolis and Ms. Katherine Blanks of Fort Wayne, Indiana.

We are honored by the presence of

Ms. Constance Davis, the director of the Midwest

Region of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, and she

is located here in the audience today.

Members of the advisory committee serve without compensation and serve as the eyes and ears

of the Commission in Indiana. Our reports and recommendations are submitted to the Commission for its consideration in preparing recommendations for the President and Congress. We are here in Indianapolis to review the extent of hate crimes in Indiana and efforts to combat it.

At the outset I want to remind everyone present of the ground rules and we'll do this periodically through the day; that this is a public meeting open to the media and the general public, but we have a very full schedule of people who will be making presentations.

We will be able to hear brief

presentations from persons who have not been

invited at the end of the session, but before I

recognize anyone they will have to meet with Pete

Minarik, the gentleman who is in the back of the

room, our staff analyst, to review their proposed

statement.

.Written statements may be submitted either while we are here or by mail to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 175 West Jackson, Suite A-1332, Chicago, Illinois 60604. The record of

this meeting will be closed on August 31st, 1991

Our staff has sought to ensure that all invited guests do not defame or denigrate anyone or any organization, but of necessity some statements may be controversial. We have sought to ensure that all sides of controversial issues have been invited to state their positions.

Any person or any organization that feels defamed or degraded by any statement made in these proceedings should contact our staff during the meeting so that we can provide a chance for public response. Alternatively, such persons or organizations can file written statements for inclusion in the proceedings. I urge all persons making presentations to be judicious in their statements.

An agenda of today's proceedings is available at the back of the room. The open session for the public to address the committee is scheduled to begin at 4:15.

I hope the City of Indianapolis will accept my thanks for its hospitality. I particularly want to thank all of those who have

assisted our staff in making preparations for this meeting.

Our topic for this morning's forum is hate crimes in Indiana. Hate crimes are defined as an incident of violence or intimidation motivated by bias, hatred, or prejudice, based upon some characteristic of the victim.

During the proceedings we'd like all parties to keep in mind that the scope of this forum is statewide. The forum is not necessarily limited to hate crimes committed by whites, and that the purpose of the forum is for information — to receive information to be — that in order for information to be extremely useful, we need specific incidents, not general statements; we need specific reasons for the increases and recommendations as to how to alleviate or prevent hate crimes.

Each speaker has been asked to limit their comments to 10 to 15 minutes max, allowing some time by members of this committee for follow-up questions, approximately 10 to 15 minutes.

At this point we would like to call upon our first speaker, Mr. Dave Arland, executive assistant to Mayor Hudnut, City of Indianapolis.

MR. ARLAND: Mr. Chairman, members of the Indiana Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, thank you for the opportunity to offer the Indianapolis perspective on a growing number of hate crimes committed in the state of Indiana and in our state's capital city.

This morning I will share remarks by
Indianapolis Mayor Bill Hudnut, who, because of a
personal family tragedy, is unable to speak in
person to the advisory committee's forum.

My name is Dave Arland and I'm an executive assistant to the Mayor. Although it is too early to document percentage increases in local hate crimes because statistics have only been kept for a few months by hate crime category, the concern and attention about several local incidents, from police shootings, gang attacks, and vandalism to cross burnings, indicates that hate crime is definitely on the rise.

Just last week a near-westside shelter

y

for the homeless was the scene of a terrifying cross burning. Gunfire has also erupted at the McCormick Place Shelter, and the Indiana Civil Rights Commission and Marion County Prosecutor are trying to determine the best course of action.

One of the problems they're facing is apparent ambiguity in Indiana law, a shortfall that does not permit criminal charges to be filed for these incidents solely on the basis of racial bias.

Another high-profile case involves an Indianapolis police officer who allegedly has some ties to the American Nazi movement. A shoplifting suspect is dead, the family is grieving, and many of us are left asking if racial prejudice is somehow involved. Investigations of both incidents are ongoing, but the questions raised by these cases bring us together this morning.

In April of last year you'll recall that the President of the United States signed into law the Hate Crime Statistics Act, and the FBI has been assigned the duty of collecting information on hate crimes as part of its uniform crime report

activities.

Hate crimes, as has been mentioned, are acts ranging from harassment to homicide. They include arson, rape, vandalism, bombing, robbery, cemetery desecrations, assault, and intimidation.

Indianapolis is complying with FBI requests and we are developing a policy to handle tabulation of crimes on the basis of type of offense and type of bias motivation, and although a comprehensive system to record hate crimes is still in process, we have compiled a list of more than 20 incidents that could be considered crimes of hate so far this year.

They include cases of church vandalism, threats based on national origin, harassment of women by men, harassment of homosexuals by heterosexuals, and a number of incidents between blacks and whites based in whole or in part on racial conflict, and those are only the reported complaints and only the complaints by individuals against other individuals.

One must wonder if this rise in this type of crime is linked to other trends.

Charitable giving is dropping in some areas. Voter turnout slipped to only 36 percent in last year's congressional elections. The national response rate on the 1990 census dropped from 75 percent ten years ago to only 63 percent last year. Everyone notices a decline in common courtesy and that you just can't get good service anymore. Students admit that cheating on exams is up. Murder rates are climbing, and so is crime in general.

It seems that the opposite of love is not hate. It's indifference. Not caring, just looking the other way, pretending the problem does not exist. Professor Robert Johnston of Earlham College speaking on the decline of civic virtue put it this way: "If we as a people are so devoted to private gain and personal gratification that we fail to accept an obligation to the public good and lose our capacity for equality, decency, and fair play, then our public life will be impoverished."

The concern for the individual, what's best for me instead of what's best for all, triggers enrollment in organizations that thrive on prejudice. In Indianapolis, an Indianapolis police

investigator who tallies hate crime statistics believes that virtually anyone who has ever been offended by some person or some group can find the support of others who are anxious to comfort the offended person, congratulate him on his perceptiveness in being able to identify the enemy, and sign him up in the group's ongoing effort to oppose the oppressor.

Indianapolis, and in turn Indiana, both, have street gangs and skinheads. There are local citizens who belong to the Ku Klux Klan or other organizations that sort and judge people by race.

According to the Anti-Defamation League,

Indianapolis was home to a group of 40 or so neo-Nazi skinheads in 1990. Indiana membership in the KKK, while dropping, is still a concern.

Indiana's hooded racists appear to have splintered from their national organization.

Tolerance of radical racist ideas, thankfully, is not strong. An IUPUI professor was dismissed in 1990 for revising history to suit his view of the Holocaust. Teachers are benefiting from meetings like "The children in a

Multi-Cultural World Conference" that brought together some 200 educators.

And so we are left asking what can be done? What steps can local communities take to counteract these noxious forms of racism and violence? Can a message be sent out that in a free society hate crimes are not going to be regarded as mere pranks?

The answer is yes. We can establish a comprehensive hate crime reporting system, teaching investigators to recognize hate crimes and report them as such. This work has already started in the Indianapolis Police Department and will continue in consultation with the FBI.

Dedicated hate crime units could be set up in our police stations and sheriffs' departments to investigate crimes motivated by bias. These units can make use of resources available through community-based groups to reduce the traumatic impact of these crimes on our neighborhoods.

We can initiate training programs to help police respond effectively and sensitively to incidents of violence based on bigotry so that

police action does not exacerbate a situation or invite additional acts of violence by appearing to condone what has occurred, and if police misconduct is detected, it must be vigorously investigated and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

We must continue to screen our officers carefully and monitor the performance of our men and women in blue. We do charge them with the protection of our city's residents and we should also support them in their work.

It is my understanding that 49 states now have some form of statute on the books dealing with hate crimes, but very few cities have ordinances on this subject. Could they be initiated to supplement what's already law at the federal and state levels?

We can introduce curriculum subjects
that teach against prejudice from kindergarten
through college, using pamphlets, handbooks,
textbooks, videos, posters, seminars, conferences,
sermons, lectures, and statements by community
leaders and public officials to help teach the
importance of understanding and respecting our

diverse society.

Even the news media can help by exposing incidents of hate crime and appealing to viewers and readers to travel a higher path. American society has become more profane and uncivil in the last 30 years. People are more self-centered and greedy. That's the bad news.

But the good news is that our American dream is not dead. Our dream is a society that is open to all, free from prejudice, with equal opportunity, where people are respected simply because they are human beings and not because they have power or money or merit or because they belong to a certain group, and we can all do our part to keep that dream alive. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you,

Mr. Arland. Now we'll entertain questions from the

committee, and I'd like to start by asking you,

Mr. Arland, you mentioned a number of activities

that you felt communities and cities could do in

order to address the problem. Are you in

Indianapolis doing any of these types of

activities? And if so, which ones do you have the

most hope for in terms of its effectiveness?

1.5

MR. ARLAND: I've mentioned that we've already started the hate crimes reporting process in our Indianapolis Police Department.

This is a new venue for us. Yes, the federal law was signed in last year by the President, but the police are not equipped currently to compile these statistics on a crime-by-crime basis, and that process is underway. We're hopeful that within the year we'll be able to delineate those by category.

Currently what's done -- I mentioned the 20 or so incidents that have been forwarded that are hate-crime oriented involving skinheads or church desecrations. Those are just pulled out as the police runs come in, as reports are filed, and our investigators look through those and pull those out. That's a very rough estimate, and we don't have the ability currently to pull those out by hate crime category. We hope to shortly.

is something that could be pursued. An idea might be to take this suggestion to the national organizations that represent cities, the National

League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors, where I'm certain that you would have a sympathetic audience, or we would have a sympathetic audience to develop a model statute that could be shared in cities across the country. That's currently done on a number of topics.

MS. PARKER: Is the Mayor planning to initiate a city ordinance of that nature as a model?

MR. ARLAND: We have talked about it.
but there's not been a decision reached. Certainly
we would look to you, if you think it would be
helpful. Many of you are Indianapolis residents,
and it's going to depend on getting the support, of
course, of a city council that is diverse and
enormous in size, and that's a political reality.
Politics is the art of the possible and one would
hope that this would be possible.

Certainly we have done everything we can to expand equal opportunity in the city of Indianapolis, and I think this would certainly fit in that vein. Our Indianapolis Police and Fire Departments have more minority and women

the Mayor came in and said "This might be a fitting cap to the administration."

MR. GRADISON: I went to a -- this is really a compliment to the Mayor. I was -- happened to spend two hours Tuesday -- Monday or Tuesday of this week with the new recruit class at the Indianapolis Police Department Academy out there on Post Road. I was really struck about what a diverse group it was. You can see, I mean, the reflections of all of the ethnic groups, and it was really a marvelous experience, and they had terrific questions.

One of the issues we dealt with was -- I was concerned about police action and so on -- was primary leadership from the African-American community in Indianapolis was there, and I was terribly impressed with that.

Quick question, though. What kind of a definition has been forwarded to IPD for the hate crime statistics? Do you have a set definition?

Do you have a copy of that or something that you can show us what that is?

MR. ARLAND: Yes. I don't have it with me, and you will have someone from IPD who is testifying this afternoon. But the FBI has put forth a document that outlines what they consider to be hate crimes based on the statute.

I might also mention, Mike, on that subject of diversity, I am pleased to announce to you today that over 40 percent of our new recruits in the Fire Department, the people that we've gone out and asked to apply -- we've been working at this for sometime. This week we got -- the deadline came up and we got those applications in, and over 40 percent of the applications were minority, which we think is tremendous considering how far that department has come, as well as the Police Department.

MR. GRADISON: We owe the Mayor an applause for it. It was challenged, of course, by the Reagan Administration a few years ago, and obviously we're all very proud of you for doing that, but it shows up. I mean, I was really delighted to see this new recruit class in IPD on Tuesday. The level of intelligence, the level of

questions that were asked of us were terrific.

MS. PARKER: May I ask another

3 | question?

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Sure.

MS. PARKER: There've been some writings and other speeches as it relates to the level of how much political campaigns can contribute to the climate that produce hate crimes. I notice that that was absent.

I know that the Mayor talked about sermons and all of this, but no mention was made of recognizing that if we are going to call for a higher order of behavior, the people who campaign for public office must not use that whole forum as an opportunity to cause a greater division. Is that something that he has not considered or is that just --

MR. ARLAND: Well, certainly it's been talked about, but you have to remember that this is a very delicate balance because in politics frequently a consultant will play to the emotions, and certainly hate crimes are an emotional issue.

I don't think it should be treated outside the

bounds of politics, but it needs to be treated very delicately if it's going to be addressed.

People need to let the folks who are running, whether it's for Mayor or city council, or whatever, know that they're concerned about this issue or it won't get addressed. That much is certain.

MR. GRADISON: Certainly not by this public safety committee, something which David referred earlier.

MR. ROSE: I commend the Mayor for his statement, and his reputation is well known. I remember many years ago when he almost alone founded out a member of the Nazi party who was a Fire Department person and dismissed that person without a lot of input or pressure from many other groups. He recognized then and said so in a public statement that being a member of the Nazi party is not the same as being a member of the Democratic or Republican party and on that any straight-thinking person has to agree.

As I understand the federal law that's on the books, the Hate Crime Statistics Act

mandates but doesn't punish or there's no penal for not doing the statistical work that the new federal law requires, is that correct?

1.3

MR. ARLAND: I'm not a lawyer.

MR. ROSE: I know, I'm not either, so please --

MR. ARLAND: Yes. Well, it is -- I can say that it is our intention to comply with the Act and to do everything we can to help organizations like yours, the advisory committee, as well as the ADL, on this issue because it's only by having good statistical information that you can begin to address the problem. It's only that we know the statistics that are included here that we can begin to work on this issue.

MR. ROSE: Are you satisfied that the department understands the difference of what a hate crime is as compared to another, different type of offense?

MR. ARLAND: I'm satisfied that the statisticians who will be making the -- compiling the statistics understand. I'm not sure the rank and file officer or the deputy chief or the

administration fully comprehend this, and certainly that was touched on here and that there needs to be more training as to what is a hate crime, how do you deal with that, and how can you be sensitive when you run across one in a patrol situation?

1.8

MR. ROSE: I think the definition that the Commission put out speaks for itself and could be the guide that's followed.

The next question I have, and I don't presume you can speak for the Mayor, there's one paragraph in his statement about one must wonder if this type of hate crime rise is linked to other trends in our society such as the decline in charitable giving or voter turnout. In laymen's language, what the hell has that got to do with hate crimes? And I wonder if that's really the Mayor's position or whether he really questions why this type of thing has increased, if indeed it has increased, which is one of the things we're trying to find out in these forums, and if so, how it can be attributed to these possibilities as in his statement.

MR. ARLAND: I think that he sees --

examples of how there's been an erosion of civic virtue, of people's concern for their city, for their county or their state or their government, people's concern for the public servants who work -- not only those in the administration, but also those public servants who have to respond to calls for help.

And certainly we are seeing that with the Rodney King beating videotape and I know our officers are seeing a lot more people videotaping them and there's even more friction; not that that's all bad. I think it's important that people who are public servants know that they're being watched by those, but in the same breath I think you have to say there should be some respect for that and there should be some respect for that and there should be some respect for the voting process and for the census and for other things.

I might say just on the matter of the census, Indianapolis had the highest return rate of any city in the country due in large part to the work of Amos Brown at WTLC, who will speak to you

later today. We have no complaints about our turnout and the distribution of dollars that will come in the next decade because we worked real hard to make sure that happened. But on the broad scale, across the country, the numbers were down.

MR. GRADISON: It would seem to me -I would suggest that the remark to which Irwin is
referring is as to those things as lack of
sensitivity, lack of compassion, as demonstrated by
people not getting involved in many of these
activities, although at the same time I think -- I
think volunteerism is in pretty good shape.

I'm in an organization that's based very heavily on volunteers, and I'm on the boards of several other groups, the arts and other things, that are very heavily on volunteerism -- depend very heavily on volunteerism. At the same time you pointed out things like giving and so on seem to be declining and I think it manifests on lack of sensitivity or concern for our fellow people in the city and on the planet. So I think I understand why you would say that, and it's probably true.

MR. ARLAND: And perhaps it's not

just not caring, which can have an effect.

q

Second page of your statement you make reference to 20 incidents, and I know that the city is fairly new in terms of initiating the new reporting requirements. Specifically when did they start and how long a time period do these 20 incidents cover?

MR. ARLAND: As I mentioned, these are only those that are reported, these are only those that get written up by police officers in the police reports and are culled through by statisticians, and if they see the word "skinhead," they pull it out, or they see black and white problems, they pull it out, or they see a church desecration, they pull it out, and that's since January of this year and it's the term of January 1st through June 30th I believe.

I would suspect that there are many more such incidents that either are not reported or are reported and don't show up because those key words aren't out there. That's what we hope to address

with the new policies and the Hate Crime Statistics
Act.

MR. GRADISON: And educating officers the way they write these kinds of reports.

MR. ARLAND: That's right.

essentially baseline data, does the Mayor feel that this -- and recognizing that since we didn't keep the statistics last year, that we can only speculate, does this seem like an increase over what may have existed last year, recognizing that we don't have any hard numbers to look at? Does there seem to be an escalation and is that what is implied by the quick 20 you just pulled off?

MR. ARLAND: Yes, I think so. I think an escalation can be measured in terms of community concern, in terms of what happens when there's a police action shooting in this community, what happens when there's a cross burning, what happens when there are other incidents that happen. There's a rising tide, and we think that we need to do more to turn it back.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Are there other

questions that we have for Mr. Arland? We certainly want to thank you for delivering this message on behalf of the Mayor. Thank you very much.

We would like to call on Representative Bill Crawford, if he is in the building.

MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman, members of the Indiana Advisory

Committee to the United States Civil Rights

Commission. Let me at the outset apologize for my

dress, there is no disrespect to members of this

committee.

MR. GRADISON: That's our first question.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mike, I'm going to exercise the prerogative for the first time in a few weeks to take a day off and go out and enjoy myself, and I did not feel like going back home and changing clothes.

I want to thank you for your invitation to give testimony during your Indianapolis briefing on the rise of hate crimes in Indiana. You are to be commended for focusing attention on this

critical area of community concern that has consistently and persistently been kept in the shadows by public and private officials who are more concerned with the community image than the well-being of all segments of the community.

1.5

Although I cannot factually verify it, I sincerely believe that incidents of crimes motivated by hatred of a person, a group, or a class of persons, based on their race, creed, color, handicap, sex, or sexual orientation, is definitely on the rise.

I can state, however, without fear of contradiction from anyone, that there is no central data repository in existence anywhere in this state that could provide empirically-based quantitative data on the incidence of hate crimes in Indiana. Tragically there is no state statute, local ordinance, or state or local administrative rule requiring the collection of data on hate crimes.

There is also no statutory definition of what in fact constitutes a hate crime. It is generally left to local law enforcement officers to interpret a given situation, and absent publicity,

they generally decide that the crime is not motivated by hatred or they downplay the seriousness of the incident.

A recent event in Indianapolis serves as a good example. A neighbor near a shelter which provided temporary housing for the homeless, whose residents were predominantly black, was accused of firing a weapon into the air while shouting racial epithets. A cross was also burned on the property of the shelter.

This was obviously a racially motivated act which would fit any reasonable definition of a hate crime; yet even though the identity of the person firing the shots was known, and it is unlawful to fire a gun within the limits of the Consolidated City of Indianapolis, no arrest was made until August the 6th, twelve days after the shooting.

Such a response by local law enforcement to this incident, along with recent revelations from Milwaukee that alleges that a young man and subsequently others lost his life because law enforcement officers failed to properly investigate

due to the alleged sexual orientation of the persons involved, only serve to fuel the perception that the protection of vulnerable minorities is not as important as protecting the image of the community.

Let me state parenthetically I had a conversation with the Marion County Prosecutor yesterday, and the Marion County Prosecutor is -- the person that has been -- that did the shooting has now been arrested and will face the charge of criminal recklessness. The person that now has been identified as burning the cross will only face a charge of trespass because that is the only statute that the prosecutor would be allowed to bring to them.

In talking with community people there is the perception and recognition and a feeling that if they or I as African-Americans was to go into a white neighborhood and shoot a gun while hurling racial epithets, we would be arrested immediately or possibly shot.

Even more tragically, as I ' back to my statement, we view this as a direct result of the

lack of strong and unambiguous leadership on the part of elected officials and private sector leadership. Legislators must come to understand that there is a definite need to measure hate by the numbers and enact legislation mandating the reporting of hate crimes.

Legislators must understand the necessity of statutorily defining hate crimes, providing penalties for those crimes, or sentence enhancement under existing criminal statutes.

Prosecutors must come to understand that vigorous enforcement of laws designed to protect vulnerable minorities will serve to increase their confidence in and support for the criminal justice system.

Elected and appointed officials, along with private sector leadership, must come to understand that peace in the absence of justice is an unattainable goal.

Everyone must understand that strong moral leadership that proactively states that those who will act on their bigotry, racism, and sexism, by acts of violence against a person, group of persons, class of persons, or their property, will

pe swiftly arrested and brought before the bar of justice. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that these persons are not wanted and will not be tolerated in any community.

point out that civil rights and religious
organizations have also railed to adequately
address this problem. There is nothing that stops
us from developing an effective network for
information gathering and sharing of hate crime
data through our statewide and local organizational
contacts.

For whatever reason, we do not collectively and cooperatively raise this issue to the level of attention and scrutiny it deserves.

This inaction on our part directly contributes to the high degree of neglect on the part of public and private officials.

In the absence of leadership from that sector, we cannot be satisfied with could've, should've, might've. We can, we should, we must either demand or provide leadership in the furtherance of these legitimate community and

public policy objectives to ensure the sarety and 1 well-being of all of our citizens. 2 . CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you, 3 Mr. Crawford. You sponsored House Bill No. 1842 in the last session of the Legislature I believe. 5 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, I did. 6 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: And unfortunately 7 8 that piece of legislation was not approved. MR. CRAWFORD: Correct. 9 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: At the time that 10 11 you chose to sponsor it, did constituent groups provide you with documentation of crimes that you 12 13 might be able to share with us? MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, I will be able to 14 15 make available to you the specific incidents that 16 led to my initiative in the Indiana General 17 Assembly. Let me state that the genesis was not 18 House Bill 1842. In the 1990 session of the 19 20 Indiana General Assembly, I believe the bill number was 1542, there was a bill being proposed that I 21 22 offered a second reading amendment on that for the

first time raised the issue legislatively, and that

23

amendment was adopted by the Indiana House of Representatives 96 to 1.

We had a hearing and debate in the Senate. We reached an agreement on compromised language. There was an extensive second reading amendment prepared to be offered in the Senate that the majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee members had agreed to, and unfortunately, because of the legislative crunch, we were not able to move that through the '90 session.

I returned in the '91 session with House Bill 1842, and again we were able to pass it out of the House of Representatives and it got stalled in the Senate, and that is where we're going to focus our attention in the '92 session in terms of trying to get that legislation passed.

I will share with you the data that was given to me and the very poignant and moving testimony given by persons who were victimized by these crimes, and I want to state that my perception again -- which is not empirically based -- my perception is that the greatest tragedy is not so much the racial or religious motivated

incidents but those incidents perpetrated against persons based upon their sexual orientation.

MR. GRADISON: We will hear from those people later on those kinds of issues. But I think -- again, you think you can attribute it to the fact of the end of the session legislative crunch that happens all the time as the reason the Senate did not adopt it. Do you think there's broad support in the Indiana Senate last year and this year with regard to this kind of legislation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Well, again, the

Senate Judiciary Committee -- it has never been
addressed on the floor of the Senate. I would

suspect, however, based on discussions with members
of the Senate that there would be enough support to
enact the legislation and move it to the Governor's
desk.

MR. GRADISON: But the legislative crunch then, that's the only reason it's not become law?

MR. CRAWFORD: That is my perception.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Crawford, for those of

us -- for the record, can you give us just a synopsis of what's in your bill, what it proposes?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yeah. What we initially proposed to establish was a whole new set of criteria and definitions of hate crimes. The compromise that we arrived at was a process of sentence enhancement.

The bill would do two things. The first would be able to require mandatorily that prosecutors would report to the State Police, the State Police being the central data repository, any crime that a prosecutor feels was motivated by hatred.

If a person was charged with a crime, there is the whole question of culpability, and the prosecutor would look at that, and if the prosecutor felt that that crime was motivated by hatred -- we're not putting the onus on the law enforcement officer; we're putting the onus on the prosecutor to make that report then to the State Police.

Then we would've allowed a trier of fact, a judge, to determine whether or not -- and

motivated by hatred, and if so, to allow enhancement of penalties, and it's not -- it's precedentially over 70 percent of most of the criminal code provides for some form of sentence enhancement, so it was not anything new that we were doing.

R

The Senate felt that we needed to tie into the existing criminal code through the enhancement process. My personal feeling is I'd like to see a whole new set of laws established and crimes defined, but in the spirit of compromise I will accept the Senate's version.

MR. ROSE: Does your bill follow any legislation on the books in any other states? And if so, how has it been working?

MR. CRAWFORD: The information that I obtained, naturally, would indicate contrary to what I heard earlier; that there were only 13 states that had hate crime statutes and we sort of tracked them. I don't know what their experience has been.

One of the things -- our national

Convention of the National Conference of State

Legislators is next week, and I intend to go to

some of the committee hearings and try to find out

from other states and from NCSL staff exactly what

that is, but right now the information is so

sketchy that it's impossible to draw any

knowledgeable and quantitative or qualitative

analysis of what's happened.

MS. SCHMITT: I'm curious. In your bill, let's assume that someone's convicted of -- I don't know -- burglary or rape, or whatever, but then the prosecutor would turn them over that this was hate motivated, which is what you're saying is how your bill works, and he's found guilty of, okay, it was a hate crime, you know, black versus white, for example. If it had been a white person it wouldn't have happened, for example, or a black person. What are the additional penalties under your bill that you want to impose because it was hate motivated as opposed to just a crime?

MR. CRAWFORD: The existing sentence enhancement provides in most instances where you -- and during the sentencing process the judge can go

plus or minus two years or plus or minus four years, whether or not it's a mitigating circumstance or an aggravating circumstance, and that's generally what we would tie into.

MS. SCHMITT: So what you want to do is make a hate crime an aggravating circumstance, --

MR. CRAWFORD: Right.

MS. SCHMITT: -- that's the bottom line of what you want to do?

MR. CRAWFORD: That's correct.

MS. SCHMITT: Okay.

MR. ROSE: That determination would be made before by the prosecutor before trial or after the crime itself has been proven?

MR. CRAWFORD: The prosecutor would make the determination in the charge that the crime was motivated by hate. Again, it would have to be proven. The burden of proof is still on the prosecution. If the person is convicted and the judge accepts that the crime was motivated by hate, it becomes then an aggravating circumstance that the judge can -- it is not a mandate -- can take

into consideration during the sentencing process.

MS. SCHMITT: So you're not trying to make what you have in 1842, for example, an additional charge; you're just trying to make that an aggravating circumstance?

MR. CRAWFORD: That as an aggravating -- that is correct.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Crawford, my assumption is that there is an organization for almost everything. Do the prosecutors have a state organization? And if so, did they testify on your bill?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, there is an Indiana Prosecutors Council. It receives state funds. They testified and worked with the chairman of the -- Larry Landis -- the Public Defenders Council to arrive at some acceptable language. So there was no opposition from that group, and the Marion County Prosecutor is very supportive and has taken on -- because of these recent revelations has taken -- he indicated to me that he's going to become personally involved in trying to move this through the next session so that prosecutors and

judges have more tools to effectively deal with these types of actions.

MR. GRADISON: He's generally a key supporter of it, too.

MS. PARKER: Mr. Crawford, I just want to ask the question that's causing a lot of people to back away from what they call new things and that is the money. What kind of budgetary concerns would have to be addressed if you were to get this bill enacted?

MR. CRAWFORD: Absolutely none, fortunately. The State Police have testified that it would not create any problems with them logistically to handle the input of statistical data, and we already go through -- if a person is charged with a crime, even a person that is going to be charged with trespass in the incident of the cross burning, or the criminal recklessness with the shooting at the westside shelter, there is going to be a trial anyway and it only involves certain verbiage and discussion, so there is no additional cost that would be attached to this process.

MS. SCHMITT: I'm just curious. When you say an aggravating circumstance, there's often, you know, or always, probably, some fact-sensitive issue, you know, was it hate related or not hate related. Are you going to define what you would consider as perimeters that they can go -- that they can at least consider as hate related versus not hate related? What do you consider hate related, I guess is what I'm saying?

MR. CRAWFORD: Well, I would suspect that -- the incident where the man shot the gun in the air while hurling racial epithets I could classify that as hate related and incidents of, quote unquote, Gay-bashing, where, you know, it's clear, the intentions are clear.

In incidents where the one young lady whose home was vandalized really caused me to bring this issue forward, and they broke in and "KKK" was written, painted on her fireplace. Those are obvious situations that we could construe.

Others would probably be less clear, and one of the problems that we've been wrastling with is a definition that would satisfy everybody, but,

you know, it's an evolutionary process. Let's start, like we do a lot of things, and look to improve and make it better, but at least let's -- I think we can develop a consensus around a foundation to build on.

MR. GRADISON: You've, of course, been made full aware of our concerns, --

MR. CRAWFORD: I'm aware of your -MR. GRADISON: -- whether we have

some First Amendment transgressions and so forth.

MR. CRAWFORD: I understand that.

MR. GRADISON: But at the same time I think we work with you very constructively and also maybe satisfactory, but it still leaves some real meat on the issue and that there is a way to pass such a law that will satisfy the kinds of concerns that we have in terms of the First Amendment, and of course we very much appreciate your willingness to hear us.

MR. ROSE: Since this has been before the Legislature twice and you've had hearings, have you had any opposition, strong opposition, or even minor opposition from individuals or groups? And

if so, without violating our rules, could you tell us where the opposition is coming from?

MR. CRAWFORD: I cannot tell you on an organizational basis. There has been opposition. As a matter of fact, the last hearing that we held -- I serve on the Courts and Criminal Codes Committee, and when we heard the bill in that committee it was assigned to a subcommittee and I was assigned to chair that subcommittee, and I had a hearing where I was the only legislator that showed up.

It was during the crunch of the session, and there were a number of persons who came to speak in opposition, and one man from southern Indiana brought a chart to show me that my bill was supportive of the process that Hitler used to -- and that I was the real racist by bringing that legislation forth. I don't know how you define those persons.

There was an attorney from here in Indianapolis who spoke against the legislation, and they are generally representatives of groups we call, quote unquote, right-wing conservatives, if

that's a good analogy. Their opposition is very 1 illogical, and fortunately the majority of the 2 members of the Indiana General Assembly saw it as 3 such and have been -- whenever we've gone on record with a recorded vote, it's just been an 5 overwhelming majority in support of it. 6 7 MR. ROSE: So far as you know, no groups have identified themselves as being in 8 opposition of your bill, is that right? 9 No, not --10 MR. CRAWFORD: That's -- thank you. 11 MR. ROSE: MR. GRADISON: If it was the attorney 12 that I think it was, he represents an 13 14 organization. MR. CRAWFORD: Right, but I'm --15 MR. GRADISON: I mean, but he does. 16 I mean, I don't think it's a very deep organization 17 either, but he has an office over at the Merchants 18 Bank Building and so on, and so he did probably 19 20 speak --MR. ROSE: Well, we acknowledge 21 there's opposition to everything and always will 22

I mean, nothing is without controversy.

23

-

MR. GRADISON: Who shall remain

nameless.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Are there any other questions for Mr. Crawford? We want to thank you. You had mentioned that you would provide us with some specific information, and we would appreciate that. Thank you very much for taking the time out of your well-deserved vacation.

MR. GRADISON: Thanks, Bill.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: At this point we'd like to call on Ms. Karen Freeman-Wilson, director of the Indiana Civil Rights Commission. We'd certainly like to extend a warm welcome. It's good to see you again.

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Good morning.

It's good to see all of you. Chairman Hughes,
members of the Advisory Committee to the U.S.

Commission on Civil Rights, first of all let me
thank you for the opportunity to address you this
morning on what we at the Indiana Civil Rights

Commission feel to be a very, very pressing issue
in the state of Indiana at this time.

Whether you hear about the young man,

who is the constant victim of harassment because who is the constant victim of harassment because his race by local white residents, whether you hear of the cross burning which Representative Crawford alluded to earlier that occurred last week at McCormick Place Shelter, or whether you hear about the unfortunate case of Donita Hoskins, which Representative Crawford also alluded to, wherein her house was trashed with other racial epithets and just totally destroyed after she worked a total of two to three months to refurbish a dollar house that she had received from the City of Indianapolis, it's very clear that there are some horror stories and I'm sure that you will continue to hear them throughout the course of the day.

But when you begin to look at hard figures, and we have attempted to do so at the Commission in the last few years, we find that in 1989 that there were two reported incidents, in 1990 there were four reported incidents of hate crimes, and in 1991 thus far there have been six.

And what those statistics, as small as they are, say to us is that not that hate crime

does not exist, because it's very clear that it does, but it tells us about the phantom nature of hate violence, violence motivated by race, by sex, by sexual preference, by religion, and thus it tells us that there are certain elements and certain aspects of hate crime and the reporting of hate crimes that create statistics that are almost intangible.

For instance, the police reporting procedures. You heard earlier that the statisticians are aware of what constitutes a hate crime but the rank and file officers are not. By the time that report gets to the statistician, there may have -- there may be substantial evidence that is left out of the report that would lead the statistician to the result that it is a hate crime. There may be facts that are left out of that report; they may never be picked up by the statistician to the extent that we then lose the ability to determine yet another hate crime.

In addition to that there are inadequate criminal and civil statutes. Representative

Crawford alluded to earlier the Marion County

Prosecutor's recent experience with McCormick

Place. He talked to them and he talked about the

legislation that he proposed, and my conversations,

as with his with the prosecutor's office, it was

very clear to them that the best that they could do

in both the charge with the shooter, as well as the

charge with the cross burner, is to charge those

individuals with a low-class felony in the case of

the shooter and a very low-class misdemeanor in the

case of the cross burner.

The reality of that is that you are dealing with people who have little or no records and who will ultimately get probation, and so ther is really no deterrent for them not to behave in that unsocial way, and so I really believe from the experience that we've observed that the local laws, the state laws, are very inadequate, not only for reporting, but for addressing the real issue of hate crimes.

The difficulty that we have found on occasion, or time after time I should say, is that it's difficult to identify the perpetrators. Only in instances where the perpetrators are stupid

enough to leave their names in addition to the racial epithets that they wrote in the woman's house, or in addition where they really don't care and are arrogant enough to hang around, that when we find out who they are, and in those instances that's when we're able to identify them.

But by and large, people don't know who the perpetrators are, they don't know who to report, they don't know who to accuse, and thus we in turn at the Civil Rights Commission and the prosecutors and other authorities cannot really address the crimes that occur.

And then we have to recognize the very close -- the very close relationship between the crime that is created throughout the state, the environment that is created, and the crimes of hate that occur, what allows an individual to think that they can vandalize another person's property because of their race, because of their sex, because of their sexual preference, or even attack the person because of their religion and not have any consequences to pay.

Notwithstanding those quantification

difficulties, I think that it's very important the we look to very tangible and very real solutions. I think that it is very important that we look to the legislative process.

We worked with Representative Crawford when they came up with the compromised legislation to enhance the sentence and enhance the aggravating factor for the sentences, but I think that the McCormick Place incident sort of illustrates the fact that we may very well need a separate offense to be charged because of the fact that the prosecutor's hands are tied.

Our experience has been -- because in those instances where we have been able to identify the perpetrators, the Civil Rights Commission has filed charges, has assessed damages, but when you think about the mentality of people that perpetrate these types of crimes, you have to realize that ultimately the persons that you're dealing with will be judgment-proof.

And so Ms. Hoskins, the woman whose house was trashed, has an 80,000 judgment, \$80,000 judgment that she may very well never collect on

because the three individuals that trashed her house are unemployed.

And so McCormick Place, where the individual sat outside next-door and shot, and who has since been charged with criminal recklessness, and who will ultimately be charged with the violation of housing race -- housing civil rights law, that individual, even though fines may be assessed, may never pay those fines because he in fact may also be judgment-proof.

So in looking at that we need a criminal statute that can serve as a clear deterrent, because we know that economics is a deterrent, but we also know that criminal punishment can also be a deterrent to people that are not necessarily accustomed to dealing with the law on a regular basis.

But we can't emphasize enough the importance of legislation that requires all of the departments not only to keep the statistics but to identify a mechanism so that they can know -- so that the rank and file officers will know and identify those crimes that are in fact hate crimes;

that when they find that there is simply a case of vandalism, that it's not a random vandalism, but it may very well be motivated by an individual's religion, by their sexual preference, by their sex or race, and I think it's very important to train rank and file officers to understand that fact.

I think that these issues are -- and ultimately and lastly I would say that we need to address the climates; that government officials, that public officials, have a responsibility to create a climate in their municipalities, in the state, and in the communities throughout the state where individuals don't feel comfortable in that type of anti-social behavior, and I think it's incumbent upon all of us not only to address the issues but to speak out on a consistent basis so that individuals will not feel comfortable in that activity.

At this time I will entertain any questions.

MS. SCHMITT: I have a question --

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Sure.

MS. SCHMITT: -- only because this is

a new topic for me, please understand that. 1 Sure, sure. MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: 2 MS. SCHMITT: But you're, from what 3 I'm gathering, advocating a separate statute that would impose greater criminal offenses if it's a 5 hate related or racially related crime. 6 Are you saying -- just so I can be clear, let's say that you use the example that 8 somebody comes in and spraypaints "KKK" on a black person's, if you will, wall. Let's say somebody --10 and they're charged with vandalism, right now 11 that's the charge. Somebody runs into my home and 12 writes on the wall with spraypaint "I hate 13 lawyers," or somebody runs into Mr. Rose's home and 14 15 says "I hate real estate developers." 16 Are you saying that the person that wrote -- the person that wrote "KKK" should be 17 punished more than the person who came into my home 18 19 or Mr. Rose's home? 20 MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Yes, because --21 and I will tell you why. 22 That's my question. MS. SCHMITT: MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Because in those 23

instances the person that is -- will run into the house and spraypaint "KKK" is more prone to escalate that activity to violence against the person that it may -- there's a large chance that it will rise above that level.

MR. GRADISON: What if -- what if indeed this was some variety of hatred for attorneys, and I'm sure there's those people out there, and that it may escalate, all right? I mean, I'm not sure that necessarily that act of spraypainting inside of an attorney's house "Well, I hate attorneys" will not necessarily even do some bolder and do even more things and get away with that.

In essence, we've been all talking about the definition of a hate crime and a hatred of an individual. This person did me wrong, stole my girlfriend, or something like that, and I decide to engage in these acts of vandalism and so on and perhaps escalate them as well, shoot their tires out when they're parked in the middle of the street in front of their homes or something.

So I'm not sure why that isn't a hate

crime also that should have enhanced penalties because what motivated that person was hate for a class of lawyers.

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Yeah, but, see, you're talking about a class of -- when you talk about sex, when you talk about sexual preference, when you talk about race, you're talking about -- when you talk about religion, you're talking about individuals who are in classes that have traditionally been victimized by discrimination, and so when you talk about hate crimes, you're talking about yet another form of discrimination.

MR. GRADISON: Attorneys have never been victimized to that degree.

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Not to that degree.

MR. ROSE: I don't want to start a debate here among the members, but I have to agree with you that the practicalities are with your issue and not with the theoretical one. The old adage that we know it works in practice but it doesn't work in theory shouldn't be applied here.

Hate crimes motivated by people who are

zeroed in on a person or a group because of who they -- not because of an individual dispute with that person or that group, but because of what they are, their race, religion, are real and have always been real, and those that belong to those groups know how real they are; whereas the other theoretical complaints about people attacking someone because they're a lawyer or a real estate developer I think are farfetched and are not in the realm of reality and they may be individuals -there's plenty of attacks on lawyers but it's usually a disgruntled client and in fact doesn't like that particular person, or even attacks on judges, but not -- it's not considered an attack on the judiciary. So you can apply a lot of theory, which I don't think addresses the issue.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I feel I understand the difference, and
I think the law -- as far as a separate crime, I'm
not prepared to state a position on that as to
whether the bill that was introduced in the
Legislature by Representative Crawford is adequate
and whether a separate -- I'm not a lawyer -whether a separate crime statute would hold up

under constitutional scrutiny or not and how you can differentiate.

I think the important thing is to get legislation on the books that would hold up and that has some teeth and not that addresses a lot of theories.

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Absolutely.

MR. ROSE: And I hope that that's what you would support, and I hope that that's what this Commission would wind up recommending.

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Absolutely, and even with the legislation that Representative Crawford did propose, the compromised legislation, in the case of McCormick Place where criminal trespass and the recklessness has been charged, if that legislation were on the books now, there would be something more to look to other than probation in those instances.

MS. SCHMITT: And my question was geared, I understand, toward theory, but the point was are you supporting -- you said you were supporting a separate crime as opposed to an aggravating circumstance?

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: I would advocate it, but I would support the aggravating, and we have supported that.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Ms. Freeman-Wilson, you mentioned that your numbers were very small and the notion of the phantom nature kind of intrigued me. How do you interpret your numbers? The two, four, six, are they the same kinds of incidents? Are they minor incidents? Have they grown in importance? How do you interpret those very small numbers?

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: One of the things is that in those cases, even though the numbers are small, we're talking about egregious cases. In the Hoskins' case we're talking about \$80,000. A large amount of that was punitive damages, but a lot of that had to do with the fact that here is a person who has refurbished this house and the house was totally destroyed.

In the case with the young man down in Franklin College, he was constantly harassed. Whenever he would walk out -- and it's a community where there aren't many blacks there anyway. He

was attending school, and whenever he would go out in public on the street, or many times when he would go out, individuals would not only follow him but they would chase him down and, you know, just constantly harass him, calling out racial epithets and threatening to do physical harm.

On the college campuses where -- other college campuses where we have been able to quantify events, again individuals have been harmed or have come close to being harmed, so the nature of our business is that you see a lot of cases and there are a lot of allegations, and even when they're substantiated, there is almost a reasonable form of discrimination to the extent that a person just merely deprives someone of something because of their race or sex or religion or national origin.

But in the cases that we find -- that we have identified as hate crimes, it goes beyond that, and for lack of a better word, reasonable form of discrimination, to the point of being very egregious and to the point that many of the individuals are threatened with bodily harm.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: And is that a significant difference between the two that you found in '89 as compared to the six cases that you've had so far this year?

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Sure, sure. The two in '89 actually involved vandalism on an automobile. "KKK" was scratched on an automobile, and the other incident was merely a calling out in a threatening manner, but more and more we're getting the threats, the clear threats to do bodily harm and the physical harm. The '91 cases are more of that nature.

MR. GRADISON: But the nature of those incidents with "KKK" scratched -- scratched on a car and the interior of a house and so on doesn't necessarily mean there's an active KKK in Indiana. I mean, I think it's probably a manifestation that this person's full of hate and there's no way of registering the hate because it's so commonly associated with bigotry and racism and an organization like the KKK or the Nazis or cross burning.

I mean, do you think that that

necessarily means there's an active KKK presence out there that is focused on the McCormick Place at this time or it's just people using those, you know, those manifestations and showing the symbolic nature of a cross burning or a --

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: At McCormick

Place I think that it was just the sentiment in the neighborhood that black people had no place in a predominantly white neighborhood. They were very clear. They were clear because they gave statements to the media to that effect.

In the case of Donita Hoskins it was a group -- a young group who described themselves as white supremacists, teen-agers largely between the ages of 17 and 21, who said that they were fighting for the minority group, and when questioned during the damage hearing who they determined the minority group to be they said white males, and so that was, you know, more of an organized gang situation.

MR. GRADISON: Obviously you don't attach either one of these incidents to a Ku Klux Klan cell in some basement in Indianapolis?

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: No.

MR. GRADISON: It's maybe a group of young kids and so on who have those racist views, probably from their parents. So it's basically kind of individual incidents and they're being provoked by hatred.

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Although we are aware and you may very well be aware of a group pocket in St. Joe County, which is -- well, you know where St. Joe County is, where they broadcast "Race and Reason" and apparently have a toll-free number that individuals can call to talk about neo-Nazi, Klan type activities.

MR. GRADISON: That's something you would report to the FCC I would take it?

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Yes, yes. In fact, the FCC, we have had communication with them.

Ms. Freeman-Wilson? Again we want to thank you. I would like to ask you if you could perhaps at some point send us just kind of a synopsis of the incidents that you have recorded.

MS. FREEMAN-WILSON: Absolutely.

1 | Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you. At this point our agenda calls for a 15-minute break, so we will take a 15-minute break and then reconvene.

(A brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: We'd like to call our meeting back to order. We appreciate your patience and indulgence with us through the break.

At this point we'd like to call upon Mr. Phil Hoy, the executive director of the Tri-State Food Bank.

And while Mr. Hoy is coming to the front, I would like to ask those of you that will be making presentations to us this morning -- the ventilation is a little bit loud, so we need to have you speak a little louder for the benefit of people that are seated in the back of the room that can hardly hear. I understand that the only alternative we have is a rather unpleasant one and that's to suffocate.

(Off the record discussion.)

MR. HOY: I'm Phil Hoy. I'm the executive director of the Tri-State Food Bank in

Evansville, Indiana. I'm also an ordained clergyman from United Church of Christ, and for almost ten years I have been on the Human Relations Commission as a commissioner for the City of Evansville and the County of Vanderburgh.

I was going to start my testimony a different way, but I understand that there was a bit of difficulty in getting someone from our area to come here and testify and the word was out that we had no problems in Evansville.

I would refer you to an incident that, happened last week, which I do have down here in my notes someplace, but I think I shall start with that. A white young lady had some black friends. Her parents objected to this friendship. The young man involved who was injured in the accident that followed was not her boyfriend. His girlfriend was with him. They were at a public swimming pool.

Her brother, a white male, 18 years old, tracked them down and eventually, because his sister was with this group of blacks, took his automobile and ran down a young man by the name of -- I believe it's Robell Givens. I know his

last name is Givens.

And he is being treated at a hospital I believe in Louisville, Kentucky, with serious injuries, perhaps will be crippled for life as a result of this accident. After the accident the 18 year-old young man simply said he did it because he wanted to stop his sister from hanging around with blacks.

So I use that as my introduction to let you know we have no problems in southwestern

Indiana, and if you believe that, we have some wetlands to sell you.

I am coming at this meeting from I guess somewhat of an anecdotal posture. That's what I was asked to do. I do have something of an opening statement. I'm old enough to have experienced the gains in civil rights for a lot of people, in addition to African-Americans, in the 1960s and in the 1970s.

There are some who say those gains were not deep and real. Perhaps they weren't, or perhaps we simply in the ensuing years, particularly since 1980, have forgotten a quotation

from our history that is almost a cliche, perhaps it is a cliche, and that is eternal vigilance is the price of freedom and is also the price of civil rights for endangered human beings.

There is no question in my mind that civil rights for many groups of people are in worse shape than they were in 1980. We've almost done an about-face. Certainly hate groups were always there, but the law, the leadership of our nation, the leadership of states and cities, was much more committed to leadership prior to 1980 than that leadership is today.

As a clergyman I have to confess -- in the reformed tradition which I commonly do every Sunday anyhow -- I have to confess that the commitment of the churches is much less today than it was prior to 1980, and as I speak with young seminarians, and I've had the privilege of doing that, I'm not seeing the kind of commitment to civil rights for a number of groups that were present in my graduate school days and in the 20 plus years following my graduation.

One of the things that I observe and

U D

have seen today is that the victims of abuse and hate crimes are more likely to be blamed than the perpetrators of the crime. I go back to the illustration, and it's more than an illustration, it's a true story that I just gave you, and that is that after this occurrence happened I was speaking with a friend of mine who said "Well, there's got to be more to the story because this young black man must have done something." He was with his girlfriend walking down the street being tracked by a driver who said "I was out to get him."

But "he must have done something," I think that gives you an indication of how in our society the victims of abuse are likely to be blamed, women certainly are. A member of my own family went through the tragic crime of rape at gunpoint and for a while had to keep very silent about it. Finally has worked through it and has been able to speak to groups, but she was always blamed for what happened, even though she was robbed of her jewelry, et cetera, et cetera. I guess she's to be blamed because she is a beautiful young lady.

The other thing I see in my opening statement I'd like to mention is something that we talked a lot about, about 20, 30 years ago, and that's systemic violence. It's my belief that violence that's built into the system, which is usually very nice on the surface, is deeper than ever.

I will tell you right out that I am a political candidate for our city council, and in running for that city council I've had much discussion about enterprise zones, which I feel promise more than they deliver. I said that in a speech and got a phone call from a white businessman who informed me that he's created ten more jobs but he could not find one African-American in the City of Evansville who qualified for one of his ten new jobs.

I responded by saying "Gee, you should have called me first because I just hired an African-American on my staff." I was a bit cha -- chagrinned, if I can get that word out, to learn that my social agency starts people at a higher salary than his private business does, which was

supposed to create some wonderful jobs, but I use that illustration to point to what I call systemic violence, violence against the race, "I simply won't hire African-Americans."

Moving from that particular concern, and I could go on a long time about that sort of violent crime that we see, I would like to say a few personal things from my own experience. I am the parent of an adopted biracial son. His birth certificate reads that he is white. His father was Mexican-American, his mother was white, one of those westside German folk in the city of Evansville. We adopted him 21 years ago.

I can tell you that with this young man growing up -- we lived in Evansville, we lived in Fort Wayne, and we lived in southwest Georgia, and he and I and my late wife were just as comfortable in southwest Georgia as we were in Fort Wayne or southwest Indiana. In fact, I have to tell you we were more comfortable, we were more accepted in what's supposed to be the hotbed of racism than we were in this state that is supposed to be a progressive northern state.

Let me give you a couple stories of hillife to illustrate what I'm saying. He was in a middle school and a white young man called him a nigger, and my son does have a short temper and he slugged the white boy, he took the first shot. He was a Golden Gloves boxer, boxed here in Indianapolis, and I hate boxing, but I was kind of proud of what he accomplished because it was an area where he accomplished much as an athlete.

So he decked this kid, and I got called out to the school, went into the principal's office, and the principal said -- he was white. The teacher was there. The principal said to me "Reverend Hoy, I had a talk with your son and I told him about the real world," and I said to this gentleman "What do you mean the real world?"

He said "Well, I told your son that since he is black" -- which he is not, but nonetheless this is the assumption -- "Since he is black, he must understand that there's a lot of prejudice out there." I looked at the principal and I said "May I ask you a question?" He said "Yes." I said "Did you talk to the white boy?" He

said "What about?"

I said "Did you tell the white boy about the real world out there, that there are interracial marriages, there are children such as my son who are real human beings? Did you tell him that that's the real world?" and to that he said "No, I never thought about it."

I'm not going to tell you my son is an angel. He's been in some trouble with the law. He and other young men broke into a car wash, and that ties in with the discrimination we see in the justice system. My son is white but people assume that he is at least partially black because he does have some black features.

The second boy, or young man, was black, African-American. The third was white. All three committed the same crime. All three came to court without any previous record. All three faced the same judge, not in Vanderburgh County, but this is in Gibson County just north of Vanderburgh where they have one of Indiana's more famous hanging judges. First crime. The white boy was sent home to home arrest. Branchville was where my son went

and where the black young man went.

ĸ

1.5

I have worked in the justice system for three years at the Youth Service Bureau in Evansville, so I can tell you that that story is replicated many times yet today.

Moving to another group that I think are a group highly discriminated against, this is the Gay and Lesbian persons. I called Mr. James Moore, who is willing to be questioned and has given me permission to use his name and his own story. He is a member of the AIDS Resource Group in Evansville, ARG. I have known James for some time and I see him quite often because their agency is a member of our food bank and they come and draw food from us.

James has been threatened on the phone. He and his mother were almost run down by a friend in a pickup truck because he had just come out of the closet. I live in a downtown neighborhood, which is a neighborhood where a number of Gay and Lesbian people choose to live. When they call 911 they are often quizzed as to their sexual

orientation rather than to the nature of the crime that is being perpetrated on them.

The leaders of ARG in Evansville that Mr. Moore could tell you about have also had their lives threatened. I called the local rabbi — remember, we have no hate crimes in Evansville — and he related to me a recent event there where a swastika was painted on the only Jewish synagogue we have.

At Sabbath service on a Friday night they had two skinhead visitors in their service.

Tensions are so high that B'Nai B'rith, and they agree, have advised them that for all High Holy Day services they must hire security to protect the people who are there to worship.

One of the organizations that's very active in southwestern Indiana is the Klan. I have a tape here which I had dubbed for a friend of mine here in Evansville, Reverend Taylor, and I'm borrowing it again to redub, but it was produced by I believe it's WTHR-Channel 13 in Indianapolis on the activities of the Klan.

And in this footage you can see footage

Indiana where the leader unashamedly and unabashedly is showing how to create poison darts. He is demonstrating how you can take your finger and dig it into one eyeball, go around the nose, the bone here in the nose, and pull the sinuses out if you attack someone, but yet we have no problems in southwestern Indiana.

R

I would move to violence against woman. We have two shelters there. I was on the building committee of the Albion Fellows Vacant Center, and my only regret is, and I regret this with sadness, that we didn't build it large enough.

On the way up here I was listening -- I have four children who try to keep the old man in touch, and so my daughter, who is a professional dancer and is teaching dance in some housing developments in Evansville and two of the public elementary schools, has decided to use some rap music. I was appalled. She said "Dad, listen to this, but I don't think you can listen to all of it."

The denigration of women, the proposed

violence against women on this tape is just appalling. I am very strongly in support of the First Amendment and the freedom of speech. These ears of mine have heard a lot. I've been around the block a number of times.

I was not prepared for what I had heard, and I was absolutely appalled that a company for which I for years had great respect, RCA Victor, you know, who produced red label records which were the finest in classical music, you know, representing the highest of human aspirations, is the producer of this kind of violent trash.

I suggest to you that our society is at this point permeated with violence. Recent crime statistics demonstrate that we expect the murder rate to be higher now than it was in those awful '60s. It was much lower in the '60s, friends, than it was in the '70s, '80s, or '90s. Something to ponder, I think.

I've told you about the experience of my son. I've had a lot of experience with men from a halfway house, which has since been closed, called Second Chance, and now from Safe House, which is a

criminal justice program in Evansville, both of them. Second Chance was, Safe House is. Those men can tell you that in the justice system if you are black or African-American, if you are poor, you will spend some time in Safe House, Branchville, or God knows where, and if you have money and are white, you will not.

Racism is pervasive, the racist names, the dehumanizing labels for race, ethnic groups, women, Gay and Lesbian persons, the humor that is cut lose. I hate to confess this to you, but the racist language got so bad in my own office that about a month ago or two months ago I had to issue a stern memo, the sternest memo I've issued to my staff, who I think are pretty good people, and I hate to admit to you that this was issued after I had hired an African-American.

We've had African-Americans on our staff
before but we hadn't for a while, and I had to
remind them -- these are people who know me, know
me well, worked with me for years. I had to remind
them that I am personally hurt and insulted by
those racist remarks.

I think I'm going to close out with a quote. I was going to use this first. I'll use it last. What concerns me is that there is very little human pride being raised. Our current President is arguing against I think a very fine civil rights bill by saying "Well, it calls for quotas."

Well, from my standpoint the quota is almost all white and all male at this time. That's who gets the first shot in any job, and I think we all know that. But I'm worried that something deeper is going on. The skinheads with neo-Nazi groups and with other hate groups seem to have carte blanche in our society.

I go back to the words of Martin
Niemoeller. Pastor Niemoeller was put in prison in
Nazi, Germany. "First they came for the Jews, and
I did not speak out because I was not a Jew. Then
they came for the Socialists, and I did not speak
out because I was not a socialist. Then they came
for the trade unionists, and I did not speak out
because I was not a trade unionist. Then they came
for me, and there was no one left to speak for

me."

I in my mind added some lines. *Then they came for the African-Americans, I was not an African-American, so I didn't say anything, I did not speak. Then they came for the Gays and Lesbians, and I was not Gay or Lesbian, so I did not speak. Then they came for the women, and I'm not a woman, so I did not speak," and on and on. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: We appreciate the distance that you have traveled to be with us this morning. Could you perhaps share with us some information concerning recommendations for preventing or activities designed to prevent some of the crimes -- some of the problems you have addressed in southwest Indiana?

MR. HOY: Yes. I think the first thing I would like to see is some national leadership again on some decent civil rights legislation. I think we have a right to look to the Federal Government for leadership.

Secondly -- my first proposal would be political. I would like to look at the leadership

of our state. I do not see much leadership coming out of our state in terms of civil rights for any group, and frankly, I would like to see it in my own city local leadership, which I am not seeing from a number of people, not just politicians, but from business people, so I would say legislation is important.

You can't legislate feelings, and I know that, but justice is not a matter of feelings.

Justice is a matter of law, and then that law must be of course enforced. There are some laws on the books, but I think that we need another look at that national civil rights law.

I live on the borderline. I'm director of a food bank that serves three states, and so those lines are only imaginary lines that somebody drew, or a river formed, such as the Ohio River, so that's why I think we need something national rather than just, you know, something in the city of Evansville and the County of Vanderburgh and things like that. So that would answer your question.

The second thing, I think that I would

the leadership of my own church. I think the churches and the synagogues and the religious community are key to this. I don't see tremendous leadership emerging in the church asking for civil rights for the groups I've mentioned, and there are other groups. I'm speaking of southwestern Indiana where I see suffering there. That's for the change of attitudes. If the religious community cannot take this on, then there's something wrong with our religion.

I would also like to see the school systems take a more active role. That's another institution that could take a more active role in influencing public opinion. I don't know how you change the minds of those guys who buy their ink by the barrel that head the newspapers.

I write. I don't write now because I'm running for office. I write every five weeks and I can write what I please, but basically our two papers, which I don't know where they are on the liberal/conservative scale, I don't even know if those words mean anything anymore in our society,

but I would like to see a change of heart there in terms of how they approach crime, reporting of crime.

I would like to see some changes in the judicial system. I think it's -- so I would ask for -- you know, I ask for a lot.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Are there questions from other members?

MR. ROSE: Yes. Reverend Hoy, although we're interested in all forms of discrimination and we are a civil rights advisory committee, this meeting today is focused on hate crimes and you've told us of two specific incidents in Evansville where you have firsthand knowledge.

There is a new federal law on the books that the President signed in April of last year called the Hate Crime Statistics Act which mandates local law enforcement agencies to report hate crimes as a specific category of crime to the FBI in a specific way. To your knowledge is that being done in Evansville, in Vanderburgh County, or in southwest Indiana?

MR. HOY: The crimes that I mentioned

have been reported. I think a lot of crimes aren' reported. We have in Vanderburgh County what's called enhanced 911, which is a very -- as you probably well know -- very sophisticated 911 system. I have a son that's a policeman also, and he's told me about this.

If you call from certain sections of the city, the caller will be grilled as to their race, as to -- yes, the color of their eyes, any number of personal questions, while their lives are being threatened, and I think we -- you know, I'm chaplain -- in fact, I'm chaplain for the Fraternal Order of Police, and I have a son that's a policeman, but I have to tell you that he feels and I feel that there's a great deal of discrimination there.

Our police in Evansville now have reached the point where they've all gone through the Plainfield Academy, which is one of the top academies in the nation, but I do not feel that law enforcement is addressing this kind of attitude, and therefore it's very difficult to get African-American males or females to join the

police force, and I'm, you know, tying a whole bundle together, but that leads me to believe that there's a lot of crime that's not reported because, folks, we, you know, think "Well, the victim's going to be blamed."

The rape I mentioned was reported because my family and I have made some commitments, but we are very strong people, we are a very strong family. We've had threats, too, over the years and that goes with the territory. If you're going to take some stands I think that's the way life is.

I don't think the law is -- I don't think the law is being honored as much as it should because people are afraid to report. They feel like they will be hurt.

MR. ROSE: Are you getting any hate crime cooperation from the city officials or from the county prosecutor, and these two crimes which you've noted, have they been vigorously pursued in your opinion or not?

MR. HOY: I think the accident crime with the prosecutor we now have will be vigorously prosecuted. I view him as a welcomed addition to

the criminal justice system because I think he is man who understands, and I think we'll see some improvement there.

MR. ROSE: Good.

MS. PARKER: Mr. Hoy, based on some of the things you've said, it appears to me that what you described in your community and in the county which you reside is a climate of indifference and also a climate of comfort on the part of some people.

How could -- and since we are asking for recommendations, what would you recommend as a remedy for trying to at least heighten a response to the community to create at least a caring concern about some of the issues that you've discussed with us today?

MR. HOY: I wish I had an easy answer to that. I mentioned justice, you know, which I think is a matter of law. Then you have to enforce it. You need a prosecutor, which we now have, who will, a man who has been a victim of discrimination. He's Jewish-American, so he has experienced some of the things. I think that makes

a difference with this man.

I think local leaders, whether they're political leaders or leaders in the school system, or whatever, could help by putting some key people in top-flight positions where they could have some influence. I would like to see our school system address this situation in a better way.

Those are generalizations, and the problem is, you know, that when it works down to the classroom teacher, you may not get results, but it's my belief if the leadership isn't at the top, you're not going to get results anyplace else if there's not some pressure. I don't know what to do. Some days I just want to walk out.

MS. PARKER: Because it appeared to me that there should have been -- could be a culling together of people of good will or something to talk about a concern and try to create an understanding.

I appreciate your illustration about the principal of the school who never thought that the white kid should have been talked to. You know, those kinds of things say that there is a complete,

in my mind, lack of understanding of the impact of anything that's going on, except seeing it from one side only. How do you bring these two together?

MR. HOY: I'm not sure. One thing we do in Evansville -- and it's hard to document this, but you can talk to African-Americans who have left. We have a real brain-drain with African-Americans because in Evansville the place where an African-American can get a job usually is with the City, usually in a token position sometimes, as in the case of Ira Neal.

He is an official in the school system, but he is the only -- to my knowledge at this point -- the only African-American who is downtown in what we affectionately call the education box, the Evansville-Vanderburgh County School System Building, but we systematically make sure they leave town by not having jobs.

Now the hopeful change that we see is with national corporations who have come in and made some changes. Bristol-Myers Squibb would be a good example of a company that I believe is really trying to be an equal opportunity employer.

Cargill is another one. I'm thinking of companies

I deal with, but there are few of them. You see,
when you have an African-American, just to speak of
that particular group of people, in a City
position, you get intimidation.

I didn't mention that in my testimony, but on the Human Relations Commission I was chairman of a committee to investigate what had happened and not happened in the Enterprise Zone and Walnut Center. Walnut Center preceded the Enterprise Zone, but a large section of the central city was cleared out and I would say 90 to 95 percent of those residents there were African-Americans.

Jobs were promised, jobs were not delivered. We were simply doing a simple survey to see what had happened, and we got shut down by the powers that be. Now I cannot prove that to you, except I know that the former director simply came into our meeting and said "The committee's work has to be over because the Mayor doesn't want us to go any further, he's getting too many complaints."

Our letter was simply asking "How many new jobs do

you have? Are you hiring any neighborhood people?" So there's a lot of intimidation.

One of those corporate entities, and I have that letter in my file, wrote us a letter and they said "We're going to have a job's fair for African-Americans primarily," and the Human Relations Commission was going to be a co-sponsor and this corporation was going to be a co-sponsor, and they let us know in no uncertain terms that if HRC was going to be a co-sponsor they were pulling their money out.

That's intimidation, that's systemic violence in my opinion, and it's hard to pin down, you see, because it's not a knife in the back, it's not a bullet in the brain, it's not being run down by a car, but all of that builds then to where an 18-year-old young man very freely admits that -- you know, if you'll pardon my foul language -- he felt he had every right to run down this nigger, you know. Now if he'd said "son of a bitch," that wouldn't have been printed in the newspaper, think about that. But we have a family newspaper.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: We have time for

one more question. Well, Reverend Hoy, we certainly want to thank you for your participation this morning. Thank you.

The next presenter we would like to call on is Mr. Arthur Jordan, chairman of the Indianapolis Education Committee of the NAACP.

(Off the record discussion.)

MR. JORDAN: Good morning to the advisory council, and my name's Arthur Jordan and I'm here representing the NAACP, Indiana State Conference of Branches. I chair the education committee.

It's been I guess a year or two since I saw you last, and at that point I was here talking to you about a grave concern of our state conference, and that was the issue of racism and violence on our college campuses.

And at that point I indicated to you that we had commissioned a committee to do a very extensive investigation of our state universities and to make our findings known to not only our state conference but also State Government, presidents of various universities, and also the

U.S. Civil Rights Commission. To date we have not yet completed our investigation, but I would like to bring you up to date about where we are and to at least tell you some of our partial recommendations.

When we met with you previously, we had -- it had come to our attention that a number of very severe things had happened, and if you could bear with me, I want to bring you up to date about what we talked about and that was at Purdue University we had been told of cross burnings at the black culture center.

At Indiana University we had been given information with regards to a number of black students being accosted and physically attacked while jogging on campus. At DePauw University we had been advised of a number white fraternities having ghetto parties in which they auctioned off and decorated walls with racial slurs.

At Indiana State University we had been told about a number of students who were physically attacked in the dormitories while they were sleeping in the night. As I indicated earlier, we

J

became very concerned about that and as I indicated commissioned a study to look at what had happened.

We conducted some very extensive hearings with almost 30 to 40 hours of testimony given by students, faculty members, university officials, and a number of other people, and those tapes, as I said, are still being reviewed and still being compiled.

Where are we today? Well, we have not as of late witnessed any of those kinds of activities, at least we have not been told of them, but I guess our concern at this point is not only those situations, but now we're really looking at some things that I think the previous speaker talked about, the systemic kinds of issues.

And I want to address those issues with you this morning because those are the things that are subtle, those are the things that although they may not be race hate types of crimes, they are just as negative, just as harmful to our minority students as the cross burnings.

The issues I want to spend a few moments talking about are issues that we also ask questions

about, and one of those issues is academic racism with regards to grades. In our discussion with students, there were many students who came to us who mentioned to us that they felt they were being discriminated against with regards to grades they had gotten in classrooms with the amount of work they were being required to do and also with white students who seemed to have done less work and had gotten higher grades.

So we're very concerned about that issue in terms of how students are graded and how our -- or, is there any fairness with regards to how minority students, Hispanic students, and African-American students are treated?

Many of the students indicated to us that there just seemed a tremendous lack of African-American professors, counselors, advisors, staff members, people that they could go talk with, people they could go to with problems and concerns, and universities seemed not to be responsive to that area, so we're very concerned about staffing.

We know that -- and plus the retort by

the universities that "We can't find

African-American professors," we know they're out
there, and we'll talk about some recommendations.

We know that the competition for getting

African-American professors is very, very key and
you have to come with a package which is
attractive.

We're also concerned about campus police activities. We've been told in our research and studies that whenever -- particularly with IU down in Bloomington -- that whenever there's more than three or four young men walking on campus, they seem to be harassed by campus security, stopped and searched, whereas white young men on campus, people are able to walk and never get stopped by the campus police, so we're very concerned about the treatment of our young African-American college students with regards to campus security.

We're concerned about student-student relationships. I think I told you last time I was here that at Purdue University it was not uncommon to be told by those that we interviewed to be called nigger at least 25 times a day going from

one fraternity to the -- or, one dormitory to the other dormitory.

And when I posed that question to the university president, his retort was, you know, "We can't legislate" -- "We have all kinds of students here, and we can't make students not call each other niggers on campus," and I was very concerned that the university did not have a policy and does not have policies with regards to what happens when you make racial slurs, whether you be a student, whether you be a faculty member, or whether you be staff members, what happens to them.

We indicated to the president at Purdue at that time that there ought to be a strong statement coming out of the university president's office with regards to what will happen to you, that "We're running a no-nonsense university here and will not tolerate in 1990 students being addressed with racial slurs."

We're concerned also with the whole financial situation. As we look at the situation, it seems that the issue of how funding, how money's being spent with regards to minority programming,

are funds being adequately spent? Is there fair distribution of funds with regards to recruitment, retention of African-American and Hispanic students? We have not yet come to a determination, but from the outset it looks like the monies are not being spent in a fair fashion.

We're concerned about curriculum. One of the things that we're looking at right now in K through 12 is the whole issue about diversity with regards to academia, curriculum, and are programs being addressed with diversity in mind. I would say to you that I don't think that's true.

I think that our universities generally run from a Eurocentric perspective and that they do not have an African center -- Afrocentric curriculum programmatically, that it does not have an Afrocentric component, and I say this to you because as late as a couple months ago I've perceived this, and as I say we're still investigating.

Even at Ball State, one of the universities I thought was doing a fairly decent job, there was a discussion on racism on campus

Journalists and over 400 students attended it, and the kind of comments that they were raising were not so much cross burnings, but were things like not having the adequate number of black faculty members, not having anyone sensitive to what it means to be black and on campus.

They were saying things like we think everybody ought to be required to go through an African-American course, that new freshmen coming in ought to be required and mandated to take a class in diversity so that they don't feel as if there's -- if there's some people on campus -- there's sensitivity that if we have a student coming in from Mount Vernon, Indiana or Booneville, Indiana, that he or she understands that there's diversity in the world and not act in racist ways towards them.

Then we're concerned about having adequate housing, and as indicated earlier I thought Ball State of all the universities was doing a fairly decent job, but after reading the article and hearing from the students themselves

that seems not to be the case.

So although we're not talking as much about the cross burnings and the physical attacks, we're talking about systemic issues that seem to be very, very engrained in universities, a lack of sensitivity, a lack of diversity with regards to staffing, with regards to how African-American, Hispanic-Americans, students are being treated at universities.

what can we do? Well, there are a number of things and as I indicated we are still in the process. A number of general recommendations that we're going to be looking at. No. 1, we propose an ongoing long-range plan to eliminate racism on all Indiana campuses. We want to develop a set of specific requirements and expectations for all schools, divisions, and all department heads.

What I mean by that is that anyone who works at a university that is state-supported needs to be required to go through diversity training so that when they teach history or when they teach math, that they're able to emerge an Afrocentric or Hispaniccentric philosophy into that Eurocentric

program that they're dealing with.

Implement an intensive comprehensive orientation program for culture diversity for all people who work at the university, whether they be cooks, maintenance people, staff members, professors, coaches, vice presidents, everybody who's connected be mandated to go through an intensive orientation towards diversity.

Develop and implement a flexible hiring program. We were told that because of the schedules, because of the agreements, that university people can't go out of the mandated hiring program. Well, as I said earlier, in order to attract sharp African-American, Hispanic-American professors, we think we need a more flexible program in order to get those people to Indiana, because, you know, how many folks want to come to Indiana when they can go to California

And as I say, it's a very competitive process attracting strong academic individuals, and that's one of the issues that we were missing in all of the campuses we visited, the lack of having

to teach or to New York?

people of color in positions where they could counsel, provide our young college students with good information, would counsel especially when they're having difficulty.

We think there ought to be a strategic plan to fully implement a statewide affirmative action program, a policy, and that plan be the responsibility of the board of trustees. We think there ought to be an overall oversight committee that looks at all of the universities in terms of staffing, in terms of what happens, so that each university is accountable to someone about what's going on with regards to staffing.

There ought to be a better program to report racial incidents and also a response plan. We found a lot of different programs and also there was nothing in most of those plans that said "This is what will happen to you if you are caught" -- "if it is determined that you acted in a racist way." So there ought to be a better program to report incidents, and also what would happen to you with regards to individual staff members, students, or professors, if we find out in fact that you

acted in a racist or sexist way.

We think there ought to be a program implemented that creates a campus atmosphere that causes mutual respect, sensitivity, tolerance, and understanding. There seems to be just, even in 1990, a great deal of intolerance towards people who are different, and we would think at a university, which is I would hope the mecca — supposed to be the mecca where we have people who are sensitive, who are there to learn, to grow, to develop, that would be the one place I would think that you would not find racism or sexism, and it's kind of hard to really imagine that in 1990 that still exists.

We think there ought to be a program to develop curriculum modifications so that, as I said earlier, that curriculum is diverse, it has an Africancentric perspective, it has Hispaniccentric perspective, it gives our students a chance to understand the real world, that it's not just Eurocentric, it's not just white oriented, that it includes everybody, it's emerged.

We think that the government, the state

legislators, must issue a very strong policy with regards to campus racism, spelling out the penalties for violation of this policy, and that has not been the process.

I think universities have been allowed to deal with things on their own rather than state governments saying, even from the Governor's Office, that we expect us to run a university with no nonsense or racism; that if you come from wherever, that you're going to be okay here, everybody's going to be safe here; that nobody has to ever worry about being -- getting negative treatment from anybody, and that has not been the case with our state legislators, and also the Governor has not really said to our university officials emphatically that "We will not tolerate racism in 1990, '91."

We think that we ought to encourage minority faculty members to become more involved in minority recruiting and retention efforts. It's my understanding that in talking to many of the minority professors that they're not even a part of the recruitment team. We think that to attract

strong minority faculty members, that minority faculty members ought to be part of that team that goes to wherever, Florida, or to the South to recruit.

The other part, I think, is that what happens once you get students there, how do you retain them there? I've talked to many students during our investigation who were very unhappy. They said "We're just here." So if there's a strong effort to recruit students, there ought to be a strong effort to come up with programs to make sure they stay there, whether it be housing, whether it be academic programs, after-school programs, counseling programs, that make sure that students are going to stay there.

So what I'm really sharing with you is that although we're not -- we're equally concerned about the incidents I reported earlier about the cross burnings and the physical attacks, but this thing around -- the systemic things are so subtle, that are really harder to get to, and those are the things that I think are equally important, is to make sure that when students are at our campuses,

=

they stay there, they're retained, they're able to get their BA Degree or BS degree.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And it would be my hope that once we put this comprehensive report together and the recommendations, that the state officials, our Governor, state legislators, are going to understand that we're running universities that will not condone people that are mistreated, violated in any way, and that we run a program that's culturally diverse, that people are culturally competent, culturally sensitive to differences, so that people -- whether we're talking about a math program or the dormitory life, or just being on campus, that we won't have people who fear and are concerned about people hurling racial slurs as they walk from one dorm to the cafeteria or from one dorm to the classroom, because we think that being at school is difficult enough and not to have to deal with any racial harassment while on campus.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you,
Mr. Jordan. Perhaps you could respond to some
questions at this point. You mentioned that you

are close to wrapping up the report. Obviously for the purpose of today's meeting we're more interested in the more criminal aspect of what your study involves. When might that data be available?

MR. JORDAN: We hope that by the end

MR. JORDAN: We hope that by the end of September that we'll have something ready to go to the press because we have to run it through our own system first. Hopefully by the end of September.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Okay. Will it deal with specific incidents?

MR. JORDAN: Yes, it will. It will be -- as a matter of fact, I have just read through it very quickly and it will be something like this.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Okay. Since you have -- since you reported to us about a year ago, have there been additional reports of physical confrontations or hate crimes on campuses reported to your committee and your task force?

MR. JORDAN: Not to my knowledge. As I said earlier, we have not gotten reports -- there

seemed to be a rash of those things happening in '89 and '90, but to date we have not been advised of any other things like that happening, and we're not sure if -- but maybe -- we hope that our presence on campus, we're hoping, at least got the message to someone that things are being looked at very carefully, this is being investigated, so we have not as of today.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: So it is your opinion that there has been a decrease in these types of activities on campus since your visits?

MR. JORDAN: No, I'm not going to say that, I'm not going to say there's been a decrease. As I said, we just have not been made aware of any increase. Are they the same? And I probably -- at this point I'm just going to say that things are probably status quo at this point. We've not heard of any additional harassment things and we've not heard of it being decreased. I've not heard anybody tell me that we've had -- less reports was happening.

MS. SCHMITT: I'm just curious. As you know today, our focus is hate crimes, crimes

_ _ _

example, IU, Purdue, particularly the state
universities, if something like that occurs, do
they merely turn it over to the Bloomington
Prosecutor, the Bloomington Police, for example, or
do the campuses or the universities themselves have
a group or a mechanism by which they look to the
student council and they're trying to combat racial
things on campus, or if there's a hate crime, do
they just turn it over to the public officials if
the person wasn't a student?

MR. JORDAN: My understanding is it's usually handled by both. The universities have their own internal mechanism for looking at it and usually calls the racial incident report committees or task force and they then also, because of the nature of the crimes or situations at the universities, get the local community police office involved, so it's being handled by campus security, by the response incident committee, as well as the community police department, so we have three groups looking at it.

MR. ROSE: When you testified here

the last time about the same specific incidents on college campuses, your testimony, along with that of a number of other people, was one of the reasons this commission decided to focus on hate crimes in Indiana to try to make recommendations to the national administration.

In your testimony, if I recall it correctly, you indicated that the college authorities, the administrators, were not very cooperative and did not -- and took sort of an ostrich attitude that "this really isn't happening here" or "it's not of importance," or "they're not hate crimes."

We even discussed, if I remember, the fact that the state-supported institutions were the -- were in fact state property, and those people, staff and faculty and administrators, who work there were, in essence, employees of the state, subject to the laws of anti-discrimination and so forth that all other state employees and agencies are subject to.

Could you tell us if there's been any change in attitude, if there's been any change in

administrative attitude in the universities as far as their handling of hate crime incidents, and can you tell us specifically about the incidents you testified to the last time and again today as to whether any prosecution has gone forward and any punishment meted out?

2'

MR. JORDAN: Let me say at the top you asked me several questions.

MR. ROSE: Sorry. I didn't mean to confuse you.

MR. JORDAN: We never said that people were not cooperating. We said they were defensive.

MR. ROSE: All right.

MR. JORDAN: We had great cooperation from university officials on our investigations.

They were more than willing to help, and provided all information we needed and made sure that the rooms were there and everybody who was to testify was there, so they were very cooperative.

with regards to how -- were there any -in the case of the Indiana State situation where
the young man was beaten up, I understand that the

individuals involved were kicked out of school, and we were very -- like I said, this is the young man that had his eye injured in the middle of the night. It's my understanding that those individuals were processed out of school and were processed very rapidly out of school.

MR. ROSE: No criminal prosecution that you know of?

MR. JORDAN: Not to my knowledge, but they were in fact, as I said, put out of school. In the other situations, because of the cross burnings, no, they weren't, and what we were told is that we don't know who did it, you know, because no names were left or cards dropped that this was done by X, so the universities were almost as we were. We know this happened and they admitted that it did happen, but in terms of bringing people to justice who in fact were the cause of those things, no, that never happened.

MR. ROSE: Were the local authorities, police authorities, or the FBI called into those cases, to your knowledge?

MR. JORDAN: Local authorities were

called in.

MR. ROSE: And their investigation came to zero?

MR. JORDAN: Right. In terms of any, as I said, additional things, like cross burnings and beatings, we have not been advised of those yet, but I think at this point that at least with the investigation and our coming to the universities and spending the hours, at least the university people, I think, were put on notice that this is serious stuff, and even internally with their own people I think the word has gone out to be vigilant with regards to those kind of activities. So even at this point we're -- so I'm somewhat pleased and at least sense that the universities are taking us very serious about this.

And once again, not being a part of their discussions or cabinet meetings, but it's my thought, my feeling, and also from the committee, that people have gone back and said to the staff members that "We've got to get a handle on this to make sure we'll be more vigilant; let the word go

Ξ

out that we're not going to have our university be labeled as someone who is tolerating." That's at least my feeling on this one.

Another thing that's happened is that at least Purdue University has actually put on -- an African-American male has been put on the board of trustees, and when we were there that was not the case, no one. So at least I think that there's some movement. Once again, if we have people of color sitting in positions of leadership making policies, I think that those things are going to be at least addressed in a more aggressive way.

MR. ROSE: You don't find an attitude among the administrators or the local law enforcement officials that these are college pranks and these are just college kids, and they have to take it with a grain of salt?

MR. JORDAN: I think that's -- I think that's -- I think that's -- well, at least at Purdue -- and we have a number of articles and in my position now where things I think that have a racial connotation because university -- at least my understanding that police officials say "Well, that's" -- you

_ _ _

know, "That's a university issue and it's not our concern." That's the feeling I got, and of course when things happen off campus, the university people are telling me "Well, it didn't happen on campus, so therefore it's the city's concern."

So really getting both of those groups to understand that if something happens off campus that has racial connotations to it, both groups have responsibility for it, and one says "Well, it did happen on campus, so therefore it's a city issue," and the city people say "Well, it happened on campus, and it's not our issue." That's what we picked up in talking to individuals in our investigation.

So we're trying to get them to understand that if it happened in Lafayette, whether it be on campus or off campus, both of you have responsibility for it, and so we're getting both of those powers to understand that if they said it was racial in nature, whether it happened on campus or off campus, that both have responsibility for investigating and bringing the culprits to justice.

_ _ _

MR. ROSE: Has the university to your 1 knowledge made it a part of student orientation at 2 universities that hate crimes either against 3 persons or property are not only violations of the 4 university rules but are criminal offenses and will 5 6 be prosecuted? MR. JORDAN: I couldn't respond to 7 that at this time in terms of whether or not that 8 is part of the orientation package for all incoming 9 freshmen, I don't know that right now. 10

MR. ROSE: Have you asked for anything like that to be made a part of orientation packages?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. JORDAN: In our -- in our -- no,

I guess it's not. It's not part of our general

recommendations at this point, but once again, as I

said, when we finally put this whole piece

together, it will be something that probably should

be included, and I'll make a note of that. I think

Mike had a question.

MR. GRADISON: No.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you very much, Mr. Jordan. We look forward to your report.

1 MR. ROSE: Thank you. 2 MR. GRADISON: Thanks. 3 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: At this time we'd 4 like to ask Mr. Sam Jones, executive director of 5 the Indianapolis Urban League, to be available. For the record let me correct my introduction, 6 Mr. President. 7 MR. JONES: It doesn't matter, I've 8 been called worse. You know that. I'm from 9 Heidelburg, Mississippi, so you know I've been 10 called worse. 11 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: President of the 12 13 Indianapolis Urban League. (Off the record discussion.) 14 MR. JONES: Thank you, Chairman 1.5 My name is Sam H. Jones and I'm President 16 Hollis. of the Indianapolis Urban League, as you've 17 indicated. The Urban League is a nonpartisan, 18 interracial, non-profit community service 19 20 organization, and our mission is aimed at the elimination of racial discrimination, increasing 21 22 economic and political empowerment of

African-Americans and other minorities, and in

23

. 4.

short, helping those minorities to enter the mainstream of American life or community life, depending upon how you want to look at it.

Let me say that I'm pleased to be here because one of my former bosses, Mrs. Parker, who is chairperson of our board, is on this Commission, and my partner and co-chairperson of the Indianapolis Law Enforcement Coalition, Mike Gradison, is a member of that Commission, and your chairperson and I serve on the board of the Indiana Academy, which is located on the campus at Ball State University, which is an unusual high school that's looking for unusual students, so if you have unusual students that you'd like to see get an unusual education, let us know and we'll take care of them. I do not know the other two members, but my pleasure to meet you for the first time and to share with you today.

We all know that race, color, however
you want to look at it, is a serious problem in
Indianapolis, the state of Indiana, and indeed
America. What was started -- and I only use 1960.
I could go back to 1619, but I just began for our

own discussion here what started in the 1960s has not been finished, obviously, not by a long shot.

The racial flareups in Indiana on
Indiana college campuses about which you've heard
already during the years of 1988, '89, and '90, and
sporadically in Indianapolis over the past 25 years
and in our high schools last year and in prior
years is our evidence that much work needs to be
done before we can experience racial and ethnic
harmony, at least in my view, in our city, in our
state, and in our nation.

In many ways the black-white situation is worse today than in the 1960s. According to the 1988 Committee of Cities Report, which is a very good report, by the way, the polarization between the black and white communities is much more pronounced now than in the 1960s.

The conclusion that can be reached, at least from my vantage point, is that we've made very little progress in eliminating race and racism from our daily lives locally and nationally. We've failed to get to the root of the problem, again in my opinion.

Many people thought that through the long-needed legislation, and I guess I was one of those also at the time, passed in the 1960s that we had solved the problem. We can hastily and proudly cite, for example, as a result of much of that legislation gains made by some blacks in politics, in education, in economics, business, military, legal and corporate arenas.

And as I said to a bar -- a publication for the National Bar Association that's meeting here currently, for those of us who stayed in school and got ourselves prepared, we're doing reasonably well, but for the masses of us, for a whole variety of reasons, some of which relates to racial segregation and discrimination, others to economics, are not doing very well, so there's a paradox in the black community in that regard.

The problem persists because we've not addressed it for what it really is, a social disease. Civil rights laws did not curb the growth of the cancer racial hatred and racism because they dealt only with two symptoms of the disease in my view, segregation and discrimination, not the

disease itself.

Growing up on a street in a neighborhood in a city that is infected by the most subtle racial hatred, or racism if you want to call it that, promotes an adversarial attitude of, quote, us and them, end of quote, mentality, that is often acted out on the job, in school, law enforcement, on the playground, and even in church.

And my one major point about church is at 11:00 on Sunday morning is the most segregated hour in Indianapolis in the state of Indiana and the nation and so on, and our media friends locally probably get tired of hearing me say that, but I say it all of the time.

What we need more than anything else, again from my vantage point, is a coming together, quote unquote, the achievement of unity, a sense of oneness, for example, like we had around Desert Storm with reference to this whole business of racial hatred and racism and so on.

The resulting unity, it seems to me, does not mean or imply uniformity. We're not taking away from any ethnic group or racial group

but the coming together as a oneness mentally, but a celebration of diversity, because one of the realities of oneness -- once the reality of oneness is understood, diversity becomes an asset, rather than an obstacle.

My late boss, Whitney Young, who died in an untimely swimming accident in Nigeria in 1979, often reminded us that there is beauty in diversity. What then is the current status of racial hatred and racial acts in a crime in Indianapolis and central Indiana?

Well, within the past months, as I'm sure you've already heard, we've witnessed another police action shooting that implies hatred for black men on the part of the officer, given his neo-Nazi activities and his history of shooting black men in Indianapolis over the past 10 to 15 years, and I have a folder back there with newspaper clippings if anyone would like to see them and I can share with you.

The second incident was that of the burning of a crude cross in front of a halfway house on the southwest side of the city, along with

the firing of a weapon in the air several times and the yelling of racial slurs. Now the police department went down to this incident, and as I understand it they confiscated four weapons from the gentleman who fired the weapons, but he was not arrested until several days later and charged with a criminal act, and there's a problem with that.

The second incident -- the third incident took place within the last two weeks. The second incident took place during the last two weeks, excuse me. The third incident was a shooting into a crowd of angry blacks allegedly protesting the calling of police over a neighborhood dispute involving a dog. Five persons received varying degrees of injury, one of them I believe serious, and there's newspaper evidence to this in my folder in the back.

The fourth incident relates to the fact that a father called me on Monday of this week to report to me an alleged hate incident directed at his son and two other black students in the town of Vincennes, Indiana, where Vincennes University is located, and I can elaborate on that later.

Finally, numerous persons have reported to me within the last several months the shouting of racial slurs from passing cars by white occupants. Let me give you a more personal incident.

My daughter, who now lives in her own place, was visiting our home on Sunday. My wife is gone and I'm the chief cook and bottle washer, along with the dog, and so she came to make sure that I had Sunday dinner, and then she dismounted her car to come into the yard. A car loaded with young white males traveling from north to south was passing, and the gentleman -- a gentleman from the car or the group yelled "Hey, Nigger, what the hell are you doing in this neighborhood? You'd better get your ass off these streets."

Now my daughter is a Harvard-trained undergrad and an IU-trained lawyer, and she was scared to death, and I said "Well, did you get a license plate number? Did you get a description of the car?" She said "Dad, it was so subtle and so quick, and I was so stunned by it, it didn't occur to me to do anything but get the hell in the house

because I was scared to death."

Now coming on the heels of these other incidents there's fear in our community. Obviously there may be fear in the other community, but there's also fear in our community not just among the masses of folk but for those of us who represent the talented tenth of the black community.

Now I told her the next time "I don't give a damn what happens, how afraid you are, get a description of the car, get a license plate number," and if she had gotten a description of the car, I was going to chase the car. I wasn't going to shoot anybody or anything, but I would have got the license plate number and reported it to the police department. That's the thing that does not happen always, so these things do happen but they don't always get reported.

And then I want to tell you about reporting in just a few minutes. What will it take then to overcome racial hatred in our city and in our state and in our nation, at least in the Sam Jones' version? Two things must happen in my

- - -

view.

First we need to have what I call a relocation of the heart built upon mutual trust and respect, following a terrible situation we had in this community some two or three years ago where a young man ended up dead in the back of a police car with his hands cuffed behind his back. This community was torn of asunder, and of course the conclusion was that the young man took his own life.

Dr. Benjamin and a group led a community task force and one of the things that they called for was a program designed to build community respect, mutual respect and understanding between and among citizens. Well, needless to tell you that that effort fell on deaf ears and went under very quickly.

Secondly, in my view we must witness what I call a long and constant pattern of funerals, and you heard me correctly. We must witness what I call a long and constant pattern of funerals. Now why do I come to this conclusion?

Well, I grew up in the South, as I told you

=

earlier, and I don't know about you, but I know a little bit about grass, and I know a little bit about Johnson Grass, which grows under any circumstances. It's tough, it grows through concrete, through asphalt. You put it out over here with pesticide, it comes up over here someplace else. It's hard to kill.

1.3

Well, in my view racism and racial hatred are like Johnson Grass, and I don't care how many programs we have, we're not going to totally eliminate it. Gunnar Myrdal told us that in the 1940s when we brought him here to do an analysis of the racial climate of America in his book "An American Dilemma," and he said what we are calling a race problem is not a black problem, but it's a white problem, and until white attitudes change towards black, we're always going to have racial problems in this country, many of which will border on hate or will end up being hate-like situations.

And so you see, we've got a lot of work to do, folks, and we've got a lot of time to await before we eliminate racial hatred and racism.

Hatred has no mercy for those who refuse to fight

it. It kills any person or group who will not try to disarm it, and I heard the gentleman tell the story about Germany as I was coming in, and he's right.

So parents must teach their children that to hate is to mutilate their own future. If you've seen the play "South Pacific," there's a line in that play that says one has to be taught, one has to be taught to love or to hate, and all too frequently too many people are being taught to hate, and until that situation changes, we still will have problems on our hands.

Teachers must also teach their pupils
that hatred is a negation of every triumph that
cultured civilization may accomplish. To hate,
then, is to opt for the easiest and most
mind-reducing way out of digging a ditch into which
the hater and the victim will both fall like broken
puppets.

Religious hatred makes the face of God invisible, and that's why I keep lifting up the fact that we've got to deal with this whole business of 11:00 on Sunday morning being the most

segregated hour. The church has a tremendous role to play in turning around this mentality.

Political hatred wipes out people's liberties, and the field of science -- and just yesterday the coroner in this community said that he could not make a definitive decision relative to shooting. I was always taught in high school and college that science was exact. Well, he can make one of two decisions, either it didn't happen or it did happen. No, Mister, in between, it seems to me.

And then in literature -- well, let me go back. Let me go -- hatred wipes out liberties and in the field of science hatred inevitably puts itself in what I call death's service. In literature and in history and others it destroys truth, perverts the meaning of the story, hides beauty itself under a thin layer of what I call blood and grime.

And so today, then, we're at the threshold of the 21st Century, and this is what we must tell, it seems to me, all men and women for whom we wish a future as bright as the smiling

faces of our children. If we do nothing, hate will come sneaking in perniciously and slyly into their mouths and into their eyes, destroying the mutual relations between people, cities, towns, the state and the nation.

If we do nothing, then, we will be passing on to the coming century what I call the message of hatred known to us as racism, as fanaticism, as anti-Semitism, along with all of the other arenas of hatred known to humankind.

Therefore, that is why I'm pleased that you are here today convening this hearing on hate crime activity in Indianapolis and in central Indiana.

I'm hopeful that not only will your report generate greater efforts at legislation, such as the legislative effort undertaken by Representative Crawford during the last legislative session but which did not even get out of committee, as I remember it, but must be continued because we've got to have that kind of legislation at the local level, but greater efforts at community education, which includes work by the Urban League, work by churches, work by schools,

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

work by all of us, it seems to me, in terms of trying to be preventive as opposed to being reactive to situations that occur, and to head off the wave of hatred that still stalks the streets, the roads, the highways, the hamlets, the cities and towns of this great state and of this great nation of ours.

Thank you for giving me that opportunity, and I will answer some questions. Before I do, let me just comment. You asked my predecessor who was here at the table about colleges and what they're doing. I just completed a stint on the Board of Visitors at DePauw University, and I know about the ghetto party thing and we went through that, and that required a lot of healing down there as well, and I think that healing is still going on.

But one of the things that the president pushed for and some of us supported was that in the first year of academic work at DePauw, which began I think last year, or maybe it was this past school year, that all freshman would now be required to live in a single freshman dorm and not scattered

_ _ _

about in fraternity houses and in sorority houses as they were before.

And part of the rationale was to be able to provide a consensus community as closely consensus as one could come around a lot issues, some relating to the importance of studying and others relating to building a positive climate of race and human relations.

And it seems to me that this is a positive effort designed to help rid that particular campus because it's indigenous to that campus of some of those prior problems and issues that almost tore that college, that university, apart, and I think we're on a positive trail down there trying to deal with that issue, and I would hope that other colleges and universities might take note of that model, particularly a lot of the private schools. It's probably easier to do among private schools than state schools because of their vastness and the dormitory shortages, and so we built a brand-new dormitory at DePauw expressly for that purpose, and I think in time it's going to pay off in terms of attitudinal changes and the ability

to recognize the beauty of diversity by all students on that campus. I'll take questions. I'm sorry, Mike.

MR. GRADISON: No, that's fine. Do you think -- I know you've talked about it several times and we've had a lot of discussion today in the questions coming to the people who've testified as to the level of so-called hate-generated crimes, and it's been suggested by some of us here that it had probably always been there, maybe along that same level, but we've never tracked that.

MR. JONES: Right.

MR. GRADISON: So what's your feeling about that?

MR. JONES: Well, yeah. You see, I feel the same thing about racism. People talk about the resurgence of racism. There's no resurgence, it's always been there. Racial hatred has always been there, but maybe for various reasons it only surfaced on a sporadic basis and in certain segments of the country; for example, the stalking of Vernon Jordan in Fort Wayne or the stalking of the black male in Missouri, and many

others that could be named around the country, and the continuous efforts of the Klan.

I think reporting has a great deal to do with it. For example, in Indianapolis when a cross is burned you ask for a person to be prosecuted. We don't have an ordinance with reference to a cross burning. We have an ordinance that deals with arson.

And so when a cross is burned and it's investigated, that situation is viewed and counted or tabulated under the label of arson, if you will, and/or vandalism, and so we've got to go back and ensure that local police departments, local law enforcement agencies like police departments and sheriffs' departments, establish a category labeled hate crimes and count those crimes as such.

And sometimes they may not want to count those crimes because if you look at the one incident in Indianapolis where we had an alleged member who was -- an alleged officer who was a neo-Nazi, quote unquote, maybe they don't want to count them because maybe you're counting yourself, you see.

So maybe what we have to do is ask law enforcement agencies to first of all purge themselves and prepare themselves mainly for the counting of hate crimes, because we know they do exist, and then that way then we begin to build a trail.

I don't think we have very much of a paper trail on hate crimes except in the more obvious instances of hate crimes. But many, many more small hate crimes take place in our communities and they don't get counted because we count them under another heading, as I said.

MR. GRADISON: I've got a quick follow-up in that regard.

MR. JONES: And could I just say one other thing, too? From a public policy standpoint it may be difficult to do that because you've got to go through the local legislative body. The Mayor had somebody here before him this morning, as I understand it.

I'm a Rotarian, and at my Rotary Club every other year the Mayor gives what he calls The State of the City Address. During this past

January the Mayor gave his State of the City

Address and listed, among the many issues that

remain to be dealt with in this community, race and

racism and problems relating to race.

Two members of the city council called a press conference a day later and said -- they questioned whether or not the Mayor and they live in the same town. Now if you've got those kinds of people making public policy --

MR. GRADISON: And they don't.

MR. JONES: And of course they don't. You're right, they don't. Well, but they live in the same metropolitan area, but that's for sure, they do that, but they don't live in the same town, you're right, but they live in the same metropolitan area.

But the point being, that they still make public policy for Indianapolis and the metropolitan area, but if you've got people making public policy for the city and the county who have that mentality, then can't you see the difficulty that you may encounter just simply trying to get a mere ordinance to create counting of hate crimes?

See? So there's a lot of work to be done, as I said, in all sectors of our community on this whole business of racism and hate and the hate crime area particularly because that's what you're dealing with here today.

MR. GRADISON: Media obviously plays a very important role. This is my follow-up.

Media plays a very important role.

MR. JONES: Well, I had that as one of my other points, that media is very important and they can do an awful lot to lift up, heighten the awareness of not only the existence of hate crimes but the importance of building bridges of understanding between and among racial and ethnic groups, but they argue that they can't do this at prime time because, you know, it costs money and sponsors won't pay for it and so on, and so what we've been doing is seeing more public radio and public television running more of these special programs and projects.

But I think our major media outlets, particularly on the television because it's been proved that people do watch television more than

they read and so on, and they still listen to radio
to a great extent, so those two media sources can

play a tremendous role in education on the one hand
and on the other hand in digging out facts and
helping us garner facts to identify and verify many
more hate situations than perhaps --

MR. GRADISON: Sam, my question was a little bit different than that.

MR. JONES: That's okay.

MR. GRADISON: I think the media in some ways, you know, they play up one incident.

Rodney King is an obvious example, and so on. One of the things -- and they're running wild all over the United States. There's obviously a very serious police problem with regard to racist issues and so on, but I think especially because of that peculiar phenomenon that occurred out there it of course attracted some extraordinary national notoriety and so on. In fact, I think the media -- or, let me ask you that.

Do you think the media basically is not doing a very good job because they're doing this hit-and-miss type of thing and that you're having

on for years and years and years, they're now -because of the marvels of technology, these
portable cameras and so on, they explode in the
public view on the evening newscast?

MR. JONES: Well, yeah, I really think in terms of the media, my answer is that they're in our best efforts are not enough and I say because I could be accused of being a media person too. I do a weekly radio program at a local radio station and I deal with issues. I think we have not done the best possible job that we could do with issues.

And let's face it, the media, whether it's print medium or electronic medium, sensationalism is a great part of what helps generate ratings and sells newspapers and magazines and so on, and so yeah, there is a tendency to focus on those high-profile situations, and once they have abated, then you don't get an awful lot of consistency until another high-profile situation comes along.

I think that the media can do more, just

as well as the Urban League could do more, the NAACP could do more, ADL could do more, citizens can do more, politicians can do more, educators, we all can do more. We're all guilty as far as I'm concerned in this whole process, and we can do more in this whole area as far as that goes.

important part about what we're about today is not only just hearing incidents or gathering facts about incidents around the state but also hearing recommendations for preventing hate crimes, and in your testimony you called for a coming together, the achievement of unity. Could you be more specific about what you meant and what specific kinds of things?

MR. JONES: Well, you know, my view is that leaders like the President of the United States, governors of states, and mayors of cities are what I call cheerleaders, and if cheerleaders buy into a problem or an issue and call for citizens groups to come together to deal with issues, and in this case hate crimes, I think that we could move much faster down the road in terms of

a lot of efforts that should take place.

For example, specific efforts like if
the Governor were to call a forum or create a task
force and have a statewide forum and public
hearings and get recommendations and suggestions,
or a conference on hate and hate crimes in Indiana,
for example, and then resulting from that a laundry
list of recommendations, like work in the schools
with children or in calling on churches to speak
out more against hate crimes, or calling for
legislation, as I said the Crawford bill, and/or
let it be known from his chair that the state of
Indiana will not tolerate hate crimes within the
state of Indiana no matter where they take place.

I think these kinds of efforts will go a long ways toward helping to get citizens -- to heighten the awareness of the issue, No. 1, and secondly to get citizens turned on and to begin to do their own things.

For example, I think, again, issues like in Indianapolis we have what we call a blackJewish dialogue. I'd like to see that expanded to become a black-Jewish-gentile dialogue so that

. - -

local citizens will come together and deal with hate crimes across the board, but those are the kinds of things that can be done even without the cheerleader calling for it together. I think it helps when the cheerleader sets the pace.

When Bill Hudnut made that speech in January and lifted up race and racism as one of the issues in this community, for many of us in the community that was a plus because that was one of the first times in my 25 years in this community that a political leader has stood before 800 or more people and talked about race and racism as being a problem in this community and that this community ought to rise up in righteous indignation and do something about it.

Now we haven't done an awful lot about it since January 1991, but at least the Mayor did take that posture, and I think in a small way in little vacuums around the community some programs and some projects have begun to take on this issue.

For example, in our law enforcement task force, we're not only concerned about police action

shootings, we're also concerned about hate crimes

The black-Jewish dialogue came about because we are

concerned about hate crimes directed at blacks and

Jews, and I'm saying we should expand that.

So you see, things are happening,

Mr. Hughes, but I don't think that we're getting

our direction, our signals, our directions of

leadership from our cheerleaders with the strength

that I think we got say from Desert -- the

President and Desert Storm.

We rallied this nation as this nation has never been rallied before, and you see, if we take that kind of concerted effort, we can do it, or in the case of Kennedy when Kennedy was President, remember Russia had just sent up sputnik and we were crying in our beer that Russia beat us into outer space, and Kennedy came along and said in 15 years we're going to have, in this case, quote unquote, a man on the moon, and then in less than 15 years we pull together money, we pull together the brightest minds, and we had the commitment of the President's office behind that effort, and, dammit, the issue -- the project got

implemented in less than the 10 to 15 years that was projected.

And I think if we had that kind of commitment from leadership, political leadership, from clergy leadership, religious leaders, the judicatory leaders, particularly the bishops and so on of the major judicatories, whether Protestant or Catholic, and the Jewish leadership with the synagogues and temples and so on, I think that we could rally people together and begin to deal with this.

But remember now that even if we do
that, racism and hatred and hate crimes are like
Johnson Grass, they're going to be a long time
being eliminated, but we should try, we should not
sit back and say "let somebody else do it," we
should do it ourselves, and I think the time is now
for that to happen.

MR. GRADISON: Does that mean we should make wars to pull the country, and get rich, up on a regular basis?

MR. JONES: I think maybe we should do something, you know, and I think also -- you

know, I'm not being facetious when I suggest that we have to have a lot of funerals. I think a lot of people have been so ingrained and so entrenched negatively about blacks, about Hispanics, about Jews, about women, and others in the minority communities.

But I'd stick to right now race and gender because most of the hate situations tend to take place around race and gender, although increasingly we see from the Gay community more hate situations taking place from that vantage point, and I think that people are -- that hatred is so entrenched and so ingrained that an awful lo of funerals have got to take place.

Undertakers are not going to go out of business for a while, and until that happens, we're always going to be faced with some form of hate crime or hatred in our community. But I appreciate what you're doing and I think we're on the right track in doing what you're doing. Thank you so much. Call on the Urban League to help where we can.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you.

MS. PARKER: And, Sam, the next time you come, please do not make your commercials about Ball State and DePauw unless you're going to give other institutions equal time. You've done a good job of recruiting today. MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Parker. Thank you. Your point's well taken. MS. PARKER: No, you see I'm from another institution. MR. JONES: Well, you're okay, you're

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

all right.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: At this time we'd like to invite Mr. Amos Brown, the station manager from WTLC, to join us. We'd like to start by offering our appreciation of your patience. I know we're running a little behind schedule. Hopefully we haven't thrown you too off.

(Off the record discussion.)

MR. BROWN: Chairperson and members of the committee, I thank you for the opportunity to address you on the subject of the rise of hate crimes here in Indiana, and I speak to you today from two perspectives, that as the station manager and the management of WTLC radio station, which is the radio station that serves and services the African-American communities of Indianapolis and throughout central Indiana. I also speak to you as the institution in the Indianapolis black community that is the repository of facts, information and data on our black community.

There has been -- ever since our radio station has been in existence in Indianapolis some 23 years, there have been reported hate crimes here in our community. While we have not had many cross burnings, while we've not had white neighborhoods in turmoil or in riot when blacks move in, as they have in other cities, we here in the central part of the state have had problems.

They've tended to be under the surface, under the veneer. They've tended to be subtle.

They've tended to be isolated. Yet when you look at it cumulatively, they add up.

For example, in the mid '70s and early '80s there were serious problems of public access and public accommodation in Indianapolis night spots. Several bars and nightclubs in this city

Ξ

were civilly sued and cited by the state Civil
Rights Commission and by the state Alcoholic
Beverage Commission over racism and illegally
denying blacks access.

At our radio station we average at least two complaints a month of discrimination. These are people who feel aggrieved enough that they don't know who to call, so they call us, and it's usually in the area of employment. Usually I end up talking to these individuals, and in many cases in talking to them it's clear that there was no overt illegal discrimination, but that there was harassment and a feeling that, quote, you don't belong occur, and perhaps a subtle hate crime was actually committed.

Just the past three months we have received an above-average number of calls concerning neighborhood racial harassment in just two Indianapolis changing neighborhoods. Part of the problem of hate crimes in the city is city leadership, they don't know where the changing neighborhoods are.

To give you an example, two of these

neighborhoods are the near-eastside, or as it's commonly known, the Tech High School/Brookside Park area, and out in the city of Lawrence. We at WTLC anticipated that problems would occur in these two areas because of our intimate knowledge of the demography of Indianapolis, both black and white. City and civic leadership didn't because they still don't understand the changing nature of the city because there are some contradictions and paradoxes of the Indianapolis African-American community.

One reason in our opinion that hate crimes may be on the rise in this state are that blacks are moving towards the center of Indiana.

Dr. Jerry McKibbon, who's the demographer at Indiana University, cites results from the 1990 census indicating that blacks are moving out of Lake County, out of the smaller cities of the state, and coming here to Indianapolis.

Newly-released census data for the city show huge increases in black population during the 1980s, increases of 30, 40, and 50 percent or more among black men and women age 30 to 44. This is partly a result of strong migration, in-migration

to Indianapolis from the rest of the state or from other areas of the country.

There's another paradox. According to 1990 census data used for redistricting, fully one-third of the Indianapolis black population lives in white-majority neighborhoods or precincts. It's an increase of 20 percent from 1980 and an increase of 114 percent from 1970.

In the past 30 years the Indianapolis black community, which used to be in a tightly segregated, small geographic area, has broken out and spread in all directions of Marion County, especially to the northeast, north, and northwest.

Let me go back to these neighborhoods where just recently we've heard examples of hate crimes. The near-eastside/Brookside Park area ten years ago was less than 5 percent black. It is one of the poorest areas of our city, consisting of underclass whites and poor working class whites, a few middle-class white suburban homesteaders.

Sometime in 1987 or 1988, as available housing for low income people or the black working poor became unavailable in black areas, and as the

the north increased, blacks slowly began to move south of Interstate 70 and Massachusetts Avenue and into the near-eastside/Brookside Park area.

The turnover was very gradual. Our staff discovered it in mid-1989, and first we sort of dismissed it. We knew that blacks in Indianapolis were moving into middle-class and affluent white areas, but we did not know they were moving into lower-income neighborhoods, and usually when lower-income blacks move into lower-income white neighborhoods, trouble will start.

When we received the census results this February, we saw that this was a neighborhood now that some of the areas were as much as 20 to 25 percent black, and it was just after this that we began to receive reports of racial harassment in these areas.

Another example, even though

Indianapolis is a consolidated city, there are
three towns that have their own Mayor and police
force, Speedway, Beech Grove, and Lawrence. 20
years ago the city of Lawrence was virtually all

white. Today it is 10 percent black. In fact, the black population inside the city of Lawrence grew by 34 percent in just ten years.

A week ago a woman called me about a racial harassment problem she had in Lawrence city. Neighbors were harassing her about her dog. She got rid of the dog, but the neighbors were white, still hassling her. She called the Lawrence Police but they would do nothing, yet there are no minorities in the Lawrence Police or the city administration, and since it's a part but not a part of Indianapolis, there isn't much the Mayor's office downtown could do.

The city of Lawrence doesn't even have a civil rights or Human Rights Commission, yet the black population in the city of Lawrence will continue to increase during this decade, but there's no infrastructure in city government or in that community that can protect black citizens of Lawrence with problems of racial harassment or hate crimes.

And when a neighborhood had a problem like the near-eastside, or the recent incident

which you heard about with a cross burning at the homeless shelter, we currently have no interracial task force or group of church or community workers ready to go into that neighborhood and attempt to work things out. So what happens is people call the police. The presence from the police can sometimes tend to make the problems worse even if the police are professionally doing their job.

I mentioned before a lack of civic and city awareness of the minority community, and this I think is the biggest problem we as a city face in solving the problem of hate crimes in this city and statewide.

The majority community has been brainwashed by their own media and from a lack of direct knowledge or understanding that Indianapolis is a major American city with complex demography, and as a result many of the majority community, including political and civic leaders, still feel that the black community is predominantly poor and that we all live in the so-called inner-city.

Our city, political and civic leadership, for example, don't realize that the

Ξ

black community of Indianapolis is the 16th largest in the country; that more blacks live in Indianapolis than live in Newark or Oakland or Birmingham, Alabama, or even Gary.

Local media, newspapers and television, view the black community as a cipher. It is covered when there's crime or controversy but never to explain changing demography, changing life-styles, or changing patterns in the community.

Indianapolis is unique among midwestern cities. Other than Detroit, Indianapolis has the highest percentage of black homeownership of any midwestern city, and we have the highest percentage of living in a home, owned or rent, than any city. Indianapolis has the highest percentage of black married couple families than any midwestern city; in some cases 40 percent higher than cities like Chicago, Detroit, or Milwaukee.

We have the lowest percentage of black single female headed families than in any midwestern city, and as I mentioned earlier, a third of the black community lives in majority white areas, while just 57 percent of the community

lives in segregated, 70 percent or more, black areas.

part of the problem also is that in some industries and employment categories black employment is declining, not increasing. Even in my own industry, broadcasting, which has strong EEO guidelines, black employment is flat and advancement is nil. So in this context of a complex black community, yet with no understanding and appreciation of this complexity by whites, that causes a fertile breeding ground in our opinion for hate crimes.

So what can you do? We offer these concrete steps for you to recommend. That the Governor of Indiana should convene a special state commission to investigate this problem, a commission consisting of blacks and whites and Hispanics from across the Hoosier state, and that the commission should be empowered to prepare specific recommendations and legislation to curb hate crimes and begin to foster racial understanding and harmony in the state.

In Indianapolis we are constantly

forming special committees and task forces to deal with everything from let's have a golf tournament to let's fix up downtown, to let's help literacy. We have no special committee or task force dealing with race relations.

We would hope that this committee and commission will strongly recommend to the next Mayor of Indianapolis, as well as to the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, and to the civic and religious leadership of this community that a blue-ribbon citywide task force be formed immediately to look at and deal with the issue of race relations in this community.

On balance, we still have an opportunity to nip these problems in the bud, but until we recognize that there is a problem in Indianapolis, it's not going to get done. Thank you for your time. I'll answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you for your presentation. Questions?

MS. PARKER: I just was thinking the demographics --

MR. BROWN: Well, that's why we wanted the opportunity because sometimes people have perceptions of a community and I think that is part of the problem. This community, black community, is growing at a rate over ten years of 9 percent faster than the white community, people moving in all areas.

And as I was telling somebody at one of the television stations earlier, a lot of the problems that precipitate hate crimes in our opinion are the normal problems of living with other people and then you just overlay race and negative perceptions on top of that.

Somebody calls and says "My neighbors are complaining about my dog." Well, that could happen in any neighborhood, or it's the typical Hoosiers don't like change, and when a new neighbor comes in a neighborhood, I don't care whether it is a white in Elwood or a black on the near-eastside, you're going to be a little suspicious; is this new neighbor going to be one of the girls and the boys?

And then all of sudden cultures clash or lack of understanding, then the chicken comes home

to roost and you have a problem, but if you don't have any mechanism to go into that neighborhood and calm them down, or when the police come they're all one to a car, they're just there trying to keep a riot from starting instead of sitting down and trying to counsel them.

It's almost like the television show
last week that talked about police in London where
they spent most of their time separating both
parties to calm them down and talk to them, not
wanting to arrest them, to just find out what the
situation is. We don't have that kind of
infrastructure here.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Brown, in the data that you presented you suggest that there may be some evidence that income and violence may be closely related in the areas -- and I'm sorry, I'm not that familiar with Indianapolis, but you suggest that there are a couple of areas where there is significant black mobility and low-income white areas, I think it was the eastside.

MR. BROWN: Eastside.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Okay. Do you feel

that the number of incidents are more predominant in lower-class blue-collar neighborhoods than in suburban middle-class?

MR. BROWN: We rarely get those kind of, quote unquote, hate crime complaints or hearing that kind of feedback from a middle-class apartment complex, or from a person who bought a 70 or \$75,000 home in a subdivision. They tend to happen in either at the workplace or they happen in these lower/middle-class neighborhoods.

We used to colloquially call the near-eastside area Kentucky, that was the kind of local -- some would say it's a derogatory term, or Tobacco Row. That's what the neighborhood's called, and we knew if a black folk ever moved into that neighborhood, you going to have a problem, and it just happened very slowly.

It wasn't like one day thousands of families or several hundred moved in there, it was a slowly evolving thing, and now it has reached a point where it's not one family on a block, it may be two, three, or four, and I think downtown just hasn't recognized that yet. Yes, sir?

MR. ROSE: My question is not directly related to hate crimes, but it's directed -- relates to your testimony, and I'm just interested, very interested in the statistics, none of which I knew. The rapid growth of the black community in Indianapolis, to what do you ascribe it? You know, are we doing something right or are conditions so terrible elsewhere that they're taking a lesser of two evils? Is there more or less economic opportunity here? What brings these people to Indianapolis?

MR. BROWN: I think, one, it is the lack of -- for those that are from Indiana it's the lack of opportunity in the Muncies and the Kokomos and the Terre Hautes and the Andersons, and Indianapolis is where the jobs are. The same could be true from the northwestern part of the state, and then as the economy -- as industries have come here to town, they have imported minorities from other cities.

So in the '80s there was a sharp increase in African-Americans, whether they were single, whether they were young married couples,

moving to Indianapolis from other parts of the country and other parts of the state. We kind of felt it, we kind of knew it. We just are now seeing the manifestations of it in the census.

So on one level that's good. On another level and what we're also looking at is there is declining population among 18 to 24-year-olds, and we're not sure whether these are negative and again lack of opportunity or perceived opportunity are causing them to move elsewhere, but there has been sharp what we call in-migration coming into the marketplace and these are smaller households, so they're not bringing families of three or four or five, and the nature of the large black family of six or seven people is not the case anymore. It's very complex.

MR. ROSE: Would you ascribe the in-migration to economic factors or --

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. ROSE: -- some other factors?

MR. BROWN: It's lack of available --

lack -- those that are from Indiana, lack of something where you lived, so you come to

Indianapolis, and this is also true for whites because there has been a huge increase in the same age ranges, about 25 to 44, who have moved to Indianapolis, and I didn't realize it. IU had to tell me that.

And then what has surprised Indiana
University is that the pattern is similar for
blacks, so they are expecting and I'm expecting
when the income data is released that there's going
to be a sharp increase in middle-income
African-American households somewhere between 20
and \$50,000.

MR. ROSE: Second factor, although I don't have any data, but the outflow of young single blacks I think would hold true for the white community equally the same. Most of the parents I know, their children who are white, children educated here and live elsewhere.

MR. BROWN: The strangest thing -- and I just finished a graph before I came down here. The same age groups that gained and lost during the decade are identical for white and black. That is highly unusual.

Any explanation? MR. ROSE: 1 MR. BROWN: Don't know yet. 2 as I find out, we'll let you know. It's like a 3 mystery puzzle. 5 MS. SCHMITT: I'm curious because you seem to be knowing a lot of statistics. As you 6 know, our focus today is hate crimes. 7 MR. BROWN: Yes, ma'am. 8 MS. SCHMITT: And we've heard all 9 morning -- you haven't been here all morning I 10 quess -- but about three or four instances over and 11 over and over again, this cross burning, and I keep 12 13 hearing about these three or four and I --MR. GRADISON: Because it's the most 14 recent I think is what it is. 15 16 MS. SCHMITT: But I keep thinking, you know, the Johnson Grass example; you're never 17 going to get rid of all of the bad apples in the 18 Do you think -- are hate crimes a real, 19 barrel. 20 real problem in Indianapolis? 21 MR. BROWN: I think that hate crime is not yet a real problem. I think there is a lot 22 of subsurface racism and then overlay on that, 23

similar to the Mayor's remarks, lack of civility under the surface.

You know, we've heard of incidences where, you know, whites will lean out of the car "Hey, Nigger," this kind of stuff, so there's a lot of that still on the surface. I think a lot of people forget there's a lot of southern in Indianapolis as opposed to northern.

What happens is because this is still under the surface and an actual hate crime is still rare, when a cross is burned on a slow news day, "God, a cross burn, that's news," you see what I'm saying?

MS. SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Or "neighbor harassed, that's news," and then the media tends to blow it up.

MR. GRADISON: That's what we just talked about.

MR. BROWN: But there's no countervailing, there's no "Let's look at the demography. Is there a growing middle-class?"

There's no counter-balance.

MR. GRADISON: You don't see behind, 1 2 you. 3 MR. BROWN: Yeah. So what happens is peoples' top-of-mind awareness, but I would say 4 that unless some things are put in place to nip it 5 6 in the bud, what will happen is if it's not arrested and people feel I can burn a cross and get 7 away with it, that perhaps because they found the 8 alleged person, you know, that may send a signal 9 10 you don't do that here. 11 MR. ROSE: Exactly. I can testify to The fact that hate crimes are relatively 12 that. rare here and as you say should be nipped in the 13 14 bud, I'm spending a great deal of my time in other 15 cities that I won't name where racial polarization 16 has really become an issue, political and 17 otherwise, and the hate crime situation is so much 18 more prevalent, such as murders, drive-by shootings of unknown parties. 19 20 MR. BROWN: It still -- it still 21 looks --22 MR. ROSE: And we have a lot to be

thankful for and a lot to protect and a lot to try

23

to prevent, and I think that should be our focus.

much. We are going to take a lunch break. We are scheduled to come back at 1:15. I'm going to suggest that we come back and try to start at 1:30. We'll be 15 minutes late, and that will give us a chance to swallow something quickly. I'd ask you to try to get back about 1:25 so that we can try to start promptly at 1:30. Thank you.

(A lunch recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Good afternoon.

We'd like to reconvene the Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Before picking up again for our afternoon session, I would again like to remind everyone of the ground rules; that this is a public meeting open to the media and

the general public. We have a full schedule of

people who will be making presentations.

We will be able to hear brief

presentations from persons who have not been

invited at the end of the session. Before I

recognize anyone, if there is anyone who would like

to address the body but has not -- we've not

contacted you, we ask that you meet with Pete
Minarik, our staff person, who just stepped out of
the room and will be back, the guy that was running
around the back of the room, if you would meet with
Pete to review your proposed statements.

Written statements may be submitted either while we are here or by mail to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 175 West Jackson, Suite A-1332, Chicago, Illinois 60604. The record for this meeting will be closed on August 31st, 1991.

The topic which we are -- which is under consideration for our forum is hate crimes in Indiana. We've defined hate crimes as the inciden of violence or intimidation motivated by bias, hatred, or prejudice, based on some characteristic of the victim.

During these proceedings we'd like everyone to keep in mind that the scope of this forum is statewide; that the forum is not necessarily limited to hate crimes committed by whites; and that we are attempting to gather information of specific incidents wherever possible, specific reasons for the increase, as

well as motivations as to how to alleviate or 1 prevent hate crimes. 2 3 We are going to deviate just slightly 4 from our agenda, and at this time we would like to invite Mr. Robert Epstein, chairman of the Ohio, 5 Indiana, Kentucky Regional Advisory Board to the 6 7 Anti-Defamation League. 8 MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you, 9 Mr. Chairman, and I also appreciate the indulgence 10 of --11 MR. ROSE: Bob, would you use that microphone so the people in the back can hear you? 12 13 MR. EPSTEIN: This? 14 MR. ROSE: I think so, yeah. 15 MR. EPSTEIN: Okay. Is that better? MR. ROSE: I hope so. 16 MR. EPSTEIN: Usually my voice is 17 loud enough that it can be heard, but if you can't 18 19 hear in the back, I'll try to refocus the 20 microphone. 21 Mr. Chairman and members of the 22 committee, my name's Robert Epstein, Bob Epstein, 23 chairman of the Civil Rights Committee of the Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky Regional Advisory Board to the Anti-Defamation League for B'nai B'rith.

For those that are not familiar with the ADL, we are the second largest civil rights organization in the United States, and we do monitor hate crimes both nationally and of course in the state of Indiana, which is part of what we do.

We also have an international section who do a great deal in the area of education. We have a major program underway right now called The World Indifference, which addresses prejudice, hate, in a positive way to try to break down those stereotypes.

We at the Anti-Defamation League appreciate this opportunity to address the Indiana Advisory Committee. I want to, for purposes of my address, speak mostly about anti-Semitic incidents, but there will be of course opportunity to address hate crimes in general as well.

In recent years our agency has witnessed an upsurge in the number of acts of ethnic threats, harassment, and battery. For the last twelve years

the league has been collecting and reporting statistics on the number of anti-Semitic incidents that are reported to our regional offices around the country.

During 1990 the number of anti-Semitic incidents, in particular in the United State's, climbed to a record of 1685 episodes. These incidents were reported to the ADL from 40 states and the District of Columbia. The overall total represents an 18 percent increase over 1432 such incidents reported in the year of 1989, and this represents the highest total ever reported since ADL began collecting this information.

Of the total 1685 incidents reported,

927 were acts of vandalism, the second highest ever
in this category, which were directed at Jewish
institutions, Jewish-owned property, and other
public locations.

The vandalism total for 1990 is 10

percent higher than the 845 reported the year

before. Included in this category are 38 serious

crimes, the same as the record-high total reported

in '89 of arson, bombing, and cemetery

desecration.

In the category of harassment, threats and assault, another record total was reported in 1990. There were 758 such incidents in which Jewish individuals and their institutions were menaced by mail or phone threats, verbal abuse, and even physical assault. Incidents in this category have jumped by over 29 percent over the year before.

What about Indiana? In this state in 1990 there was a decrease in the number of anti-Semitic incidents reported to our regional headquarters in Columbus. The survey revealed a total of ten incidents reported, including three vandalism and seven harassments and threats.

Although this represents a decline from the 15 incidents in '89, several of these, especially those reported at Indiana University in Bloomington, were quite troubling. Several of these cases are worth noting in some detail here.

In November of 1990 temple B'Nai Israel in Kokomo was vandalized. Two outside glass showcases for announcements were broken with

rocks. Rocks were thrown into the temple's stained-glass windows. A large swastika and two smaller ones were carved with a pocket knife into the front doors of that temple.

There have also been a number of episodes at IU in Bloomington where predominantly Jewish fraternities, the campus Jewish center, that is the Hillel, and various university structures were vandalized with anti-Semitic, racist, and homophobic graffiti.

In fact, only three weeks ago a similar incident occurred. The S A M, Sigma Alpha Mu fraternity, and the ZBT house were vandalized with swastikas. Jewish communal institutions in both Bloomington and Indianapolis are regular targets of anti-Semitic hate mailings. It should be noted that these mailings are only counted as one incident for purposes of our annual audit.

In 1990 synagogues in Lafayette,

Indianapolis, and Bloomington received vicious

anti-Israel and anti-Semitic mailings and telephone

calls. In '89, as I stated earlier, Indiana

experienced a total of 15 such episodes and 11 of

these were harassments and threats.

The vandalism figure remained unchanged from '88, but the harassment figure increased by nine incidents. Especially troubling was the vandalism of Temple Israel in Valparaiso and the threatening of Fort Wayne's congregation B'Nai Jacob by a gunman wearing battle fatigues, a beret, and a bandanna over the lower half of his face who came to, quote, shoot some Jews.

In addition there was a number of harassing anti-Semitic letters and phone calls received by rabbis and other Jewish leaders in a number of cities around this state, including South Bend, Fort Wayne, Bloomington, Indianapolis, and Nashville, Indiana.

In this context it should be noted that in 1983 the synagogue in Bloomington was set fire by a member of an anti-Semitic hate group known as The Covenant, The Sword, and The Arm of The Lord. This was by our recollection the most serious anti-Semitic incident in the entire midwest in the past ten years, and parenthetically, I had the job of investigating that particular crime, along with

the FBI. It took several years before the people that were responsible were brought to justice, and they were tried, although out of the state of Indiana.

While ADL's audit of anti-Semitic incidents are not comprehensive and represent only those that are reported, they do serve as a barometer for describing and measuring racial and religious intolerances in this country. On a national level the increases in the quality and severity of these incidents are quite disturbing to the league.

What are the trends that we see? These statistics reflect several national trends that are worth noting. In recent years there has been a particularly unsettling increase in the number of anti-Semitic racist and other bias-motivated incidents occurring on U.S. college campuses, up by more than a third in 1990 over the past year or the year before.

In one sense this is perplexing in light of the advance that we see in the openness of college campuses. They're also occurring at a time

when the universities themselves have achieved unprecedented racial diversity and when university administrators are stating vigorously to students the importance of concepts such as diversity, pluralism, and the appreciation of difference. Still we're faced with this continuing increase in hate crimes and vandalism and problems on the campus.

In addition there has been a resurgence of anti-Semitic incidents motivated by the events in the Middle East, and in the past year these were related to the Persian Gulf Crisis. Between January and August of this year there were approximately 20 incidents of anti-Israel pro-Palestinian threats against Jews and graffiti on synagogues or other Jewish property.

With the onset of the Persian Gulf
Crisis and efforts by anti-Israel forces to link
Iraq's invasion of Kuwait with the Arab-Israeli
conflict, we saw an additional 25 anti-Semitic
incidents which contain references to those events
by the end of 1990. There were also several
regional incidents in January of '91 related to the

-

outbreak of the Gulf War.

On a more positive note, the skinhead related anti-Semitic incidents are down significantly, although skinhead activity remains a major concern. We see that effective law enforcement action at both the federal, state, and local levels against violent neo-Nazi skinhead activity has sent a firm and clear message to these groups, and that is the message that this type of behavior will not be tolerated.

Another resounding message to the hate movement to consider the serious consequences of their conduct was communicated in 1990. The successful civil suit against Tom Metzger (phonetic), his son John, and two neo-Nazi skinheads in Portland, Oregon resulted in a multi-million dollar damage verdict in favor of the estate of a black man from Ethiopia whose brutal murder was motivated by bigotry. ADL participated in this suit, as well as the Southern Poverty Center, as I understand it. This victory will surely have a resounding impact on the skinhead movement around the country.

One other positive thing that we see in the ADL is the new federal Hate Crime Statistic Act which goes a far way to helping us gauge and understand the extent and nature of hate crime in this country. The information gathered by this Act will help us to focus attention on the need for direct action to address the far-reaching implications of crimes prompted by prejudice.

I think in the interest of time I would like to stop there, and I'll be glad to answer any questions that you have both regionally or regarding what's going on in the Indiana scene, if I can help you out.

that I would be interested in hearing a bit more on is you mentioned you felt that the skinhead activities and events were down over previous years.

MR. EPSTEIN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: And you implied that effective law enforcement was sending a message to that group. Do you believe that that is the primary reason for the decrease in those

physical kinds of things or activities relative to that particular group?

MR. EPSTEIN: - Well, as we understand the skinhead movement, there is no national leadership; that there are a group of splinter groups around the country; and that Metzger in particular was quite active in disseminating information and providing methods for these people around the country to do their deeds.

Metzger, I wouldn't say he's been put out of business, clearly that's not the case, but yet I think that this lawsuit in Oregon, which struck him dearly, gave him some pause in terms of disseminating bigotry around the country because that was the basis of that case.

It wasn't that Metzger, either Tom or John -- and I'm not sure how much you know about the Metzgers, but the father actually and unfortunately is from the state of Indiana originally and he since moved to California. I believe he's from the Warsaw area of Indiana.

So we're seeing somewhat of a break-up in the dissemination of this information. Clearly

there will be outbreaks of skinhead activities here and there. There was a serious incident in Indiana either in '89 or '90, and I believe that the gentleman who then was the leader of the group here, Mr. Showalter, was arrested and convicted of possession of some arms. I believe he had a cache of AK-47s.

So that what we're seeing is less activity, but what we see, and I believe this — this is at least my understanding, and I don't purport to be the gospel nationwide, is that it tends to be quite violent; I mean, maybe less, but more violent in propensity, so it's not like we calforget them.

I think you also see different groups go in cycles, and that sometimes a group, whether it be the skinheads or some other group, will peak out and then another group will pop up, so that as an example you'll find almost like an interlocking directorate between and among several of these groups. They carry cards in different organizations.

The Metzgers I believe had some

1.5

affiliation with the Klan way back when and then they became involved with WAR, White Area Resistance movement, and then the son John, along with his father, has been actively involved in propagating information on college campuses, as an example, is what I understand the son's job is.

Does that answer your question?

MS. PARKER: One of the other things we are charged with is developing a set of recommendations. What kind of recommendations would you offer to us that we can include in our report to respond to some of the things you've outlined?

MR. EPSTEIN: Well, enforcement of all statutes and the enactment of other hate crime statutes where they do not -- where they're not presently on the book, and coordination on a state, federal, and local level of law enforcement, training of local, state, and federal law enforcement as to the sensitivity of the issues involved.

And I can give you -- I'd rather speak in generality rather than specifically, but there

and this is not meant as a putdown at all of law enforcement because they were very receptive to this. We have actually done some training of law enforcement in terms of sensitivity of these issues and how to deal with different hate groups, albeit even terrorist groups.

We brought in an expert from Washington, as I recall, that dealt with the -- we had a colloquium -- not a colloquium. We had a meeting of some top law enforcement people, it wasn't a large group, to basically train them in anti-terrorist activity relative to a specific potential incident, thank goodness which never occurred.

MR. ROSE: Excuse me.

MR. EPSTEIN: Mr. Rose?

MR. ROSE: These threats, hate mail and threats, do the postal authorities give you any cooperation? Are there any convictions that ever result against the mailers?

MR. EPSTEIN: The postal authorities do give us assistance, and I don't have the answer

to your second question, I don't know.

I did leave out one important thing, and that is on a broader basis positive educational programs we find to be of extreme importance dealing -- even in -- whether it be with young people in the schools or people that have already been more set in their ways that have prejudice built in, and we have a very large bibliography of materials that our educational department circulates to schools to deal with prejudice with hate crimes.

I'm not sure if I brought any with me.

I did not bring any of that, but I would be more
than happy to leave with you some of our
publications. This one is our 1990 audit of
anti-Semitic incidents, and I'll be glad to leave
this with you, which details more completely what
I've just stated, and this is the '90 report on the
skinheads, which I think also reports state-bystate activity of these groups.

Also with the skinheads, I'm sure you're aware, they move around a lot. An Indiana group may not necessarily do its business here, but make

•

it over to Ohio or Texas, and contrarily a Texas group may come up here and meet with an Indiana group. Yes?

MR. ROSE: You're aware, I'm sure, of the federal law that was enacted last year, the, hate crime reporting. Two-part question. First of all, do you have any knowledge as to whether Indiana law enforcement authorities are in compliance in reporting the hate crimes? And secondly, does ADL -- are you linked into that? You're the best collector of this information in the country. Do your reports go into that media bank which supposedly goes to the FBI?

MR. EPSTEIN: I believe it does go to the FBI, and as far as I know, Indiana is in compliance with this statute, as far as I know.

It's a little early, really, to get the history.

MR. ROSE: Your information is self-collected; it doesn't come from authorities generally, is that correct, as far as incidents and occurrences?

MR. EPSTEIN: Our information is self-collected. We have our own fact-finders. We

do deal very closely with law enforcement. We share information with law enforcement. I hope that answered your question.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: There was some reference to a recent incident here in the city of Indianapolis with a police shooting and references to the potential neo-Nazi activity within the police department. Does your organization have any information relative to these kinds of organizations and operations in the state of Indiana within law enforcement agencies?

MR. EPSTEIN: I don't think that we have any information that has not already been published, let's put it that way. We are very deeply concerned about the incident to which you referred, and let me preface that by saying -- or, let me add to that that I am a volunteer. I'm not on the paid staff, and in view of the fact that this is such a sensitive issue right now, I don't think it would be appropriate for me to comment beyond what public statements have been made by the organization. I hope you understand the sensitivity of what I'm saying.

1 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: I understand what 2 you're saying, yes.

MR. EPSTEIN: But I would add that we are in the forefront of our own investigation into that matter.

MR. GRADISON: That's Officer Sharp?

MR. EPSTEIN: Yes. I would also say
that many times these investigations take a long
time to really bring to a fruition. I can recall
in -- which is difficult for the black community
mostly at this time in Indianapolis.

Let me give you the example of the Bloomington bombing of the temple. They're not exactly corollaries, but there's I think some lesson to be learned from the two.

Part of what we had to deal with in '83 when the synagogue was destroyed was the public relations portion of dealing with the congregants and they couldn't understand why justice wasn't being done and why an arrest wasn't being made and why the crime wasn't being solved. In that case it took three to four years to solve a crime.

Now I'm not stating that in this case

there was a crime, I'm not concluding that, but I'm simply saying that I can understand the sensitivity of the general community, the black and the general community, who is indignant over what happened to Mr. Powell and seeking some type of remedy to that problem, and I can just tell you that it takes a long time for that process to work out. It may never work out to anyone's satisfaction, but it's a very difficult situation. I think that's about all I ought to say on that.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: I would like to request that to the extent that ADL has a public statement that is issued, it would be most appreciated if we could obtain copies of any public positions that you can send to us. Are there any other questions?

MR. GRADISON: I know that Chief
Annee and the City have been very grateful for what
ADL has done with regard to that incident so far.
I take it you're aware of what happened yesterday
with the coroner's report?

MR. EPSTEIN: Yes.

MR. GRADISON: Not surprising --

2 MR. GRADISON: -- at all? Probably political as well. 3 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Well, thank you very much. 5 6 MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you again for allowing me to speak out of turn here because I 7 know that you have a crowded agenda. I will leave Я these with you so that we can enter those into the 9 record. 10 Thanks, Bob. We'd 11 MR. GRADISON: like you also to -- I know Sam and I would both | 12 like you to continue to remain in contact with our 13 coalition. 14 15 MR. EPSTEIN: Sure. CHAIRMAN HUGHES: At this time we'd 16 17 like to call -- we appreciate your patience, it's been appreciated -- Stephanie Turner, President of 18 19 Justice, Inc. 20 MS. TURNER: I have an outline here 21 so that you can follow along with my brief 22 presentation. Now, do I need to --23 (Off the record discussion.)

MR. EPSTEIN:

1

No.

MS. TURNER: Okay. I represent

Justice, Incorporated, and I thank you for calling
on Justice to be represented here at this meeting
today. We consider it very important and hope that

we can make some kind of contribution.

A little bit about Justice. First of all I'll simply read our statement of purpose. It is this: Justice, Incorporated is committed to the attainment of civil rights and social acceptance for Gay, Lesbian, and HIV-positive citizens in Indiana through legislation, political action, and public awareness.

We have been in existence since approximately -- since 1981, and have been lobbying in the Indiana General Assembly since about 1985, and focusing our attention largely on HIV testing and HIV-related issues in the Legislature.

However, we were formed initially with the intention of adding the words "sexual orientation" to the state's Civil Rights Code.

Justice has been -- in the last six

years I would say the incidence of hate crimes has
been more and more brought to our awareness. We

look at hate crimes and consider hate crimes to be physical assault, vandalism to personal property, threat of violence, threat of intimidation, harassment, motivated by fear and hatred of the group in which the individual is perceived to be a member, including Gay men, Lesbians, and people with AIDS.

The important or operative word here in distinguishing Justice's mission from other civil rights advocacy groups is the word perceived to be because not always is it apparent that a person'is Gay or Lesbian and not always is a victim of a hate crime based on sexual orientation an actual Gay; Lesbian, or HIV-positive person, so this is important to note.

Just a little information
statistically. We did at one time in 1988 send out
a survey, a demographic survey to our mailing list,
which consisted of at that time 2400 names. Of
those 2400 individuals, we received responses from
223, which was a 9 percent response rate.

The question in particular I'd like to bring to this forum was "Have you ever been a

victim of violence, harassment, discrimination, or discrimination because of your sexual orientation?" The responses were 21 people indicating yes to that question in regards to physical violence. 124 of those individuals yes to verbal abuse. 25 people responded yes to police harassment, and 27 of those individuals responded yes to property damage.

One thing that is also noteworthy is the extremely small number of people reporting physical violence or property damage to us that did not also report those crimes to their local police departments, a very small percentage of those individuals.

I'm sure I'm repeating some information that you've already heard today, so I'll cover it briefly and then invite your questions. The perpetrators as we see it of hate crimes against Gay, Lesbian, and HIV-positive people or people with AIDS, typically they are not affiliated with a group. They are acting on an individual basis.

They are generally white male conservative fundamentalists, probably -- or, in

-

some cases I guess it wouldn't be safe to say probably, but possibly repressed homosexuals themselves who -- this is all speculation -- have come from repressive backgrounds.

The victims on the other hand, as I've already noted, are not always Gay, Lesbian, or HIV-positive individuals. Generally the higher the profile, the greater the risk the person is putting him or herself under for possible attack or harassment. If someone is considered to be in the closet, then that individual is obviously less likely to be a target.

The more high-profile Gay and Lesbian people are those who attend Gay and Lesbian functions. Those who are involved in their local organizations, those who attend Gay businesses, Gay functions, et cetera, are more likely to be targets. Males who are perceived as effeminate, likewise females who are perceived as masculine, are probably at a higher risk. Any Gay or Lesbian person self-identified who appears on the media, newspaper, radio, TV, is obviously also a target.

I'd like to give you three examples, two

-

of which are I consider to be not typical but nevertheless possible scenarios and then another example, No. 3 here, a typical situation.

In Example No. 1, this woman was pastpresident of Justice, Incorporated, and in 1984 she
was at the time very high-profile in the media.

She had gone on television here in Indianapolis to
debate with a fundamentalist minister some issues
regarding homosexuality, and possibly as a result
of her media exposure she was targeted with a
series of threatening letters. It began with
threatening letters.

She went to the police department and asked for assistance, received none, and after a period of two or three months of threatening letters ceased coming to her home, she felt that she was safe. She actually left her home at that time to go live with someone else in order to try to get security that way.

However, one night as she was leaving her place of work after hours she was forced back into the building and held at gunpoint for three hours, raped repeatedly, and the message of the

attacker was "You will leave here heterosexual or you will die," and when the perpetrator pulled the trigger on the pistol that he had been holding in her head, the back of her head, for the last three hours, when he pulled back the hammer on the pistol, she realized at that point that her life was at stake.

She struggled to get away, there was a little struggle, and eventually she was knocked unconscious and either left for dead or for whatever reason the perpetrator escaped. She was injured. She was, I don't believe, hospitalized, but she was injured after that case. She went on to testify before a federal subcommittee on criminal justice, I believe, to give testimony in regards to her victimization.

Example No. 2 happened in 1990 -- or, 1989, rather, when again a series of messages clearly based on the person's affiliation with a group or with a -- because of sexual orientation, he was the target of a hate campaign that largely focused on his personal property. It began with small incidents like vandalism, which seemed

-

routine, however it escalated to the point where at one point clearly anti-Gay, with the words "fag" spelled out on flowers that he had planted in beds around his home.

Fires were being started on his porch at night. He was essentially held prisoner in his own home. In some instances receiving calls of a threatening nature, and this went on for a couple of months and indeed seemed to be escalating. He contacted the Marion County Sheriff's Department and indicated — also through Justice — indicated his situation and concern that something worse than vandalism to property would occur.

I have a letter here from Justice to the Marion County Sheriff's Department, and in brief

I'll read you some highlights here. The complaint is not so much a listing of the incidents that occurred as it is a complaint against the sheriff's department for its lack of response, which is something I'll address here also in a few minutes.

"In general Mr. Shay, the man in question, feels that your department is not taking the threats against him seriously and that it seems

to be failing to recognize the relationship between the growing number of incidents and that those involved with this case seem not to have what he feels is a true working knowledge of bias-motivated crimes.

He is very concerned that his case has been assigned to a robbery detective and not to a bias crime unit. He states that the officers at the scene have not in at least one instance even left their vehicles, much less collected examples of the readily-available physical evidence.

He complains that he has given the original case number and detective's name to the officers at the scene of subsequent incidents, yet the detective seems to have no knowledge of these.

Mr. Shay tells us that he has given the names of many of the youths reported by others in the neighborhood to be involved in these incidents, as well as the racially-motivated vandalism earlier in the year in that same neighborhood. He gave those names to the detective assigned to his case, but the detective did not contact the individuals or their parents in the seven weeks since those

names were first reported."

So this letter coming from Justice is essentially a plea to the Marion County Sheriff's Department to take swift action to protect what was clearly to us and because of Mr. Shay's diligent documentation of the situation that it was going to become more confrontational than just the vandalism he was incurring on his property.

Eventually Mr. Shay had to sell his.

property and left the neighborhood. Now his

position, why him? Why a victim? I think that in

part he too had an open life-style. He was, in

other words, a well-known Gay man, also a member of

his neighborhood association, and vocal in his

neighborhood association about some concerns that

he had, and I think that the perpetrators in this

case were youths in the neighborhood whose parents

were not really all that involved in their

whereabouts after hours.

Case No. 3 is a typical night at the bar. I could put that in quotes as well because this is the type of thing that I hear about all of the time. It was a typical phone call to me at my

home about 10:30 the other night. This happens all the time. I get calls at home or will get a call at the Justice office.

The situation was simply a patron of a business in Muncie, Indiana who was leaving the business. It was a Gay restaurant and bar. In getting into his car he turned around to see two people, one of whom had some kind of an implement that came shattering down on his windshield and came across his nose, and I think he had to stop the bleeding. I don't think he had to go to the hospital over that. There were shouts of faggot and other types of epithets.

This is a typical scenario. This is in fact so taken for granted by members of our community that the attitude is -- I think the attitude of some of our community members is dangerous because they don't realize that this is an injustice to them, that this is a crime of hate directed toward not them as an individual so much as the whole community, and that we need to take action.

Let me tell you a little bit about some

of the problems we have in the Gay and Lesbian community, in particular reporting and tracking crimes of violence against Gays, Lesbians, and people with AIDS.

One of those problems obviously from the letter that I just read you some highlights from is cooperation or lack of cooperation with local police departments. Some of that lack of cooperation, I think with the Ken Shay case in particular, while this is just random vandalism, "What is the big deal? You're having some vandalism at your house," but they don't see that this is -- these are related incidents; that the level of damage continues to increase, and that in fact the owner of the house is in jeopardy for his well-being, so a lack of seriousness on the part of local police departments in handling the crimes.

Crimes of hate are different than crimes of passion. A crime of passion is generally committed by an individual who knows the other individual and has some kind of angry confrontation. A crime of hate, on the other hand, comes from an anonymous source and is directed to

an anonymous source and is likely to be repeated in the sense that it can be a hate campaign, as I already mentioned; not just a one-time incident, but something that would happen over a period of time targeted to the same individual simply because that individual represents a group. So local police departments need to realize that, and that is one of the reasons why we're having problems with getting them to report the crimes.

Getting them to come and take a crime report obviously is not a problem. If they're called, they'll be there. However, to report it as a bias crime is something that we need to emphasize, particularly since we have federal legislation requiring it now. Local police departments and local civil rights advocacy groups do not always see the need or even the opportunities to work together toward this end of reporting the crimes.

Likewise, a lack of cooperation on the victims is also occurring from the point of view of Justice. One of the things that Justice has attempted to do is indicate "Okay, report the

crime; not necessarily as a bias-motivated crime,
but report the crime."

As I indicated when I first began speaking, some of these physical violence and property damage incidents were not even reported to the police. We've urged our membership and people in contact with us to report these crimes and then come and call us with a dual report so that we, too, can track the crime as a bias crime.

Fear of exposure is another reason why victims do not always want to report the crime.

They don't want any attention given to them. They may consider themselves to be at a risk for losing their job or at a risk for becoming disenfranchised from their family or some other type of situation.

No. 3 reason why victims of bias crimes, particularly if they're Gay or Lesbian, do not wish to report the crime is such that simply they feel that they deserve it in some way, something that we would call internalized homophobia in our community. "Well, that's what I get for going into a Gay bar," or "took my chances." "I've got a little bit, you know, of bruises here. You know,

what the heck? That's part of the whole life-style." That's wrong thinking and that's something that Justice is trying to correct.

. 1

The role of advocacy groups like

Justice, Incorporated and some of the other civil rights groups that Justice works with is, as I mentioned, this dual reporting to try and track the crimes as they occur.

I'm not real happy that I'm unable to bring to you today a trend, statistics that indicate a rise or a stabilization or a decline. I have no idea. All I know is what my sense -- what is going on in the community tells me and that is that there is certainly no decline in hate crimes, in fact there may be a rise. But dual reporting, matching police reports, is something that we have attempted to do.

Obviously workshops, seminars, information, working with the academic community is something that the advocacy groups can do in collecting data. Just this morning I was speaking to a sociologist at Indiana University here at Indianapolis who is doing some interviews with

people in the Gay and Lesbian community. Justice has been helping her to find some people who would be willing to tell their stories.

Forwarding calls and reports to the

Justice Department, filing information with the

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, and as I said

before establishing more of a working relationship

with the local police departments are activities

that the local efficacy groups can undertake.

Justice recommends as a response to the problem of hate crimes police sensitivity training programs, programs that have already been implemented in larger cities like Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, where police officers are given some understanding of the Gay and Lesbian community, some of the issues that occur there, some of the reasons why Gay and Lesbian people are often targeted for hate campaigns, and some sensitivity training as to the number of Gay and Lesbian people out there.

According to the Kinsey reports in the 1940s and '50s, 10 percent of the population is Gay or Lesbian, and there are also Gay and Lesbian

_ _ -

police officers that are very closeted and very much in fear of being exposed on their job because of the high homophobia on police forces.

Establishing liaisons with a police department in the Gay and Lesbian community is likewise important. In Indianapolis we have worked to accomplish that in the last couple of years. We have a liaison with the Indianapolis Police

Legislation on a state level to increase penalties of convictions and to require data collection to put a little more teeth into the federal law are also recommendations from Justice. Media attention, likewise, in the case with Ken Shay, the man whose home was vandalized, who eventually had to move, and Kathy Sarris, a former president of Justice, who was willing to tell her story to local media and also to testify. Those are some recommendations that we would make.

And finally, community education, not just with the mainstream community, but among our own population to give victims of hate crimes a feeling that they can do something about it; that

it is wrong to be a victim, it's not an every-day occurrence, not a routine happening. To dispel the belief in some people's minds that a problem exists, that's one of our aims.

I guess I will wrap it up there and invite any of your questions that you might have at this point. Mike?

MR. GRADISON: A couple of them,

Stephanie. I think -- and Sam's not -- well,

either Monday or Tuesday of this week Sam and I and

Carl Radford and primarily representatives of the

African-American community were out at the Police

Academy. It was part of the new sensitivity

training, and we'd already been out there a couple

of times.

This was the first time we met the entire 48 recruits of IPD, and they could ask questions of us, and it was one of the best sessions I've ever had with the police department. Unfortunately there was nobody there and I'm curious to know whether you were invited to participate. It really struck me.

I kind of presumed that you'd be there

and you were not, because that -- they're trying to encourage this kind of activity, and I wanted -- I did -- we got kind of sidetracked. I wanted to say to Bob Turner, Captain Turner, that "What happened to representatives of the Gay and Lesbian community here?" I mean, that's the whole reason -- there's some serious problems we've got here. All we've got -- there's got to be a continuous liaison between IPD through Shirley Provetus (phonetic) and representatives of the community.

I would -- they're going to do more of these type of things and I will do what I can. I think you ought to do it yourself, and you ought to call Bob Turner out there at the Police Academy and make sure you're included as a community leader in such things.

MS. TURNER: I appreciate it.

MR. GRADISON: And it was a wonderful, really excellent session. The recruits really surprised us, how sharp they were. Another quick question.

MS. TURNER: Well, to answer your

first question, no, we were not invited.

MR. GRADISON: Well, I saw Marla -the other question, when you got that call from
Muncie with this complaint about the harassment,
the beating of the car, window beatings, what do
you do with a complaint like that when they come in
to you?

MS. TURNER: We will generally take a note of it. The next recommendation is to -- besides recording the information I guess -- to encourage the person to file the report as a Gay hate crime with their local police department, to inform obviously the patrons -- or, the owners of the Gay establishment, and if need be, go to the local media and ask to receive some media attention on that, but of course the business owners aren't real crazy about that.

MR. GRADISON: How is it with the media in general in terms of your ability in Indianapolis and elsewhere around the state to get attention for those problems of homophobia and so on?

MS. TURNER: I've seen more media

```
attention occur in the last couple of years, with
 1
      the Ken Shay case in particular. Ken was very
 2
      aggressive in seeking the Indianapolis Star's
 3
      assistance in reporting what was happening with him
      and his complaint against the Marion County
 5
      Sheriff's Department.
 6
 7
                    MR. GRADISON: And Kathy was pretty
 8
      high-profile, too.
                    MS. TURNER:
                                Yes.
 9
10
                    MR. GRADISON: Where is Kathy?
                    MS. TURNER: She is downtown at City
11
      Market right now.
12
                    MR. GRADISON: I thought she left
13
14
      town.
                                  She's here.
15
                    MS. TURNER:
                                               Yes, sir?
16
                    MR. ROSE: Your introduction referred
      to hate crimes against HIV or AIDS victims.
17
                    MS. TURNER:
                                  Correct.
18
                    MR. ROSE: Your testimony that I
19
      heard related directly to it. Of course the most
20
21
      widely publicized case ever was from Indiana, the
22
      Ryan White case, --
23
                    MS. TURNER: Correct.
```

-

MR. ROSE: -- which displayed horrendous bigotry, prejudice, fear, and hysteria nationally and discredited Indiana and Kokomo in particular because of his treatment, which was in the early '80s. What can you tell us today as far as the situation concerning AIDS victims or perceived victims? Is it better, is it worse? What are the facts and what are any recent cases you know of with hate crimes or harassment of those unfortunates?

MS. TURNER: Well, a lot of the bias crime, threat, harassment, of Gay males is connected to the fear of AIDS and a perception on the part of the people who are doing the harassment that this person is an HIV carrier.

Locally I am drawing a blank right now on specifics in terms of violence. I can think of some discrimination, discriminatory practices, but not a hate crime related incident per se, but you will hear among the epithets that are shouted as -- you know, I know you were speaking earlier about drive-bys, for example. AIDS is among those words that are attached to the faggot, queer, and those

types of words, so I guess the connection is that among the Gay male community that the hatred is directed toward the people who are perceived as spreading this disease. Does that answer your question?

MR. ROSE: Partly, yeah. Do you have any direct input that you can give us as to whether you feel that there's been any improvement educationally or behavior-wise on the part of the public as opposed to what happened in the early -- to Ryan White, for instance, as opposed to what's happening today with people who either are AIDS victims or perceived to be AIDS victims?

MS. TURNER: My perception is that the education is gradually taking effect. However, whenever a new case hits the media, for example the Florida dentist, then HIV and AIDS issues are inflamed in the public's eyes and the public wants to have a place to point their finger, a direction to do that, and a lot of times it is the Gay community.

MR. GRADISON: With a lot of help from Jesse Helms, of course.

MS. SCHMITT: Do you think that the AIDS phenomena, if you will, with the media and all are hindering your efforts to maybe move forward?

I think they are myself because they always come back; maybe make a step forward, and then something about AIDS, and that whole movement is a step backwards.

MS. TURNER: Well, the media is as human as the rest of us and they want to sell their newspapers as well, so they're going to sex it up in any way that they can I think, and sometimes I do think that it's inflammatory and sometimes I do think that it hinders the progress that we make in educating people about the way to contract the virus and precautions, and that sort of thing.

MR. GRADISON: Thinking about Ryan White, it would seem to me -- of course, you know, Ryan was an incredibly remarkable kid, and of course that's true whether, you know, the kind of -- his educating virtually the whole world about the reality of HIV and so on, but I think he was a straight kid, you know, and he suffered a great deal himself.

were relating, to have acquired that disease and all of that, but -- so the fact that he did so much and educated who knows how many hundreds or thousands or millions of people because he just sacrificed his whole life to it and so on, but does that really -- didn't people kind of say "Well, it's unfortunate, he's a straight kid, and he acquired it from a contaminated blood source"? And do you think it still had a favorable impact on how it affected, you know, Gay men or women with AIDS?

MS. TURNER: I think people are seeing it as different in a way. I mean, one example is, you know, we've been talking for years in the Gay and Lesbian community. Let's talk about high-risk behaviors, not high-risk groups, and you still see and hear people talking about high-risk groups, so we do have the Gay community, the intravenous drug abusers, and the promiscuous, that broad category there, that are people who are at risk for AIDS, instead of, you know, naming the activities that actually transmit the virus. So I

:

1 do think, yeah, there is some bias. 2 questions? CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you very 3 much. Okay, thank you. MS. TURNER: 5 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: The next presenter 6 7 that we will hear from will be Marla Stevens, who's from the Indiana Civil Liberties Union and is the 8 9 chairman of their Gay and Lesbian Task Force. MS. STEVENS: I'm also going to speak 10 to you on behalf of the Association of -- Great 11 Lakes Lesbian and Gay Association, of which I am a 12 co-chair, and I brought you a few -- let's see. 13 14 (Off the record discussion.) I really appreciate 15 MS. STEVENS: being allowed to come here today. As President, 16 17 George Bush said upon signing the Hate Crimes 18 Statistics Act on April 23rd, 1990, "The faster we 19 can find out about these hideous crimes, the faster 20 we can track down the bigots that commit them. 21 Enacting this law today helps us move toward our dream, a society blind to prejudice, a society open 22

to all."

23

I know that you all have -- at least are allowed to do this because the staff director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reported in the minutes of the February 11th, 1985 meeting of your organization that the Commission has a clear jurisdiction in the matter of violence directed against homosexuals when the issue is related to the administration of justice.

Ms. Chavez has suggested that the Commission work with one or more state advisory committees to start a project aimed at fact-finding and data-gathering. The Commissioners also agree to the suggestion with the understanding that such a project does not rule out the possibility of future consideration of the issue as a whole Commission study on a national level.

I brought with me a few photographs today. These were taken just recently at Gay Pride Celebration on the Circle in Indianapolis, and I think they demonstrate the fact that hatred against Gays and Lesbians is real in Indiana.

These are protestors from several churches and some affiliate groups on the steps.

Actually at this point they are committing an illegal act, although most of the time they were down there they were exhibiting legal hate speech rather than a hate crime, and I'd like to be able to make a clear distinction between the two.

However, at this point they were committing a crime. And you'll notice the police officers were standing around watching and ignoring as they violated the permit that the Gay and Lesbian community had, and took the stage.

You can see some of the signs that they have, and I grew up as a child in the deep South and I remember the faces of hate, and the faces of hate haven't changed. The faces seem to be the same. The looks are the same to me. The anger, the bigotry, the ignorance that it's based on is all the same. It's just the populations that change over time.

This is the face of the hatred of one of their leaders, the Reverend Gene Hood. Mr. Hood doesn't carry a sign. Mr. Hood carries a baseball bat. AIDS really is something that affects us as Gays and Lesbians, and the hatred exhibited against

Gays and Lesbians because of AIDS I think is made very clear by this sign that said "Sodomites murdered Ryan White."

MR. GRADISON: You see the Flag in his cap, too. He's a true American, isn't he?

MS. STEVENS: Reality when you're dealing with hatred doesn't matter a whole lot; it's perception that counts. Another standard sign, "AIDS - God's curse on homos," parentheses "Sodomy," this is the second year they brought this one down there.

This is a new sign this year and it indicates somewhat of an escalation. It says "Burithe Fags, Not the Flag." It's significant in that the level of violence that we face in these attacks is severe, and the numbers of us who have experienced these attacks are huge.

The ABT report, which I've given you a couple of excerpts from, it's very specific about hate crimes and what they do. Hate crimes are political crimes. Bias crimes -- it says here that bias crimes range from threatening phone calls to murder. These types of offenses are far more

serious than comparable crimes that do not involve prejudice because they are intended to intimidate an entire group. This comes from a U.S. Department of Justice study that was the foundation of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act.

The fear they generate can therefore victimize a whole class of people, and you've seen that in Stephanie's testimony when people refuse to report ordinary -- some ordinary violent crimes out of fear of exposure, out of fear of reprisal, out of fear of the very people they're reporting those crimes to.

For a variety of reasons there are no accurate data regarding the number of bias crimes committed each year; however, there is plenty of documentation to suggest that the problem is widespread and considerable evidence that it is increasing. Bias crimes may also be turning more violent. Compared with the past, a larger proportion of the incidents appear to involve personal injury as opposed to vandalism.

One of the things that the ABT report stated was that the most frequent victims on a per

group to group, are Gays and Lesbians in the United States. We exceed the per capita incidence of violent crime exhibited against racial minorities, religious minorities, ethnic minorities, and at the elderly and other groups that have been studied to date.

We have the highest incidence of crimes and yet the prejudice against us has allowed some states to enact hate crimes laws that do not include us. It's very ironic, but the people who need them most have the least political popularity in order to get the protection they need.

The statistics on hate crimes on a national level -- we have to rely on statistics on a national level because we don't have a whole lot of current statistics on a state level. The groups that collect homo and Gays and Lesbians are volunteer groups.

They do not have the resources or the ability, even when they have the intention, of carrying through with statistics gathering. It's a difficult task and requires the kind of continuity

that small volunteer groups that come in and out of favor or in and out of existence just don't have.

I called our Gay and Lesbian switchboard last night and they had at one point agreed to handle statistics gathering, but they changed administrations and the word just didn't pass on. The same thing has happened in Bloomington, and of course Bloomington was probably the second highest reporter of hate crimes in the nation on a per capita basis against Gays and Lesbians.

The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force a couple years ago, when we were doing better reporting, said that we had the highest per capita incidence -- the second highest per capita incidence in the United States, in Indiana.

Some of the -- some of the studies that have been done recently, the NGLTF, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, reported -- instead of reporting numbers of crimes and has started relying on the U.S. Department of Justice to do numbers of crimes, it has instead been relying on reports from -- studies from population centers.

They did six studies this year, and in

each one of those groups hate crimes against Gays and Lesbians had risen 42 percent from the year before. Part of this is likely to be that people in those communities have done a better job of collecting data, but it can't account for the entire 42 percent.

The other thing that's real important to recognize is the connectiveness of hate crimes. I mentioned that briefly when I talked about my recognition and experience as a child versus my experiences of today.

Mr. Epstein mentioned a fire bomb, a torching of a synagogue here in Indiana by the CSA the Covenant, Sword, and Arm. They were caught in Missouri when they torched a Gay church, the Metropolitan Community Church. The Metropolitan Community Church has had a higher number of torched churches than any denomination in the United States, including its mother church in Los Angeles, and so it's essential to track Gay and Lesbians -- crimes against Gays and Lesbians because --

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: They're unable to hear you because of the ventilation system. Could

1 we just -- maybe there's a way to boost the microphone a little bit. 2 MS. STEVENS: _ It says on and off. 3 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Oh, okay. 4 MS. STEVENS: Sorry. I'll speak up. 5 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: All right. We'll 6 ask you to hold the microphone. It's kind of tiny. 7 MS. STEVENS: It's little. Is this a 8 little better? 9 10 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Are we getting anything? 11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Not very much 12 13 better. 14 MS. STEVENS: How about this? I was 15 talking in the wrong end. It's essential that we track Gay and 16 Lesbian crimes, if no other reason -- if for no 17 18 other reason than the bigots who do them do not 19 discriminate. They don't discriminate against the 20 groups of people that they commit these crimes 21 against. 22 Hate seems to be just hate, and in order 23 to adequately seek out these perpetrators, it is

essential to follow all of the groups that are perpetrated against, and the Missouri-Indiana connection and the church bombings and synagogue bombings is a perfect example.

In terms of getting a better sense also of the depth of these kinds of crimes, we find that one in seven -- that seven -- let's see if I can find the statistic. I think it is one in seven men and one in eleven women in the Gay community report having experienced a violent crime committed against them because of their sexual orientation. This includes being punched, kicked, beaten, raped, shot, and murdered.

I did an informal poll among Lesbians in the Gay and Lesbians civil rights work in Indiana and fully 60 percent of those women report sexually-oriented crimes ranging from threats to rape. Half of the women who have led Gay and Lesbian organizations in Indiana have been raped in the course of their work, and these rapists routinely mention changing the sexual orientation of the woman, and I'm one of those survivors. It's an unbelievable experience.

I think that the most important thing that we can deal with in terms of dealing -- in terms of stopping the spread of these crimes is dealing with the way that the police handle these crimes.

Currently, to my knowledge, no police department in Indiana has a working definition -- has adopted a working definition of bias crimes, even though the FBI has a model definition, even though a number of police departments around the nation have had model definitions for many years longer than the FBI.

My favorite, by the way, is that adopted by Baltimore, and my second favorite is New York's. New York's is important to Gay and Lesbian people because it acknowledges crimes and bias crimes that may look like nonbias crimes, such as street robberies, and it gives them a higher level of scrutiny to discover whether they were a bias crime if they were committed and if there's a pattern of commitment of these sorts of assaults in a high Gay percentage neighborhood.

We've seen a lot of that in downtown

Indianapolis. There's a corridor that has a lot our businesses in it with a very high rate of muggings, assaults, several murders, shootings on the streets, and in anywhere else these would have been declared bias crimes.

The other thing that needs to happen is the police need training. First the police need to have some basic training in bias crimes to begin with and then police need sensitivity training in the particulars of the communities that are most affected.

Again the Gay and Lesbian community is the most affected statistically and yet we have never -- there is no police department in the state of Indiana that currently has a talking relationship in either its academy training or its continuing education programs with the Gay and Lesbian community. This includes Indianapolis, and this is very rare for metropolitan areas in this country.

Also the reporting of crimes, we don't have a system of reporting. The most basic thing that seems to help in other areas is just to have a

check-off on the form that's used by the officer on the street. The investigating officer, if reminded to look for a bias crime, may find one.

Our people tend not to want to report these crimes. In Indiana you can lose your job, you can lose your children, you can lose your home, you can be denied credit, you can be denied access to public accommodation if you are Gay and Lesbian. So passage of a Gay and Lesbian civil rights bill would certainly affect people's willingness and ability to report crimes and relate the bias nature of those crimes.

Until that's adopted, dissemination of the Justice Department's 800-number for reporting of bias crimes would be very helpful. If this Commission can do nothing more than fund television PSAs that give out that bias crime number and define bias crimes, that would be an enormous help.

I understand that the FBI is doing regional training on statistics gathering in Chicago in a few weeks, on August 22nd and 23rd. However, it's funded only for police departments

with cities with greater than a hundred thousand people. Others can attend, but they must pay their own way, and of course the smaller departments tend to have less funds and are less able to do so.

Seven Indiana people -- seven Indiana departments are currently signed up to participate in this, Allen County, the City of Gary, the City of Indianapolis, Evansville, South Bend, Marion County sheriffs, and Fort Wayne, and I would encourage those departments to consider the funding of their attendance of this a mandate to spread the word and spread the training throughout the entire police departments in Indiana.

The other thing that we could use is a recognition that hate crimes are more serious and this has to be incredibly carefully drawn so as not to violate people's First Amendment rights to speech. However, the American Psychological Association in congressional testimony has stated Violence directed at Gay people tends to be especially brutal.

According to a 1980 study by Miller and Humphreys, quote, intense rage is present in nearly

*

all homocide cases with homosexual victims. The striking feature of most murders in this sample is their gruesome, often vicious, nature. Seldom is a homosexual victim simply shot. He is more aptly to be stabbed a dozen times, mutilated and strangled, end quote.

According to Melissa Mertz, coordinator of the Victims of Violent Assault Assistance

Program of Bellevue Hospital in New York City,

"Attacks against Gay men were the most heinous and brutal I have encountered. They frequently involved torture, cutting, mutilation, and beating, and showed the absolute intent to rub out the human being because of his sexual preference."

I have had reported to me the most unbelievably vicious and violent incident. I've had people call me up in the night telling me that they had gone out with someone, left a bar with someone, been driven to another site where a gang of thugs got out of the car, wrapped the man in barbed wire, and tossed him into the trunk where they took him away and raped him all night.

I cannot tell you how devastating these

things are. I cannot begin to tell you what it's like to wake up at 2:00 in the morning with a man who's calling me from the hospital saying "The police are not taking me seriously. I was stabbed. I almost" -- "I was stabbed in the neck. I had an eight-inch stab wound in the neck. By the grace of God it missed all of my vital organs. But as I laid there bleeding they refused to touch me because they were afraid I might have AIDS."

exhibit the most basic compassion and at the most important time -- they're trained to save lives.

If they will not even carry out their training at these times, how can we even hope to have people who are wise enough to discern the vagaries of what is a bias crime and what is not a bias crime, with sketchy information and the difficulty in street language and street behavior?

We have a long way to go. I don't hold a lot of hope for us getting where I think we ought to be in a very long time, but I think we have steps that we can take now and I hope that you encourage people to take them.

=

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Marla, the comments that you just made, are these Indiana incidents?

MS. STEVENS: These are -- those were Indiana incidents.

How recent?

CHAIRMAN HUGHES:

MS. STEVENS: Within the last three years. You know, these were just the things that came off the top of my head while I was sitting there. I've had other incidents - people followed home and shot in the head while sitting in their living rooms, while people screaming "Faggot" outside; other people -- men -- an incident in Richmond where a man had a neighbor who screamed "Faggot" at him and other anti-Gay epithets scrolled -- scrolled anti-Gay epithets on the side of his home, threatened violence against him, eventually broke into his home, stabbed him a la

The police did -- even though the man directly identified his assailant, the police never picked his assailant up. When the man threatened to sue the police, the police came and picked him up and took him on a very threatening drive to

"Psycho" in the shower.

nowhere, and told him that he would die; that violence would be committed against him and he would die if he did not withdraw his suit.

We were able to settle that, and part of the settlement was that the Richmond Police would have an education program with the Gay and Lesbian community. Unfortunately, the administration has changed and that's not come to fruition. But these are just -- these are just anecdotes. We have no mechanism currently for getting the full scope of the picture. Now these are just the people who know to call my home.

MR. ROSE: The Civil Rights

Department of the U.S. Department of Justice, have they ever been contacted or are they of no help?

Have they never pursued any of these egregious cases that you testified to?

MS. STEVENS: Currently there is no legal mechanism for them to pursue it, and since we are not included in the laundry list of civil rights law, there is no mechanism for them to do so.

MR. GRADISON: Jesse will die before

he has sexual orientation in there. But I have a brief anecdote that supports with those pictures that Marla showed to us about this Gay Pride Day on June 29th on Monument City -- Monument Circle here in Indianapolis.

I participated in a number of efforts to get the organization back on Monument Circle.

There was an effort to take them off the Circle.

The other concern was security. We had meetings with Joe Shelton, who's the director of the Department of Public Safety here in Indianapolis, and in fact Stephanie was there. I don't know if you were there or not, but Stephanie was there,

Eric Evans that chaired the Gay Pride Committee Day was there, and that was one of the things that concerned them.

On June the 16th of this year on a program on WXIR-FM here in Indianapolis there was a live broadcast of Indianapolis Baptist Temple here in the city, and a couple members of the Gay community, both Gay men, reported to Eric Evans and Stephanie, and others who were leadership in Gay Pride Day and the Justice organization, that on

_ _ _

this program they heard the pastor say to members of the congregation -- it's a huge congregation incidentally, you know, Baptist Temple -- that "If you want to have some fun on June the 29th, show up on Monument Circle with baseball bats."

The support came through. I called the general manager of the station, Gary Arnold.

Mr. Arnold said that this is the only program they don't tape because it's live from Baptist Temple, but he suspected they might have a tape.

I then called my buddy, Greg Dixon, who is the pastor of the church, and he said "Nothing like that could have taken place," and then a couple weeks later he called back -- two weeks later he called back and said "Yes, it did take place. I was out of town that particular Sunday, and my son, the Reverend Greg A. Dixon" -- he's not a doctor -- "Greg A. Dixon, did say that in jest before this congregation, to show up on Monument Circle with baseball bats."

So the concern of the one photo you saw -- the organizer of the Gay Pride Opposition, the Gay Pride Day Opposition on Monument Circle

were primarily members of the Indianapolis Baptist
Temple, but there was some others there. Reverend
Gene Hood's from a different church, but he
actually organized that day. That was the man -the pastor holding the baseball bat in his hand.

In a subsequent conversation with Greg
Dixon I said "What about that baseball bat?" He
said "Oh, it was a plastic bat. It was pink. It
was just" -- "and no one could've taken it
seriously." Well, we have the photos that prove it
was anything but a plastic bat.

And I said "Go talk to Captain

Tirmenstein, Captain Bob Tirmenstein of the

Indianapolis Police Department, who was in charge
of the security detail on Monument Circle on June
the 29th," which I know Captain Tirmenstein. He's
responsible for security at the abortion clinics in

Indianapolis, and he's done a marvelous job with
the security against Operation Rescue.

Anyway, I talked to him. He said "We were" -- this man is six foot five and weighs around 280 pounds. He's very soft-spoken, but he doesn't put up with any nonsense. I watched him

take Wayne Trafalgar (phonetic) at a rally of
Operation Rescue and said "Watch out, Buddy,"
picked him up by his seat, and tossed him into the
back of a car, and he said "We were really
literally terrified," I think is the word he used,
"that there was going to be violence that day."

So when Gene Hood and his bunch marched up on the Circle that way, he said "The best thing to do is let them sit there for about ten minutes, and if they didn't move in ten minutes we'd remove them, but let them get off the Circle," which they did, they left at their own free-will. We expected real violence there. We were very concerned.

When Gene Hood got that baseball bat -this young man was carrying this baseball bat
around. These two police officers grabbed the
baseball bat, gave it to the head of the rally,
Gene Hood, and he carried it around for the rest of
the day, as indicated by the picture, and if you'll
notice -- I didn't even see this before.

Bob Tirmenstein said "Look at those pictures real close. There are two police officers who followed him the rest of the day." They

followed him wherever he went around the Circle, and in some of the photos I saw that Victoria took there's two cops right behind him all the time.

They were honestly terrified there was going to be major violence perpetrated by these good, God-loving Christians upon the Gays and Lesbians on the Circle that day, and I would've loved to've had Captain Tirmenstein come here and talk to you about it because they were really that concerned, and I passed that back to Greg Dixon as well since he protested, and we had nothing -- you know, we had nothing evil or sinister in mind. The police didn't believe that.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Was a report filed with the FCC?

MR. GRADISON: That's in the process now, too. I've been trying to be cagey because I don't want Greg to think we're after his tapes, so I didn't mention the tape. So I'm hoping -- and I've passed the word back to Eric and both Stephanie; we'd love to have those two people file a complaint in that regard, those who heard the program, to see if we could, you know, get ahold of

that tape, because we're sure that the temple has the tape. Gary Arnold of the radio station thinks the temple kept a tape of the program. They admitted it happened. The temple admitted that they did say that on that tape.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SCHMITT: Mike, I'm just curious because -- I really appreciate a lot of her other comments, but the pictures is just a matter of some people that were anti, carrying around posters. Free speech, I'm not opposed to that. I mean, I'm like what's a bunch of pictures of people carrying around posters, because you guys, or I could, you know, do the same thing on the other side. know, I was thinking well, freedom of speech, everybody ought to be able to go to the Circle and carry around whatever they want to carry around. Are you saying that they were intimidated? MR. GRADISON: They were concerned about --

MS. SCHMITT: Is that -- that's -- that's -- that's worse than a culprit in my mind.

I mean, if it's a matter of just -- I don't care whether it be a white rally, a black rally, a

Lesbian rally, or whatever, anybody in my mind ought to be able to go down there and carry any kind of posters they want to bring around.

MR. GRADISON: As protestors against the rally they have a right to do that.

MS. SCHMITT: Exactly, but if you're saying they were intimidated and the police were siding with the other side, then that wasn't what was -- what I got out of what -- what -- was that -- are you -- is that what happened?

MR. GRADISON: No, but Tirmenstein said they were very peripheral with violence, and I was surprised because he's such a soft-spoken guy, and I, you know, almost thought about seeing if he -- you know, it was so late because I just talked to him on Monday about this and he told me what I just relayed to you as the incident.

They thought the possibility was there for violence. That's one reason they kind of laid back as they did and gave the members of the Baptist Temple congregation a chance to do their things and then peacefully move away because they thought if they actually grabbed them, that might

have been some kind of an incentive and it would ignite things, you know. He said it's a hateful, spiteful bunch, and they were terribly concerned about the possibility of violence.

I'm sure Captain Tirmenstein would be willing to write a letter to that effect, too. I passed it back to Mervin Dixon -- Dr. Dixon, rather, Dr. Dixon, and told Dr. Dixon it would be advisable if he called Bob Tirmenstein to find out the real story about that baseball bat and Reverend Gene Hood. I sent the letter out on Tuesday morning. We'll see if Dixon responds.

MS. STEVENS: Well, I wonder how many people would be allowed to take over the stage at any other event and just stay there, because people were a little nervous about whether they might -- whether the people who didn't have a right to be at a particular area of an event would be troublesome. You know, usually that's not how we conduct law enforcement.

MR. GRADISON: I certainly can't deny that.

MS. STEVENS: The photographs that I

showed you, the slogans that I showed you, I think I showed you more to indicate that -- you know, we usually don't -- they usually don't hire people to videotape and to take photographs of the real violence that they do, and I think sometimes a graphic presentation of the intensity of the feeling that drives the violence is an important thing and that's what I meant to say about those photographs.

MS. SCHMITT: I'm just curious. question. Maybe I've already expressed myself about like the pictures, and there can be a whole lot of -- and you can be upset because the press is against you or your group, or whatever, but as far as hate crimes, which is what we're here to look into, do you believe that there is -- or, that there are a lot of hate crimes against your group or any other group going on in Indiana, or is it more just a "Well, people have demonstrated against us and there's media against us"? I mean, are there crimes? There's a distinction there in my mind.

MS. STEVENS: There are crimes,

23

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

absolute crimes. They range from vandalism to murder and include everything in between, and unfortunately one of the things that we know about these criminals is that they start out young. The average age of these criminals is less than 20 when they begin.

And the ways -- and they usually start out with lesser crimes, such as vandalism, and we have very -- because we don't take vandalism too terribly seriously in the law, we don't punish it at a very high level, and because we don't have any form of recognizing the enhanced nature of these crimes, these little, early hate criminals, who eventually, if they're allowed to get away with it, are the people who eventually escalate to murder when they're 25, there's no mechanism to stop these kids to get the early intervention that we know can work to sort of erase the old tapes and give them some new and more positive messages about how to live with difference in the world.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Rose, last question.

MR. ROSE: What you painted was a

pretty bleak picture about the lack of basic protection that the law should afford you without any input from this organization or any other, and obviously you're not getting it.

What specific recommendations do you have that we could pass on right now to make the laws that are on the books enforceable no matter who the victims are? And I want to distinguish so though not to cast any aspersions.

There are crimes all of the time between heterosexuals, knowing people, and certainly homosexuals. We're here to zero in on bias hate crimes, not those other kind, and none of the statistics you gave me -- gave us, I presume, refer to the former group.

MS. STEVENS: Oh, no. These were all referring to bias crimes. They're all bias crimes. And the first thing I think that you all could help us do is to help us document those. They're not being appropriately documented in Indiana. The structures are not in place that would allow them to be appropriately documented or accurately documented in Indiana, and that's the

first thing that we could use.

Again, the very first thing is a definition, is encouraging a universal Indiana adoption of a definition of hate crimes, a working definition of hate crimes, a practical working definition for the street officer to use in doing that initial investigation.

Second is to do -- is to encourage the training of officers and to help find funding for training for those officers in both the definition and investigation of hate crimes and also in learning about the Gay and Lesbian community and resolving some of the issues of prejudice which exist within the police department.

The police department officers are human, they mirror the public, and there are biased and bigoted officers out there, and we need to make sure that those officers have every opportunity to have the information that can counter that bigotry.

Third, to adopt a uniform reporting method with a very minimum of a check-off for investigation on the initial report form.

Fourth, to adopt -- to encourage the adoption of civil rights laws for Gays and Lesbians that would leave Gay and Lesbians free to report crimes.

And fifth, to thoroughly investigate any reports of police misconduct against the Gay and Lesbian community.

We are too often targets of inappropriate and selective use of law enforcement. This has set up a situation where my community does not trust the police. My community fears reprisal if they complain about the police inaction. My community is subject to discriminatory behavior on the part of the police.

We have evidence of that in the language that the police have used, in some of the attitudes exhibited by the police, and it's going -- those kinds of things are going to take awhile to break down, and we have to stop it now to have any hope of getting full cooperation from our community in the future and on its own behalf.

And until those things can be implemented, I think you'd probably have in your

power the dissemination of the other numbers so that those -- so that people can understand that the Federal Government recognizes hate crimes and wishes to receive those statistics.

much. We are going to modify our schedule in order to try to get somewhat back on time. We're going to forgo the break and we'll move right ahead and call on Reverend Taylor at this point, who also has someone with him.

(Off the record discussion.)

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: We will take a

quick two-minute break.

(A brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: In the interest of time and in appreciation for those people that have agreed to provide testimony for us, we're going to quickly try to move ahead. We understand that we are running over and we know that that infringes on the schedules of some of our later speakers.

To the extent that we run into conflicts, we will understand and offer our apologies up-front at this point. But if we could,

we'd like to start with Reverend James Taylor, the director of the Indiana Interreligious Commission on Human Equality. Reverend Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and members of the panel, it's a privilege to be here. I had a cynical thought a moment ago and that is that perhaps you asked this clergy person to come this late in the day so that I would just say "Amen" to everything that's already occurred.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: I wish that were

the case.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I -- I -- I think you'll find I really am about to do that. I certainly could support -- most of the important things that have been said so far today have already been said, both in terms of documentation and in terms of recommendations about implementing activities in communities.

A number of trees died so that you could -- so I could be brief today. Let me just show you what I've handed to you for the record, and I really want to use my time a little differently and I'll let you hear from someone else

=

that's a guest with me today.

Our agency, known affectionately as

IICHE for a long time -- we're practicing saying it

"echee" because in Japanese "echee" means unity or

oneness, and I think that works pretty well,

describes who we are and what we do.

Over the years we've provided training, specifically regarding assisting local communities to deal with hate crime activities, most notably probably in 1981 an emergency conference on the Klan was held. We had Julian Bond here.

In February of '89 we held strategic meetings around the state, focusing primarily on the vulnerability of rural Hoosiers to hate crime influence. I don't know if you've gotten into this very much, but there's a very strong presence in rural Indiana where farmers, who are victims of economic hard times, also fall prey to the schemes of extremist groups of one kind or another, and we could go into that perhaps if you want to do that.

You've already talked about the Sharp case in terms of the neo-Nazi involvement, which I referred to in my remarks. We spend a lot of time

on Indiana college campuses, for example. That's been referenced by Mr. Jordan and others today.

Some that haven't been referenced: I get the kind of calls that many other folks get.

I, too, have been to DePauw University. We provided, and to their credit, training for the sororities and fraternities that were involved in the ghetto party episode a couple years ago.

It was our agency that was involved in working with those young people, and as I met with the presidents of those fraternities and sororities, I can safely tell you I think about my own children. They were not mean, they're not mean kids, they're ignorant of the price that many have paid for their own liberty and justice, and they're eager to get in touch with the roots of that movement.

And I remember one occasion when we showed some footage from "Eyes on the Prize" and the history of the civil rights movement. They were wrapped in attention as to that. They said "Did this really happen? Is this really what this is about?" It's a sense in which we have another

generation now to educate in terms of the importance of civil liberties and civil rights in American society.

I have responded, for example, to

Batchelor (phonetic) Middle School in Monroe

County, Edinburg High School in Bartholomew County,

a number of places around the state where the

convergence of stress in the community is being

reflected even in the much younger grades.

Some places of higher education are taking seriously the need to develop anti-harassment policies. That needs to be up and running and in place before something happens.

Earlham College is an example where we about a year ago worked with that administration in developing that policy so that when the occasion was there they would be prepared to deal with it.

I want to make two points, and I think others have talked about this in a different way today, but I think it's very important to understand some of the social dynamics that are at work in our culture and in our society, and I have them listed here for you.

These are almost like two trains that are headed toward each other on the same track. I mean, something inevitable is going to be disastrous here unless there's some movement one way or the other.

The first is and you heard Amos Brown and others talk about the demographics which demonstrate that as Americans, and as Hoosiers as well, we're becoming much more diverse both religiously and ethnically. There's a lot of statistics out about this, but one of those is reported here.

By the year 2000, 85 percent of all new persons entering the labor force will be minorities, women, and immigrants. Well, that's a perceived threat to the economic security of a lot of families; where did all, quote, these people come from?

Bearing in mind the increasing diversity and pluralism of America as a people and Indiana as a state, that over against the other force which is the prevailing attitude in the justice system and in the courts, which purports a kind of color-blind

or a race neutral philosophy, or if you would, sexual orientation neutral philosophy, or whatever it is, to apply that kind of standard on the one hand against the increasing demands of a more diverse population I think will lead to not only the kind of stories you've been hearing today, but you will see a profound increase in the level of violence that occurs because persons who are acting out of their own perceived insecurity has a relationship to that.

During the recent Gulf Crisis there were threats here to the local Arab-American community. There was a bomb threat at the Islamic Center of North America, our neighbor in Plainfield, Indiana. There've been a number of anti-Semitic threats received by local congregations, Jewish congregations, in Indianapolis. I can go on and talk about these things.

I want to point out to you there's one piece I did bring and that's a piece that we do use in training, and before someone on the panel says "What do you recommend?" there's recommendations for action on the back page, and I'll just tell you

where to find it.

What I'd like to do now, Mr. Chairman, if you would, introduce to you someone from -- don't walk out -- introduce to you someone who is perhaps not an isolated victim, but perhaps the most recent victim of the kind of terror and harassment that occurs in a hate crime experience.

Patsy McCormick is here as the director of the shelter for homeless veterans on the near-southwest side of Indianapolis. You have in your packet a collection of the Indianapolis Star coverage of that hate crime over the past several days. The first report is near the bottom, the most recent near the top, but in any case that'll give you some record of what's occurring there.

The last page you have is a letter that our agency has submitted to the print media in the city, this one in the Indianapolis Star. If you looked at this morning's paper, that was printed in this morning's paper, with the careful editing of some cogent phrases, which the newspaper has the right to do.

Having said that, I do want to ask Patsy

of the experiences that she has had as the director of the shelter, and at the same time perhaps you may well have questions for her in terms of what it feels like being in the spot that she's been in in the last several days.

MS. MCCORMICK: Two weeks ago today --

(Off the record discussion.)

MS. MCCORMICK: Two weeks ago today I was sitting in my office and I thought I heard fireworks, and I thought that was strange, kind of out of season for it. I heard somebody screaming, so I looked out of my office window and the guy next door was shooting directly at our building and he was aimed at the front porch where the guys were sitting out there smoking, and I first called 911, ran outside.

The night guy had already called 911, but when I got to the door everybody was just shoving each other in, trying to get in, and so I went down the street and I said "What's wrong?" I mean, it still didn't dawn on me what was wrong. I

kept asking "What's wrong?" Of course that guy took off.

And there were six people sitting in their yard two doors down, sitting there, and I says "What is wrong?" and they said "We didn't see a thing," and I said "I know you didn't see anything, but what's wrong?" and they said "We're not having niggers in our neighborhood, and if you house them, you're leaving too." I said "These are homeless veterans," and they said "We don't care. They're not staying in this neighborhood."

So I walked back down the street. We got that taken care of. The police came in and took four guns out. They didn't arrest the guy. He since has been arrested and out on a thousand dollar bond, I guess for just shooting a firearm in the city. You know, I don't see -- I still don't understand why he's out. I just can't figure it out.

Then the following Sunday night they burn a cross in our front yard, smashed the windows out of my car.

MR. TAYLOR: Tell them what you do

with your car now.

MS. MCCORMICK: Yeah. Every night now I have to take my car downtown Indianapolis, take a cab back, take a cab back in the morning to get the car so that I can take guys where they need to go if it's, you know, down to the Trustee's Office, food stamp office, work, whatever, and so with the \$10 a day cab fare, you know, versus 152 minimum for a window, I have a \$250 deductible on the car, it's just ridiculous to live like this.

And then still not realizing, you know, that the neighbors were that angry, I've been there three years, nobody had ever said a word to me.

I've never bothered anybody in that neighborhood.

It's the same people that have a yellow ribbon on their porch. You know, I don't know whether they think that all of these people that came back from Saudi are white. I don't know what they think.

MR. GRADISON: They came back from the right war.

MR. ROSE: General Powell wouldn't agree with them at all.

MS. MCCORMICK: It's the same people

that come to my door and ask me for diapers for their children, the same ones that say "Can you give me things for Thanksgiving dinner?" "Can you give me Christmas gifts for my children? We have nothing." "Can you give me gas money? I have a new job." I just don't understand it.

Another lady called me and she said
"Well, we're not going to have black people in this
neighborhood. They have their area and we have
ours," and I asked her what church she went to and
she's Nazarene, and this can't -- you know, I just
still can't figure it out.

She said "Is this going to lower my property?" We're not the ones smashing windows and burning crosses and firing guns at people, and so it looks to me like they're looking at the victim -- you know, they're still blaming us. We have done nothing to these people. They're making it very difficult.

Center Township, I'm sure, is afraid to send people right now, and I guess my main concern is that these people don't win and financially is the only reason that they may win, and that's

really out of my hands right now, but if it continues for Center Township and the different ones, they might be afraid to send someone there.

MR. ROSE: You say financially they might win. Can you explain what you mean by that?

we can't hold out, you know, without the funding, and so if people are afraid, they're not going to keep supporting us. Center Township came out and they interviewed each guy. Two of them decided to leave, but those two guys wanted their own apartment also. They were not afraid; they walked down the middle of the street to the store. So it's not that they were afraid. But financially that's what I meant.

The other guy signed that they were staying. But, you know, as those guys leave, we can house 40 people in there. It's a nice facility, it's a wonderful facility, and it's a much needed thing. All of the shelters are full. I can call, you know, in the middle of the night somewhere and they're all full. We need this shelter.

200

It's a lot better for Center Township to 1 put them in with us for the per diem rate that we 2 have than it is to give each person a \$350 3 apartment and support them that way. It's a lot 4 5 cheaper. 6 MR. ROSE: Your total funding comes 7 from public support? 8 MR. TAYLOR: Per diems. 9 MR. ROSE: Per diems. 10 MR. TAYLOR: Per client, right. 11 MR. ROSE: There's no private 12 not-for-profit charitable support that's coming 13 in? 14 MS. MCCORMICK: Well, this far we 15 haven't done that because we've only been open -well, this is the entire fourth week. We were just 16 17 getting off the ground. Center Township and VA had 18 stuck in 25 people and we were just getting off the 19 ground when this happened with these people, and financially if they win us, it's a terrible thing 20 21 if they win it. 22 MR. GRADISON: And you've been in the

neighborhood for three years you say?

23

three years with sex offenders. They were convicted child molesters that were sent there by the court. Some of them were black, and the sheriffs are angry enough to go further down the street in shackles in front of somebody's house instead of parking right in front when we had a space available, so I don't know, you know, why the people at that time chose not to hop on it then, but right now it's ridiculous.

MR. GRADISON: Now you're dealing

MR. GRADISON: Now you're dealing with war veterans. You'd think with the patriotic fervor in the land that they would embrace them.

MS. MCCORMICK: They don't, and you see, VA sent somebody and the neighbors came along and said "Don't even think about it."

MR. GRADISON: Have you said what the police have done so far in prosecuting?

MS. MCCORMICK: I mean, I still don't understand why the police didn't take this guy out, you know, the night that they went in and took the guns out. That to me is ridiculous. I can understand Center Township, I really can, but I

mean, we still have to stick together. We can't let these people win.

I mean, I live there, too. You know,

I've been staying there since September. I'm not

afraid to stay in that place. I'm not afraid of

those kind of people, but I am afraid of the fact

that they can bully somebody and win, and the guys

aren't afraid. We took precautions; you know, we

did things to our windows so that they can't hurt

us when we're inside.

MR. ROSE: Are you satisfied with the police protection now that you're getting out there?

MS. MCCORMICK: Well, the night that they burned the cross it took them a long time to get there. I said "What took you so long?" and they said that they have two squad cars in a five-mile radius, and so -- I mean, that let me know that nobody was going to watch our place, and I know they can't sit out there and watch us, and it also let me know that my car was going to be out of there every night.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Did any of those

shots hit your building?

MS. MCCORMICK: No, no, it didn't.

This guy, you know, is an alcoholic. He's, you

know -- and then another guy down the street,

Channel, I think, 13 interviewed him last week and

he said "What do you think about it?" and the guy

said -- on the air he said "I think every nigger

should be shot," and he said "What did you say?"

and he said "Every nigger should be shot."

But we have had some nice things. There are a couple little girls that keep coming forth to bring food and they come across the field and bring food a lot, they do that, and the mother -- I went over to thank the mother and she wouldn't come out of the house because she's afraid of the neighbors.

MR. GRADISON: And she sends her kids out as emissaries. I'm glad she's not my mom.

MS. MCCORMICK: So if you have any suggestions on --

MS. SCHMITT: What's the Indiana Civil Rights Commission doing now because I, through articles, know they were going to get involved in some way?

_ _ _

MS. MCCORMICK: They're filing suit 1 on the two guys, but even the guy, you know, down 2 3 the street that said he wanted them shot, I mean I don't know why somebody doesn't sue him, too. MR. GRADISON: I don't know what you 5 could do with him, but --6 MR. ROSE: We have First Amendment 7 8 advocates here, some stronger than others, and that's the reason nothing can be done with him. Ιf 9 10 he would have incited -- and I'm not a lawyer, but I believe if he would have incited the crowd 11 12 specifically, "Go get your guns and shoot these people," that's --13 MR. GRADISON: That's something else. 14 15 MR. ROSE: -- that's where he would 16 have been over the line, but he was smart enough, either innocently or otherwise, to phrase it 17 properly so he's protected. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Does your shelter rely on placements by agencies? And if so, which 20 agencies provide placements for you? 21 22 MS. MCCORMICK: Center Township,

Veterans Administration, and Midtown Mental Health,

23

and all of them are on the homeless teams. They're all just working with the homeless.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Since the incidents have you received any additional placements from those agencies?

MS. MCCORMICK: No.

MR. TAYLOR: That's part of the problem.

MS. MCCORMICK: That's the problem.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Are they suggesting that there is an imminent danger to their clientele and that's why they are not giving you additional placements?

MS. MCCORMICK: They said they were going to hold back a little bit until it got quieted down. This was what Center Township's thoughts were. VA has been sending people through Center Township for funding. If they haven't already had the funding, they send them over, but they haven't come all the way through. They'll call me and say "I'm sending somebody through Center Township and so you'll be getting them tonight." Well, that happened twice in the last

1 two days. MR. GRADISON: Have you met with 2 Julia and the people at Center Township? 3 MS. MCCORMICK: Well, you know, 4 I've called. Yeah, I've been in touch with them a 5 lot. 6 7 MR. GRADISON: But you haven't met with them, you just talked to them on the phone 8 9 only? MR. TAYLOR: We're going to work on 10 11 that. MS. MCCORMICK: I haven't been down 12 The team that comes out every Friday from 13 14 Center Township, they just are having a real hard 15 time with it, too. They think that, you know, they should go ahead and fill it up and let's get on 16 with it. 17 MR. GRADISON: If there's no room, 18 19 you wonder where those people are going who should 20 be coming to you. MS. MCCORMICK: They could have 21 22 filled that place in a week, they really could 23 have.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Are all of their referrals African-Americans?

MS. MCCORMICK: Pardon?

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Are all of their referrals African-Americans?

MS. MCCORMICK: No, we have —

probably 60 percent are. We have a little guy, and
he's really sweet. He's Mexican, but he'll go
through the neighborhood, I mean, if I'm driving or
something, you know, and he'll say "Hi, Hi," I mean
just like Mickey Mouse. He's just so excited for
everything. You know, he's just real happy to see
everybody, and they look at this guy like they hat
his guts, I mean they hate him, but he's real
sincere.

Another thing. The incident when it first came up the night that they were shooting the gun, we had two black and one white guy at the grocery store down the street and then this man took off after them and run them down the street. They went over and got in the alley and run down. By the time they got in the house the guy was already in his house.

We did have witnesses to the cross burning, two witnesses as a matter of fact, another next-door neighbor that lives in part of that same house and then our night shift, you know, and they said that was the first time they've had a cross burning in Indiana that they know of where somebody's seen it, so that helped a lot with the FBI, and the FBI are really involved in it now.

MR. ROSE: The VA's a federal agency. Have you made any complaint, formal or otherwise, of the fact that they discontinued sending patients or sending their needy people through you because of these racial harassments?

MS. MCCORMICK: Well, see, they still are, but they're sending them through Center Township and Center Township's blocking it, --

MR. ROSE: I see.

MS. MCCORMICK: -- see what I mean?

So in other words, if the people don't have

their -- like on disability or something, then the

funding goes through Center Township.

MS. PARKER: Has your neighborhood -you were saying that you'd been there for three

years and these were the same people that were there when you moved in there three years ago. Has there been any change in the -- because sometimes just the moving in of one person can be the change that causes some kind of behavior. Has there been any change in --

MS. MCCORMICK: Yeah. The house next door has three apartments in it and always changing. I mean, they're always changing. It's all rental property along in there. You know, a lot of the nights we'll wake up, and outside there's an alley there between us and that little house, and either the guy's beating his wife or one night he took a sledgehammer and beat his car up, he knocked all of the windows out, the lights and everything. I mean, these are the same people that are complaining about us that we don't even bother. We're not even out to bother these people.

MR. TAYLOR: Did you mean the racial composition of the neighborhood?

MS. PARKER: Yes -- no, no, no.

MR. TAYLOR: To what degree that there's more black or more white people?

MS. MCCORMICK: You mean in the 1 neighborhood? 2 3 MS. PARKER: Yes. MS. MCCORMICK: There are no blacks. 4 MS. PARKER: If you were there for 5 three years in which you had sex offenders as your 6 7 basic residents and this was not -- no one seemed to oppose -- was opposed to this, and now you. 8 9 change and go to veterans and all of a sudden you 10 have this great opposition, I wonder if there may have been a new neighbor or someone who was in that 11 12 neighborhood who might have started causing --13 raising these questions that created the kind of 14 climate that made people decide it was all right to become violent. 15 16 MS. MCCORMICK: That could have been 17 because it is rental property and it keeps changing 18 all the time. 19 MS. PARKER: But you can't pinpoint 20 any specific kind of neighbor, individual neighbor 21 change that might have caused an activist to start 22 this?

MS. MCCORMICK: Well, except the guy

23

next to me, the one that shot the gun, that house you know, that has three apartments, that one changes all of the time, so it could be that it was just him that moved in.

MS. PARKER: I just wondered because that just seems -- to go after veterans is even worse.

MS. SCHMITT: Well, what kind of cooperation are you getting from local or state or federal authorities, I mean the police, the Civil Rights Commission in Indiana, so on and so forth?

MS. MCCORMICK: Well, the FBI,

they're the ones I think that -- they're the only ones that's going to do anything with the guy that, you know, burned the cross because Indianapolis Police said they didn't know what to get him on.

MR. TAYLOR: Same problem we've been talking about all day.

MS. SCHMITT: Yeah, uh-huh.

MR. ROSE: Excuse me. They're not the same offenders. The gunman -- the one that fired the gun and the cross burner, those are different people, is that right?

MS. MCCORMICK: Just friends. 1 MR. ROSE: Just friends. 2 MR. GRADISON: And it seems the Civil 3 Rights Commission has been helpful to you, too, and 4 they've spent a lot of time with you down there in 5 filing charges. 6 7 MS. MCCORMICK: Yeah, they're filing 8 charges. 9 MR. TAYLOR: Civil charges. MR. GRADISON: Well, that's all they 10 11 can do. 12 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, but that's the 13 point. 14 MS. PARKER: And she already said 15 that maybe they don't have any money, so you can't 16 collect or recover in the way of damages even if you win. It's a Catch-22. 17 18 MS. MCCORMICK: I think right now 19 that we're struggling, you know, to hang in there 20 to keep open. I know that it will slow down and it 21 will back off. I believe that without a doubt, 22 because if this had been somebody else, they would 23 have already been out of there I believe, most

people, but we're not afraid, the residents aren't afraid and I'm not afraid, but I don't want these people to win. I really don't want them to win.

And not only that, it's ridiculous because, see, these people aren't even going to be in that house, by the way. They'll probably move again.

MR. GRADISON: Did you have a religious affiliation with your shelter?

MS. MCCORMICK: No. I rent the building from a church next-door, and it's my uncle that pastors that church, but we're not affiliated and I'm not a member of that church. As a matter of fact -- well, no, I don't have any, and as far as Center Township or any government funding, you just really can't have any anyway, but they did say "If you want to take them to church it's okay, but don't preach."

MR. GRADISON: Do any of the members of the -- have they been going to church? You say the church is close to you?

MS. MCCORMICK: Yeah -- well -- yeah. It's just next door. As a matter of fact, it looks like maybe it's part of the church.

They're both red brick, but there is an underground tunnel, but we don't use that and would never use it unless there were a fire or something. But, yeah, some of the members go next door to church, and then sometime they'll go to other churches, they have people pick them up.

I'll tell you what, though, through all of this, this is the only minister that I've heard

of this, this is the only minister that I've heard from through all of this. I mean, not one church has called, not even the church next door. No one called to offer support or to say "We're praying for you," or anything. That's the truth. That really surprises me a lot. I have nothing else to say.

MR. GRADISON: Thank you. We're really sorry you had to go through all of this.

MR. ROSE: We wish you good luck, or I do at least personally.

MS. MCCORMICK: Thanks a lot, guys.

MR. ROSE: Hang in there. Don't let

them win.

MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Our next presenter

is Phyllis Bartleson, Human Rights Consortium of Indiana, first vice president I understand.

MS. BARTLESON: I have some information I wanted to share with you before I get started. I hope you can hear me. I kind of speak loudly anyway. I'm Phyllis Bartleson and I'm the vice president of the Indiana Consortium of State and Local Human Rights Agencies, and for the sake of time I'll try to be brief in my presentation.

Most of what I would say you've already heard here today, and that is that we do have a problem in our state with hate and bias crimes.

One of the major problems that the agencies agree on in discussing this particular issue with them is that there is a lack of reporting. That seems to be a major problem.:

Various crimes and criminal activities are reported to the various law enforcement agencies across the state but they are not specifically reported as bias crimes or hate crimes. Maybe they're reported as vandalism by juveniles, aggravated assault, neighborhood dispute, but what we have found is there are very

few crimes that are actually labeled as hate or bias crimes. This seems to be a problem.

When I was asked to speak here today, I contacted all of our 17 agencies that belong to our group and asked them to assist me in gathering data to present here today, and if they did not have any case-related data in their offices, to contact their local law enforcement agency.

Many of the responses that I received back was that "We don't have any hate-related cases per se in our caseload." In checking with our law enforcement agencies, they do not have any statistical data that they can share with us.

So that seems to be a significant problem within the civil rights arena that it appears when we request statistical information, that we don't have a problem, that these crimes don't exist in our communities throughout the state, which I think particularly for those of us in the civil rights field know this is not true.

I have gathered a few instances. Some of these are quite recent that are in your packet. This one happened in Evansville July the 29th and

appeared in the paper. It's an incident of a you man, who happened to be black, who went to a swimming party at a pool with a white friend. They were not boyfriend and girlfriend, they were just friends.

What happened to this young man was that her brother took issue with the fact that she was associating with blacks. She had been told by her parents not to do so, and she in fact did, and as a result her brother ran over the black man and drug him in the car for several feet.

He was transferred from Evansville to a hospital in Louisville to attend to his injuries.

The gentleman in question, the brother, was charged with aggravated battery. This is a recent case of July the 29th in Evansville.

Of course I have the article that the lady just spoke of with the shelter house, so I won't go into that one. In the area of racial epithets and slurs, I have an article here from Michigan City, Indiana. It's dated July the 24th of '91 of the school board superintendent who was a target of racial slurs, okay?

This is a very educated person, and the scenario kind of went like this: He had phone calls all weekend calling him "nigger" and "black bastard." "Some of the callers told me to get out of town. We're sick of you. We don't want you here. We never wanted you here, and it's time for you to get out of town."

Mr. Clay did not report this to the police. That seems to be another problem is getting the victim to report the act to the proper authorities, okay? For whatever reason he did not report that. He did make some comments, I guess, during the next school board meeting and they took the issue up.

In Columbus, Indiana, I have an article here that's dated September the 14th of '90, "Teens Linked to Cross Burnings." Okay. This is fairly recent. In this instance the Sheriff of Bartholomew County did not arrest the three young men that were involved in this, I guess because they were juveniles or the issue wasn't taken seriously, although a cross was burned on two different occasions in the street in front of the

home of a black female.

Here's an article in your packet of a smoke bomb judgment in Columbus that was settled in June of '91. However, the case originally goes back to 1988 where there was an incident of a smoke bomb.

This one is of particular interest
because it brings out something that I think is
important in relation to these crimes and kinds of
activity, is the fact that this family had property
damage, and of course the financial loss from
moving, and not to mention the terror of the act
and the humiliation. They had sought considerable
damages; however, they only received a \$20,000
judgment.

The gentleman in question, of which there were two, that perpetuated this crime were sentenced to a year in prison and a thousand dollar fine, which raises the question to me as a person in this area what cost or what price do you put on terror? Is \$20,000 enough? Is a year in prison enough to deter these types of crimes? And I think these are areas that the government needs to look

1 at.

Я

You terrify a family for months and months and months to the point that they're either afraid to leave home or they move to another neighborhood because they can't live where they would like to live or can afford to live, what price do we put on that?

In the other areas of civil rights, for example employment, education, we've probably made numerous strides in the last 20 years or so, but for some reason the housing issue has basically remained unchanged. We still have neighborhood fracases, okay?

When a black family or Mexican,
Hispanic-American family, or a Jewish family moves
into a given neighborhood, they're harassed,
garbage is thrown on their lawn. There's one
article in here where a family had chemicals poured
into their swimming pool, their car windows shot
out, those types of things, that had children. The
children were terrified. The one son had
nightmares, and so on.

These kinds of things still go on,

despite the gains that we've made in the areas of employment and education, so that is something that I think needs to be addressed.

One important thing that I think we're all well aware of is the correlation between crime and criminal activity and poverty. Poverty is on the rise in this country. We have more homeless people, we have more people unemployed, and so on. So I think the expectation is probably that we're going to see more crime.

And when we have people who are out of work, losing their homes, losing their cars and their possessions, they're going to blame someone, okay, and generally that someone is someone that is vulnerable, that is less able to defend themselves, which may be someone that is of another ethnic group, has another sexual orientation, someone that they feel will be defenseless against that attack, and I think that's what we need to be looking at.

There's more to it than just a, quote quote, hate crime. There are other variables that go into that, and some of those variables are in the socioeconomic realm, and I think those issues

need to be addressed as well to rectify some of that.

What I would like to see in the future:
There's not a great deal of communication between
the various civil rights agencies throughout our
state and the police departments, the law
enforcement agencies.

I believe, and my sister agencies as well believe, that training, and I think we've heard that over and over again today, is essential, sensitivity training, training in the various laws as far as civil rights and human rights are concerned, and I think that has to be mandated by your police chiefs, by your mayors of your cities, and the money has to be there.

It's okay to pass a law and say "Okay, this is what we're going to do," or "This is what we're going to have to enforce," or "This is how we would like for this to go," but if the local government agencies don't have the money for training or to enforce this law, it doesn't amount to very much, and I think that's something that needs to be addressed as well.

networking -- Mrs. Schmitt and I had discussed that in the hallway earlier -- between the various agencies, so that, for example, the civil rights community will be aware of what the Gay community is doing and what kind of training, and so on, is going on. The networking, I think there needs to be more of that as a solution to some of these problems.

I think we need more education in our schools about ethnicity, about cultural diversity, and not at the secondary level, at the elementary level, because that's when children learn and that's when what they've learned sticks with them, okay?

responsibility because basically what we're dealing with is an attitudinal problem, and in order to change those attitudes, those negative attitudes, those stereotypes, we must as a society work together, and when I say we, I'm talking about our teachers, our law enforcement, our helping agencies, our parents. We all have to, you know,

do what we can.

There's a case in your packet about a worker. This is in litigation right now. In September of 1990 it was referred to EEOC of a black worker at Westville, Indiana, who was racially harassed, okay, on the job. He went to his employer. His coworkers were giving him a hard time. He reported it to management.

They refused to do anything and Condiff (phonetic) said "Oh, Well, you know, they're just guys, they're having fun," and it went on and on and on. The man was terminated and as a result he filed charges.

I think that our managers of our companies have a responsibility to uphold the law, and when they don't I think the workers have a recourse and should pursue that, and that's what happens in a lot of cases is that people are not aware of their rights, they don't know who to go to, they don't know what resources are available in their various communities or where to get help, so the act is not reported. People are -- they don't really know where to go.

There's a couple of other articles ther in your packet. One that comes to mind -- I brought a couple local articles from Muncie. They go back several years. One was a fire bombing back in 1982 of a family that was associated with the Klan that burnt out a black family who happened to move in an all-white neighborhood.

The other article is in reference to a crime that probably should have been labeled as a hate crime but was not, and this is where two young white kids from Selma, Indiana, came through Muncie and had drove through the black community and shouted out the window that they were going to kill them a nigger tonight and went about six blocks down the road and did so, in fact. The two young men were charged with manslaughter and they both received eight years and they were out in about 18 months, and this was not reported as a hate crime.

So I think that the bias laws are a step in the right direction, but I think that the responsibility of the enforcement and the relaying of that information to the communities rests with people such as ourselves, and that's basically the

_ - -

gist of my presentation. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you,

Phyllis. The data that you collected to prepare

your testimony for today, do you think that that

data collection effort will continue, the 17

agencies will continue to gather that information?

MS. BARTLESON: I would certainly hope so. At our next meeting in September it's one of the things that I intend to put on the agenda so that each local office, whether it's from a case or from an incident that happened in the community that was reported to the police department and in turn hit the newspapers, "Clip that article. Let's begin to keep a record," because we don't have any now, and that was one of the problems.

We know personally of incidents that have gone on in our community. For example, in checking with our local law enforcement agencies, yes, there have been things that have gone on but they're not reported as hate crimes.

They're reported as school disturbances, you know, maybe this white gang against this black

gang, you know, or it's reported as a neighborhood dispute, and sometimes those kinds of activities do not hit the newspaper. It has to be something that will sell newspapers, for lack of a better term, before you read about it, unfortunately.

And I think within the black community, particularly where there has not been a very good rapport with the police over the years, there is a reluctance to report crime, there is a reluctance even to call the police in some cases because they feel that they're not going to do anything anyway, so they try to more or less handle it themselves; "I'll go get my gun and my brother-in-law," or, you know, whatever, rather than call the police and report it, which is unfortunate because then you can't collect the data, but I think there's a real problem with -- I would like to see more cooperation between those agencies and the police, law enforcement.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: I certainly wish you success in that because finding data, finding data sources, is always a difficulty, and it would be comforting to know that the Human Rights

Consortium was serving as kind of a statewide repository of that kind of information.

MS. BARTLESON: Well, we'll certainly give it our best shot.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Are there other questions from other members? Okay. We would certainly like to thank you very much at this point.

MS. BARTLESON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: At this point we have representatives of the Indianapolis Police Department, and based on a quick discussion that we held a few minutes ago, also representation from the Indiana State Police. I understand there may be some possible overlapping, so what I would like to do in the interest of time is to invite Officer Romine, along with Lieutenant Schneider, or is she still with us?

MS. SCHNEIDER: I'm not testifying.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Okay. And Sgt. Heck from the Indiana Police Department. Since I understand that your information is somewhat similar, perhaps --

(Off the record discussion.) 1 So what we'll do is CHAIRMAN HUGHES: 2 3 ask each of you gentlemen, if you would please, to introduce yourself and your departments. MR. ROMINE: Okay. I'm Officer Gary 5 Romine, I'm with the Indianapolis Police 6 Department. 7 MR. ROSE: Would you use the 8 microphone, please, sir, so the people in the back 9 10 can hear you? 11 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: If you can attach it. 12 13 MR. ROSE: Put it on your collar or your necktie, if you will. 14 MR. ROMINE: I'm Officer Gary Romine 15 I've been 16 with the Indianapolis Police Department. 17 a member for almost twelve years. My duties now are to handle uniform crime reporting for our 18 department. That includes reporting hate crimes 19 20 since Congress passed the Act in 1990 I believe. I guess what you're wanting to know, if 21 I'm correct, is how we're reporting or what we're 22

23

reporting.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Yes.

MR. ROMINE: Well, first of all, hate crimes aren't separate crimes all by themselves in the state of Indiana. At least to my knowledge there is no statute that defines a criminal act. You know, if I hate you or you or you, there's no law against that. There is a law against committing murder, rape, robbery, vandalism, that kind of thing. That's how hate crimes are investigated right now.

You heard from the lady about the cross burning. That would be investigated as a vandalism or destruction of property. When she said that there was not much the officers could charge the person with, that's very true. The Legislature hasn't passed any laws to make it a crime to do that.

You know, to burn a cross is not a crime. You can go out in your yard and do it if you want. To do it on somebody else's property, that's a vandalism or a trespassing, so it's not a hate crime by itself.

The FBI has been charged with collecting

hate crime information from the local police departments, and I'd like to say that through UCR, you know, the program is voluntary, police departments are not obligated to report hate crime. As far as I'm concerned, or I know, the Indianapolis Police Department intends to report that.

It is something new. All of a sudden we're faced with identifying crimes as hate crimes, where in the past we haven't been and we've just handled them as vandalisms, murders, and so on. So now they want us to report what hate crime is. So we're in the process of getting people trained.

I've been to an FBI seminar on hate crimes. We have a detective that's going to attend one this month, and when she gets back, hopefully then we'll have enough information to begin reporting hate crimes to the FBI through UCR.

I think it's pretty important to understand that what we report to the FBI is only going to be a real small portion of, if you will, hate crime. You know, they're going to limit us to crimes that concern against race, religion,

national origin, or sexual orientation, so you're going to have other crimes that are going to be against people who have AIDS, rich people, poor people, smokers, nonsmokers, people who drive red cars versus people who drive black cars. Those kinds of things are not going to be reported, even if there's a criminal incident occurring with them, as a hate crime.

We're going to limit -- the FBI, I should say, is limiting what we report to them as hate crimes. We're going to have to have -- first it's got to be a murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, simple assault, intimidation, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, arson, or vandalism or destruction of property.

We have to have that crime first, and then we must determine that that crime was committed because of the suspect's or the offender's bias. If it wasn't, then we won't report it as a hate crime. An example of that would be if you have two people vying for the same parking place, one is white and one's black, and one of them gets it.

that leads to an assault, a fist-fight. Maybe one of them pulls a gun and shoots the other one. If we took, let's say, the black person out and put a woman in there or another white person, would that crime have occurred? There's a great possibility that it would have. They were fighting over the parking space, not fighting over, you know, because the guy was black or was white, so that's not going to be a hate crime. Therein lies the problem.

when a crime happens, let's say it's a simple battery, and one of the parties calls the police. We get on the scene, and let's say the white guy calls the police. He's going to maybe say "The only reason this guy hit me is because I'm white and trying to get this parking place." Is that in fact true? I would suspect not.

MS. SCHMITT: Who makes that call, the officer on the scene?

MR. ROMINE: The officer on the scene is going to take the report as given to him. Then, hopefully, we will have a detective assigned.

He'll handle the assault as we would now. The only

thing now is since it's not a crime to hate somebody, we wouldn't be even looking at that. That part that we're interested in is "Okay, do you want to prosecute for the assault?" "Yes, I do." We get the necessary paperwork and then off to court we go.

Want us to report that as a hate crime if indeed it is. So the officer's going to make the report with the facts that he has on the street. The detective would then go and talk to these people, keeping in mind we need to know if it's a hate crime or not, and he's going to establish "Well, yeah, if it was a female involved or another white person, or another black person, it's not a hate crime because they would still have done the same thing."

MS. SCHMITT: So it's the detective who says "I think you ought to take it to the FBI"?

MR. ROMINE: Right, and this is going to be based on FBI guidelines. The Federal Government's going to sit down and say "okay" -- again, you've got to have a crime committed.

Assault is one of the crimes. It's got to be racial bias, religious bias, national origin bias, or sexual orientation bias. It's got to be one of those also.

So if you have the same situation and one of them has AIDS and the other doesn't, and that's why he hit him, sorry we don't report that. So, you know, there's going to be a lot of problems. The department's not trying to hide or say we don't have a hate crime problem. It's just until now nobody's asked us.

People report these as crimes and they are investigated. They've been investigated ever since I've been on the police department. It's just that we haven't singled them out as hate crimes. We just singled them out as far as rapes, robberies, what they are.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: The practical procedural problems of your addressing them is that now the detective -- the new step is the detective now has to make a determination, that's essentially the new item, the new step, for reporting purposes?

MR. ROMINE: Right. I think that's what we're going to try to accomplish. That's what I will recommend to the Chief of Police, that -- you know, I read the reports, I handle the UCR. If I see one that I suspect is a hate crime, then I can forward that to a detective who has the expertise and the knowledge to know what a hate crime is.

We'll let them talk to the victim, let them tell me. You know, as we can train detectives, train people on the department, to recognize hate crimes, and when they find one or come across one, they can notify me so that it is reported.

You know, the procedure's just not in place yet. This is too new. You know, I just found out here a week or so ago that the reason I hadn't heard from the FBI and I haven't received a packet of forms on which to report this is that Congress didn't appropriate any money to make the forms, so they tell me that the one form that I received at the seminar our department is supposed to use that and make our own.

Well, you're talking money and manpower and it's something we have to work out, and I think we will be doing it, and we're working with the State, as the State Police are, in developing an incident-based reporting system where hate crime is just part of that now, it will be the new expanded UCR, and once that comes on-line, then I think most of your agencies in Indiana that are reporting to UCR will continue reporting and will be reporting hate crimes. We'll all be using the same guidelines that defines what a hate crime is and what has to happen before it's reported.

MS. PARKER: Sir, would you please tell me what UCR stands for? Maybe I missed it.

MR. ROMINE: Oh, I'm sorry. Uniform crime reports.

MS. PARKER: I thought so, but we use all of these acronyms.

MR. ROMINE: I'm sorry. I'm so used to talking to other police officers and law enforcement people that I forget. Basically I think that's all I have.

MR. GRADISON: That's a step in the

right direction. I've been very curious as to how 1 it's going to work out. Are you making this trip 2 or are you --3 I have already been to MR. ROMINE: the seminar. 5 6 MR. GRADISON: Are you the only 7 officer who's been there so far? MR. ROMINE: I am the only one. The 8 FBI invites us. When they invited before, they 9 invited one person from the department. This time 10 they invited one more, and they're conducting that 11 12 as a regional seminar, so they're taking people 13 from several states. 14 MR. GRADISON: One of the deputy 15 chiefs or someone besides you? 16 MR. ROMINE: Well, they sent me because it's UCR and I handle the UCR, and this 17 18 time we're sending a detective from the special 19 investigations branch because they are the ones 20 that actually investigate these crimes. 21 If you have a case MR. GRADISON: 22 currently under investigation -- for instance, you know, we had someone who testified just before of a 23

crime involving a cross burning and so on at this shelter for homeless veterans and so on. You really don't have that in place yet I suppose, or you would have -- for you to be able to look at that crime, the cross burning and so on, other than as a trespass or a vandalism, when will you be picking this up where you can start looking at that kind of a case, or can you still go back and look at that case, once things are in place, as a hate crime, or have you --

MR. ROMINE: I hope to go back,
okay? I currently -- I review all police reports
from our department, all detective reports. That's
my job to make sure they conform to federal
guidelines. I have been pulling anything that I
suspect to be a hate crime.

MR. GRADISON: Okay.

MR. ROMINE: The problem with it is that all I have is raw, unsubstantiated police reports, that's what the people told the officer on the street. Again a detective is assigned to handle the crime, you know, whatever the particular crime under Indiana statute is, but they're not

particularly looking to see if it is a hate crime.

Again, it's not a crime to hate somebody.

So that they're handling that; they're

just not trained to know "Hey, we need to let

Officer Romine know that this needs to be
reported." So I hope to, once the mechanism is in
place, once we work out the problems, go back and
pick all of these up.

MR. GRADISON: You will, but -you'll have to do that yourself? I mean, I guess
there would be a training procedure sometime at the
academy or something, training new recruits, as
part of this ongoing training?

MR. ROMINE: I have no idea. I couldn't answer that.

MR. GRADISON: It's a big mission.

MR. ROMINE: I know just currently right now I'm the only one doing it.

MS. PARKER: Earlier someone -- one of the people who spoke earlier suggested that perhaps there should be some kind of a check-off when the police gathers the information initially to indicate that this probably has some hate crime

connection. How do you respond to that as a part of the procedure of trying to collect and get a sense of what the policeman saw, felt at the time, the impressions that he got at the time of gathering the information?

MR. ROMINE: I would think that's a real good possibility and I say that based on the past record. You know, a few years back there was a big interest -- interest started rising in domestic violence, and prior to that, again, we reported domestic violence as batteries, just whatever the crime was, and we still do that. All we did was have a box on our incident report to say, you know, "Suspected domestic violence? Yes or no." Probably that's what we'll do with the hate crime, I would think. Again, I'm not positive. It's something that has to be worked out.

MS. PARKER: I mean, that's a suggestion to us, so I just wanted to get a reaction.

MR. ROMINE: You know, it would flag it for me, flag it for the detectives, you know,

everybody would know "Hey, maybe we ought to report this."

MR. GRADISON: You'd obviously be able to do a better job. That's why some of the police statistics, you know, are suspect to me because you say all you've got is basic batteries and basic trespass, basic vandalism. All these other elements have not been included.

MR. ROMINE: And it depends on whose definition you're using. You know, we try to follow federal guidelines as far as how we define the crimes that we report to UCR.

MR. GRADISON: So you really don't have great generated statistics in a lot of those kinds of areas because of no way to track them previously?

MR. ROMINE: Right.

MS. SCHMITT: Did they give you -
I'm just curious -- any inclination at the training

session as to how many they expected you to

report? I mean, are you going to report every

little thing or is it going to be like really

egregious? Do you plan to report two or three or

four incidents to the FBI? I'm just curious. Do you have any feel for that whatsoever?

MR. ROMINE: As long as I'm doing

UCR, any hate crime incident I come across once we

start reporting we will report. We report

according to guidelines now and we will continue to

do so, unless I -- you know, as long as I'm there,

I can't see anybody saying different. Nobody in

the department has ever tried to, to my knowledge,

cover any of these crimes up. If they're there, we

report them. You know, the hate crimes, we report

them by the guidelines that I have here in front of

me. We report them according to those rules.

MS. SCHMITT: Uh-huh.

MR. ROMINE: Unfortunately, like I said, there are a lot of crimes that they don't include that you people may be interested in as being reported, and I'm not sure how we would, you know, respond to somebody coming up and saying "Well, hey, you have a trespass here and it's a hate crime. Are you going to report that?" Well, under federal guidelines we can't report that if it's not one of the accepted or the ones that we

can do.

MR. GRADISON: When do you think you'd be in a position where you'd be able to plug this into Bob Turner and surround the Academy as something to teach to recruits to be on the look-out for and that kind of thing?

MR. ROMINE: I would hope that sometime this fall, as soon as the detective comes back from the seminar up there, where we can work with the detectives first, you know, get them keyed into it, and then I guess it's going to be up to, again, the Chief as to when and if we would try to train every single person on the department to specifically look for hate crimes. Again, that's a major undertaking. There's 900 people on the department to train and budgets are tight.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you, Officer Romine. Officer Heck?

MR. HECK: My name is Jeff Heck with the Indiana State Police. I've been there now 14 years. I serve in our investigation division and am currently commander of our auto theft section, but have been filling in what we term our case

management section. Basically that is responsible for the collection and entering also into the uniform crime reports statistics from our case reports from our 18 different posts.

I would, I guess, echo the same thing that you heard. We track our investigations obviously by Indiana statute and could use the same examples that he's just given you. If we have a case where a -- it amounts to a battery, it's got to be reported as such.

We are also involved in the incidentbased program. First I should say it appears that
I'm going to be going to the same training he
mentioned sometime August 22nd or third, I
believe. I've been in touch with the FBI. They
recommended and requested that we didn't attempt to
try to report this until we'd been through this UCR
training.

I was curious to see -- there are apparently eight states according to the FBI that now report, have a law, a mandatory state law, reporting hate crimes, and I didn't think, and I apologize, to tell you which states those are. You

may already know. But we do -- also, the State Police plans to collect that information.

We plan to do that by converting
what's -- the way we now report to the FBI to this
incident-based reporting that's already been spoken
about, and the information that's going to be
collected will involve racial, religious, national
origin, or sexual orientation bias.

As far as implementing that plan, the only thing that may be a little bit different is the way our case system is set up is such that we have a person at each district or each post throughout the state of Indiana that's titled our district investigative coordinator, and it's his job to review and what we call status each report as to what phase of the investigation it's in.

At that point, based on the number of personnel, more than likely the 18 different investigative coordinators, will be trained. They review and read each case report, and they will be trained if they suspect that it may be something that could be reported as a hate crime and it would be one of the departmental crimes. Then if that is

not noted in the case report, I would hope then that would be sent back to the officer and that be included in the report.

case management section here in Indianapolis and then that will be entered into this incident-based reporting system we hope to have, and I think the important thing -- maybe one thing to add about that, something that certainly impressed me about it, is in addition, as a way to send information to the FBI, this also serves a database to use as far as for investigative purposes, so that information is going to be there. It's not that we're going to be collecting it and sending it away. It will be here for use if we need it.

As far as any specific hate groups, I'm sure they've probably already been mentioned here, many of them the whole day, but we know in Indiana that we have the skinheads operating, the Ku Klux Klan, and so on and so forth.

Our department, and by law, keeps information on only criminal activity. We don't document people based on membership groups and that

type of thing. We keep information. Although we do keep information according to criminal activity, so any specific -- once again, and it relates back to what we've said, any specific incident has to be related to a crime being committed before we'd keep that information.

MS. SCHMITT: I'm real curious just because I understand that it's got to be related to a crime, for example -- I forget your list -- but vandalism or something, but assuming that there is that crime, one on the list has occurred, then how does the officer determine or you determine? Is there another guideline against -- in other words, who do you have to hate? In other words, does it have to be a black, a woman, homosexual?

I mean, somebody could come into my house and say -- and I'll use my example I said this morning -- "I hate lawyers," or "I hate real estate developers." I mean, is there also another category that deals with the discriminated against class I guess is my question?

MR. ROMINE: Yeah, we have -- like under racial, it's got to be anti-white,

anti-black, anti-American, Indian, Alaskan, anti-Asian, or Pacific Islander, anti-multi-racial group.

MS. SCHMITT: Okay. I'm just curious.

MR. ROMINE: If it doesn't fall under one of those, then it's not a racial.

MR. HECK: The other thing I might add to that also, and I'm sure that most police departments have this on their case report, is a motive. Obviously property crimes and things, for example theft, I think its standard motive is personal gain, somebody takes something to profit from.

In the case of battery -- and that may be an appropriate place if some of these groups aren't represented. If, in using your example, you have a person that doesn't like lawyers and simply because of it a battery, the motive would be worded to that effect, and that would be another area that that could be picked up, as I said, hopefully by our people reviewers.

MS. SCHMITT: Uh-huh.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

Sergeant, how much liaison MR. ROSE: do you have with the various municipal and county sheriffs' departments across the state? Particularly the smaller departments that don't have the resources to send their people to these training sessions, how are they going to pick up and implement this, or do you know how they're going to pick up and implement this crime reporting statistics or federal law?

MR. HECK: The important thing to remember is, you mentioned reporting through the FBI through the uniform crime report, that's strictly voluntary. I think in Indiana, and you may know for sure, there's like a 30 percent compliance.

> MR. ROMINE: 121 agencies report.

MR. HECK: So it's not mandatory to report. Obviously those that do volunteer the information and do report I think will be complying, so I would feel safe to say of those reporting probably a hundred percent will comply. However, it is not mandatory. It's a voluntary program.

MR. ROMINE: I think maybe also you might want to know that once we start reporting to the State, the State will then report to the FBI for us. The State is going to be responsible for training the different agencies, local agencies, on how to report, what to report. So the fact that this comes under UCR, the State will have a trainer. In other words, we hire --

MR. ROSE: Your report goes not directly to the FBI but through the State, is that right?

MR. ROMINE: It will, it will. When we go to incident-based reporting and a state reporting system, then all of the local departments will have to report to the State. The State then takes it to the FBI, and currently each individual department sends it directly to the State.

MR. HECK: That's one of the advantages of the incident-based reporting, it's going to be a centralized reporting, it's going forward as he said, and if I'm not mistaken I believe there are 33 test sites right now that are going to be cooperating in testing this

.

incident-based reporting and this software package that we have.

MR. ROMINE: A lot of the training will eventually be picked up by the State that way because they're going to be training the individual departments through the law enforcement academy, how to report. It's just the initial start-up that's going to be the difficult time.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Would either of you gentlemen speculate as to when there might be a statewide network actually in place and in operation?

MR. ROMINE: At least two years I would think, at least, very minimum.

MR. HECK: What we've mentioned, this incident-based reporting, Indiana hopefully would be the first state to do that. There are other states attempting to, but I think we're much farther along at least to be able to accomplish that.

MR. ROMINE: The other states seem to be having a lot of trouble and, you know, we're picking up their problems and have solved a few of

them. The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute is going to be the agency that's going to administer the database and actually do the reporting for us, and they're looking at trying to start collecting test data sometime late this year.

And then we have to go through a test phase and the FBI has to approve, you know, what we do, and once the FBI says it's okay, then we can start reporting. Like I said, that's going to be at least two years I would think. Other states have been working on it far longer than that and still are not reporting.

MS. PARKER: Do you have any recommendations -- as people who are responsible for helping to implement this, do you have any recommendations that you could share with us that we might use in our report as to what might be something that can be done to make this more workable or to ensure that the law and the hate crime act is really enforced? We're looking for help, too, as we put together our recommendations to the Commission.

MR. HECK: Personally I feel like --

I mean, I feel like things are in place and it's just a matter of implementing them. We've been working on this, the different departments and the Criminal Justice Institute, on this incident-based reporting, and I'm very impressed with it, and it's just a matter of putting it in place.

So as far as a recommendation, it's just a matter of -- I guess patience would be the best recommendation, and sometimes that's a hard gulp to swallow, but I mean I feel very confident that this -- you know, the issues are addressed and they will not be a problem to report. It's just a matter of putting things in place.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Well, we'd certainly like to thank you gentlemen for reporting to us and also for your patience in the delays that you've experienced.

MR. ROSE: Thank you very much.

(Off the record discussion.)

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: We'd like to take just a three-minute break, if we could, and then we will go into our open session. I understand that we have four or five individuals that have signed

up to speak to the group, and we'll take a quick three-minute break.

(A brief recess was taken.)

this next session, our open session, to order, and I'd like to start the open session by reminding everyone that's present of the ground rules. This is a public meeting, open to the media and to the general public, but those of you that have expressed a desire to speak have registered.

If there are others among you who have not done so, you need to contact our staff representative, the gentleman in the back of the room, and talk with him before we can add your name to the agenda.

If you would like to provide additional information, written statements to us, that may be done this afternoon or at a later date by merely mailing the information to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The address is 175 West Jackson, Suite A-1332, Chicago, Illinois 60604. If you didn't get that, check with me later after the meeting and I'll be glad to give it to you. The

record for this meeting will remain open for receipt of that information until August 31st.

It is also necessary to remind everyone that from time to time in the course of our meeting information may be controversial. We have sought to ensure that all sides of controversy have been invited. Any person or organization that feels that they may be defamed or denigrated by any statements made during the proceedings should contact our staff during the meeting. We've sought to ensure that all of our guests do not defame or degrade anyone or organization, and would remind all of our speakers during this public session to keep that in mind.

This is a hearing, a forum, on the rise of hate crimes in Indiana. We define a hate crime as an incident of violence or intimidation motivated by bias, hatred, or prejudice based on some characteristic of the victim.

We are here and the scope of our forum is statewide, and we are open to crimes that are not necessarily limited to hate crimes committed by whites. For the information that we have been

1 attempting to gather, we are interested in specific 2 incidents, not necessarily general statements. We would like specific reasons for a perceived 3 increase or decrease, if that's the position, and 5 recommendations on how to alleviate or prevent hate crimes. 6 With that kind of additional background 7 information, we have several individuals who have 8 requested to address the Indiana Advisory 9 10 Committee, and we'll start with Mr. Phil Burger. 11 Do I have the correct name? MR. BURGER: The first name is 12 13 Donald. CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Oh, I'm sorry. 14 15 MR. BURGER: That's quite all right. 16 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: If you would identify yourself and the city of your residence, 17 please, and if you represent or if you are 18 affiliated with an organization that you're 19 20 speaking for, please identify the organization for 21 the record.

MR. BURGER:

and I'm the owner of Community Conflict Resolution

22

23

÷

My name is Donald Burger

_ _ _

Services, Inc., a for-profit advocacy organization, at 1512 N.W. 82nd Terrace in Kansas City, Missouri.

I'm in town to participate in a meeting of the National Association of Human Rights Workers that commences this evening, and will be on the program tomorrow afternoon addressing myself to police mutilations and hate crimes generally.

I am a former and now retired employee of the United States Department of Justice Community Relations Service. Prior to having served 22 and a half years with that organization, I was the first director of the Iowa Civil Rights Commission and served as the assistant director for the Kentucky Civil Rights Commission.

I'm going to limit myself to speaking to several resources addressing hate crime activity that you may or may not be aware of, and I'll leave copies of the printed material with you after my comments are finished.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Burger, before you start, I neglected to mention that we would like to limit all testimony to five minutes.

MR. BURGER: Well, I'll keep it unde

2 five.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you.

MR. BURGER: From the 1990 annual report of the Unites States Department of Justice Community Relations Service there's a paragraph titled "1-800-347 Hate Hotline." On April 30th, 1990, the Community Relations Service initiated a 1-800-347 hate telephone hotline for reporting incidents of harassment and hate violence arising out of prejudice, based on race, color, or national origin.

On May 9th, 1990, CRS was authorized to receive reports of incidents based also on sexual orientation and religion. The President announced initiation of the toll-free hotline service at the signing of the Hate Crime Statistics Act. The 800 line enables CRS to reach more individuals in the communities who are involved in racial and ethnic disputes, disagreements, and difficulties.

The line provides individuals who are parties to racial or ethnic disputes involving harassment or hate violence a safe, immediate, and

effective way of requesting assistance. Hotline calls requesting assistance based on race, color, or national origin are referred to one of CRS's ten regional offices for attention.

CRS collects information and tabulates calls reporting incidents of hate violence and harassment arising out of sex orientation and religious prejudice.

The next paragraph: Hate violence and hate group activities - The Community Relations

Service will continue to respond to conflicts arising out of hate violence and hate group activity across the nation. The reporting of such incidents may increase with the advent of the CRS toll-free telephone services and the national reporting of hate-motivated crimes under the Hate Crime Statistics Act.

The Community Relations Service will work with state, regional, and local agencies and communities to examine, design, and implement alternative approaches to reduce, prevent, and adequately respond to racially-motivated acts of violence.

From the preceding year's annual report to Congress, the Community Relations Service

Northwest Region, in the wake of rising concerns over malicious racial harassment and hate group activity, in the Northwest Region local task forces were formed with CRS assistance in 18 communities.

With assistance by CRS and the governors of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington in November of '89, this coalition provided training for 125 regional law enforcement personnel.

The coalition's legal and corporation papers, bylaws and methodology, have been used by two other CRS regional offices in establishing the Mountain States Coalition in the Rocky Mountain Region, Denver, and the Heartland Coalition in the Central Region, Kansas City.

The last document I have just came off the press this past month and it's titled "Avoiding Racial Conflict - a Guide for Municipalities," and I'll read the pertaining paragraph. Hate activity ordinance - A municipality can further demonstrate its concern about the safety and security of its citizens by establishing an ordinance against hate

crime activity, that is crimes in which racial or ethnic bias or prejudice is the motivating factor.

A municipality may wish to establish an ordinance against hate activity modeled on an existing hate crime law which may be in effect in that state; develop public service announcements and local information campaigns to inform community residents about hate crime; develop a local coalition to counter hate activity involving all segments of the community, such as police, educators, clergy, business people, human relations specialists, adults and young people, and establishing a local hotline for reporting hate or bias activity. Data collected by such units can aid local officials in measuring trends and in enforcing civil rights protections for all members of the community. And that's all of my comments.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you,

Mr. Burger. Questions from any member?

MR. GRADISON: What is this

conference tomorrow, you're participating in

tomorrow, the conference tomorrow?

MR. BURGER: The National Association

```
of Human Rights Workers is having its annual
 1
      regional conference, and among the topics to be
 2
 3
      discussed include police-community relations and
 4
      hate group activity. There are also sections on
      housing, employment, and the other issues that
 5
 6
      concern the civil rights enforcement agencies.
                    MR. GRADISON: Where will this take
 7
 8
      place?
                    MR. BURGER: There's a reception
 9
      tonight, all day tomorrow, at the Omni. I assume
10
      you know where that's at. I'm not sure I do yet.
11
12
                    MR. GRADISON: A class hotel, my
13
      goodness.
                 We couldn't afford it. We're just poor
14
      civil rights workers.
15
                    MR. BURGER: So am I, and I'm
16
      considerably poorer now that I got here.
17
                    CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Well, thank you.
18
                    MR. GRADISON: Thank you very much.
19
                    CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Well, we appreciate
20
      your interest in sitting in on our hearing through
21
      today.
22
                    MR. BURGER: My pleasure.
23
                    MR. GRADISON: The public I take
```

፤

it -- is there a schedule in terms of when they're going to deal with the police-community relations question?

MR. BURGER: Yes, there is. I can give you a copy of the agenda.

MR. GRADISON: I'd like to have that, please.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Our next speaker is Mr. Alvin Sykes.

MR. SYKES: Good afternoon. My name is Alvin Sykes and I'm here in two capacities, representing two organizations. One, I'm the national president of The Justice Campaign of America, a non-profit organization in Kansas City that provides assistance to victims of crimes and injustices. I'm also here in my capacity as atlarge -- midwest at-large board member for the National Association of Human Rights Workers.

Since I've been driving and riding all night from Kansas City to here, I will certainly stay within your five-minute time limit because we haven't checked into the hotel and I'm ready to go, but I felt, particularly with the significance of

this week and this opportunity to present to
this -- testimony to this body, I would be remiss

if I did not come here and share some of the
knowledge and experience that we have had in Kansas
City and other parts of the country.

Specifically my testimony will relate to the issues of dual prosecution by state and Federal Government as it relates to the criminal civil rights enforcement, also effective use of the law enforcement coordinating committees that are established around the country that assist the federal and local law enforcement officials, as well as the creation of a justice-seeking atmosphere within communities that have -- to us that have been very effective in fighting hate crime activity.

I will speak particularly of one particular case because it is our signature case and embodied within the pursuit of this one case I will address the three areas that I wanted to deal with.

Ten years ago this week in Kansas City an individual by the name of Raymond Bledsoe

Ť

(phonetic) was on trial in state court for first-degree murder charges. He was tried before an all-white jury in the death of a musician in Kansas City by the name of Steven Harvey (phonetic).

Even though there was testimony given by co-accomplices of his who witnessed him beat Steven Harvey with a baseball bat to death, as well as friends that, when he returned from a park, that had blood all over him testified to that, Raymond Bledsoe was acquitted in state court for first-degree murder charges.

Immediately there was racial tension within Kansas City. Most of it was directed toward the all-white jury and the motivations of an all-white jury that acquitted this individual.

We in fact contacted the United States

Justice Department, myself along with his widow

contacted the civil rights division seeking a civil

rights investigation. We were initially told that

no, there's nothing the Justice Department can do

because of the fact that Raymond Bledsoe and Steven

Harvey were not state officials and murder is not a

federal offense except under certain circumstances.

Subsequently we went to the library on our own and looked up the statutes and found the three criminal civil rights statutes that are on the books that apply all across the country.

Basically it's 18-241, which is conspiracy against rights of citizens; 18-242, deprivation of rights under the federal law; and 18-245, which is deprivation of rights -- no, I've said that one.

It's the federally protected activities statute.

In this instance what we sought to do immediately was to inform the public that there was an alternative action that could be taken in this case because the United States Supreme Court previously had established that when one set of facts violate both federal and state laws, that there is dual jurisdiction, and both the jurisdictions can prosecute irrespective of what the other one does on a particular case, and it would not constitute double jeopardy.

So we established lines of communication between the law enforcement community, the civil

rights community, as well as the local enforcement community, and we went to Washington. We helped establish a justice-seeking atmosphere by getting people to understand that if they cooperated with the law enforcement officials, particularly in Washington, and with the FBI, that we would have an opportunity to be able to obtain justice in the case.

We also dissected aspects of the case that were of concern to the public, the issue of an all-white jury being one of them, and we subsequently made changes within the state law as it addressed blacks being included -- an increasing number of blacks being included in the jury pools.

After 18 months of pursuit and monitoring of the federal investigation in Washington and getting people to cooperate along with the FBI in their investigation, a civil rights trial was held in Jefferson City, Missouri, and Raymond Bledsoe was convicted of civil rights violations under the 18-245 statute, which was depriving him, Steve Harvey, of use of a public facility because of his race, and Raymond Bledsoe

is now serving a life sentence in a federal penitentiary in Alabama.

That case there, the knowledge that we gained from that case, compelled us to form The Justice Campaign of America, and I will submit some literature to you that will expound on what we do, but to address those three previous points that I wanted to address is why it's important that there be dual prosecution here in the United States.

within the United States they do not -- people do not know what constitutes a civil rights violation, so therefore they don't know to go to the Federal Government as well as to go to the local officials. If people are aware that they can in fact go to the Federal Government and that they can hold the Federal Government accountable, as well as the local officials, then a lot of the frustration that people go through will subside.

The other issue is the law enforcement coordinating committee. During the middle '80s under Ed Meese there was established law enforcement coordinating committees all across the

=

country in every district. The chairman of the -the U.S. Attorney in each district is the chairman
of it.

It was designed to deal with prosecutorial problems between law enforcement so that they can come together on various cases and determine whether this case can be tried here or whether it be tried in this jurisdiction or in both, in exchange of information.

If that in fact had occurred earlier on in Steve Harvey's case, we would not have had the problems that we've had to go through to get the information and get the people to cooperate with the law enforcement officials.

justice-seeking atmosphere is when you can establish open lines of communication between human rights workers, the bureaucracies with the community, with grass-roots organizations, and help elevate the pursuit above the emotional level and get to the heart of justice. That will effectively decrease the occurrence of hate crimes here in America and certainly here in the state of

1 Indiana. CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you, 2 Questions for Mr. Sykes? Thank you Mr. Sykes. 3 4 very much. 5 MR. ROSE: Are you a lawyer? MR. SYKES: No, I'm a victim 6 There's a difference. advocate. 7 MR. ROSE: You're a very articulate 8 9 man. MR. GRADISON: Thank you very much. 10 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Dr. Greg Dixon. 11 MR. DIXON: Thank you very much. 12 Chairman Hughes and each of you, I appreciate this 13 opportunity to come and give you an opportunity to 14 at least understand where myself and others of our 15 fellow pastors are coming from. 16 I'm Dr. Greg Dixon, pastor of the 17 Indianapolis Baptist Temple here in the city of 18 I am also the national chairman of 19 Indianapolis. 20 the American Coalition of Unregistered Churches. 21 Every day myself and our fellow pastors 22 and members of our churches are subjected to the most vile, wicked, unconscionable verbal abuse, not 23

-

only in person, but in written form, through anonymous telephone calls and even threats, et cetera, and yet we would be the last to come to this forum today and suggest that there should be an expansion of the hate crime laws of the United States, whether local, federal, or state; in fact to the contrary.

Our recommendation is that all hate crime laws and legislation cease immediately in the United States, especially, quote unquote, verbal intimidation. In essence, these laws, if allowed to continue, will literally outlaw the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Sinners down through the ages have always considered the specific preaching against their sin to be verbal intimidation and a serious threat against their well-being. In reality, these laws would make any serious contemporary application of the Bible illegal.

The meaning of person and hate crime legislation, quote, race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, should be stricken totally. Preaching in itself is

in reality a verbal threat. By its very nature it delivers to the ear a serious warning from the Almighty to mend their ways or suffer serious physical, emotional, or eternal consequences, except for immediate repentance.

Paul, the Apostle, would have been guilty of a hate crime in the book of Titus, Chapter 1, Verses 12 and 13, when he declared the Christians to be liars, evil beasts, and slow bellies, quote unquote, with the added admonition to Titus to, quote, rebuke them sharply, closed quote.

He would have also been guilty of a possible Class A misdemeanor in Acts, Chapter 17, Verse 22, when he told the Athenians that he perceived them to be too superstitious, and the Apostle would've been guilty of a Class C felony in Acts 24-25 because of his graphic description of the ruler Felix's shortcomings.

I might add that, in context, that Felix had a drinking problem, which means that if Paul had called him a drunkard, it would've fallen under the category of physical disability in that the AMA

has deemed alcoholism a disease.

Obviously Felix was intimidated because he trembled. Felix was a law enforcement and also a member of the judiciary, therefore calling for an even greater or heavier penalty.

Paul would have also broken these laws when he told the Romans that sodomy is vile affections. Of course the Lord Jesus Christ would have broken every area of these laws in Matthew, Chapter 23, when he delivered his excoriating sermon against the Pharisees, a sect of the Jews.

In a free society the preacher and others must always be allowed to speak out against wicked officials and ordinary people, for God is no respecter of persons. The First Amendment has served us well for these 200 years. Let us not tinker with it now, especially when it involves the people from hearing a message from God, whether it be from the pulpit, press, or public platform.

Are we near to Orwell's thought police?

I hope not. To give you a little idea briefly of what I'm talking about and the practical application of what I'm saying, last year Dr. Paul

Cameron, a nationally recognized Christian, pro-family activist and researcher, drove to Canada to deliver a public lecture which would criticize homosexuality.

When he arrived at the border the cases of books and literature he brought with him were impounded. He was told that in Canada it is against the law to humiliate homosexuals publicly. In 1988 an evangelical pastor in Sweden opened his Bible to the story of Sodom and Gomorrah; informed his congregation that God is still angry at sexual perversion and will judge those who practice it.

Several months later this pastor was serving a four-week sentence in jail. He had violated Sweden's anti-hate statute, a law which protects groups such as homosexuals from, quote unquote, verbal violence, public statements which might cause them embarrassment because of their sexual orientation.

West Germany, Britain, Israel, as well as Canada and Sweden, already have their anti-hate legislation firmly in place. I think it not difficult to see that the United States of America

is headed in the same direction, and for this reason the American Coalition of Unregistered Churches call for the total disbandment of all of these laws that strike the very core and heart of the First Amendment and in the final analysis will not really solve our social problems. Thank you.

MR. GRADISON: Dr. Dixon, in terms of -- you know, where would you draw the border between what is acceptable First Amendment protected speech? I know you and I have debated this issue on several occasions.

For instance, if it is a particular group such as homosexuals, or Sodomites as you refer to them, you don't say that -- if the verbiage is "Let's all get together and kill them or main them or, you know, do grave personal injury upon this group as a class," and so on, is that kind of thing acceptable?

I mean, where do we draw the line between hateful things you say about a particular group of people because you think that their -- their sinful activities in which they engage -- where do you draw the line between "You're terrible"

people because you engage in sinful activities" and making threats of some kind? Where do you draw that line do you think?

MR. DIXON: Well, if it can be proved that what a person said incited violence, then obviously that person from a civil standpoint certainly would be culpable and even possibly from a criminal standpoint, from the standpoint of inciting a riot, as an example, and these have always been recognized as common law crimes down through history.

Now, if a person says these things ought to happen, or even if a person says that those things should happen, as long as they don't happen, they should be totally protected under the First Amendment.

MR. GRADISON: So in other words, if they say that "You are a sinful group and engage in activity which God has condemned historically, traditionally, Biblically," what have you, "and you should all go to hell, you know, tomorrow morning," --

MR. DIXON: That should be totally

```
protected.
 1
                    MR. GRADISON: -- or that "You're not
 2
      worthy of living anymore," or something like that,
 3
      or "You're terrible people and death is too good a
      fate for you" --
 5
 6
                    MR. DIXON: But you understand what
 7
      you're saying is not necessarily what I would
 8
      say, --
 9
                    MR. GRADISON: Well, that's what I'm
10
      saying. I'm trying to --
                    MR. DIXON: -- or what someone else
11
12
      might say, but I believe it should be protected.
                                    To say that "You" --
13
                    MR. GRADISON:
14
      you know, to say that "You should all die
      tomorrow," for instance?
15
                                I'm -- I'm not -- I'm not
16
                    MR. DIXON:
      saying I would say that.
17
                    MR. GRADISON: I'm not saying you
18
      would say it either.
19
20
                    MR. DIXON: If a person did say that,
21
      it should be protected.
22
                                   As opposed to "Let's
                    MR. GRADISON:
23
      all get baseball bats and go down" -- "we'll all
```

march out of the church and go down and beat them 1 over the head," or something, you'd agree that 2 would not be protected? 3 MR. DIXON: I think that should be protected. 5 MR. GRADISON: But if they all gather 6 together and decide to go downtown and take 7 action --8 9 MR. DIXON: The minute the common law 10 crime has been committed, an injury has been done, 11 then at that point whoever the perpetrator of the injury is ought to suffer the consequences. 12 13 MR. GRADISON: Okay. So in other words, if nothing happens, no matter what you were 14 15 invited to do, it's okay and should be protected? 16 MR. DIXON: Absolutely. I'm curious, Dr. Dixon, 17 MS. SCHMITT: 18 because you weren't here the whole time, but I can see what you're saying as far as what you and Mike 19 just went through as far as a verbal type of First 20 Amendment issue, but we've heard a lot of testimony 21

today, and I think one of the issues that's going

to come in front of our committee is if in fact a

٠

22

23

crime was done, in other words a white batters a black only because of racial reasons, in other words, you know, it's just a racial hate crime, if you will, that in addition to battery, as opposed to it being white on white, that there ought to be — that ought to be either a separate criminal charge and/or an aggravated circumstance that could possibly add more to the perpetrator's sentence, are you in agreement or disagreement with that?

MR. DIXON: I'm in total --

MS. SCHMITT: I'm speaking about hate crimes, and that's really, I think, what we're doing here.

MR. DIXON: I am in total disagreement to that. I do not believe there's any respecter of persons, and I do not believe that a black or white is any more precious as far as the law is concerned, nor do I believe that a policeman who is injured in the line of duty is any more precious than the individual citizen who is injured. There must be no respecter of persons. That's why hate crimes strike at the very heart of the destruction of our liberties.

MR. GRADISON: So in other words, we'll say it's a -- a group of African-American militants may decide that too many young black men are being shot by white police officers, and they gather together and they have a meeting and they say "Let's go down and bash all of the white people to death that we can." They march right out and they do just exactly that.

I mean, the dimension could be now "Hate all white people and all white people are not worthy of living anymore, and let's do something about it." You think that would mean that beyond the fact that they may assault people and there may be physical injury, that's all there should be; the element of hate and an enhanced penalty say, an enhanced sentence as a result of hate along with the criminal act itself should not happen?

MR. DIXON: That's correct.

MR. ROSE: As a hypothesis, if some group or gang burns down your church because they don't like you and don't like what you preach, don't like your religion, and this has parallels because other institutions have --

1 MR. DIXON: It has been done, 2 obviously. Okay. What kind of a 3 MR. ROSE: crime would you classify that as, or how would you 4 classify that criminally? 5 6 MR. DIXON: Arson. 7 MR. ROSE: Simple arson? MR. DIXON: Yes, sir. 8 9 MR. GRADISON: If the Baptist Temple 10 was burned tonight by a bunch of --11 MR. ROSE: Anybody. 12 MR. GRADISON: -- a bunch of Nazarenes 13 or something, but anybody at all --MR. DIXON: Of course they'd lose 14 15 their salvation, so they wouldn't do it, you know. 16 I say that jokingly because my friend, Pastor Hood, 17 was supposed to've been here. 18 MR. GRADISON: Yeah, I understand 19 We know Pastor Hood. But I'm saying that if 20 they're going to suffer in God's court, you know, 21 for that reason, but they shouldn't suffer any further other than an arson charge for what they've 22 23 done burning down the Indianapolis Baptist Temple?

MR. DIXON: I think you make a very good point. God alone can judge hate, not man.

Man can judge arson. Man can judge the physical act and he is responsible to judge that, that is the State.

MR. GRADISON: Would you as an individual and a man of God, preacher of God, forgive whatever religious group -- well, say a religious group burns down the Indianapolis Baptist Temple because he does not like what you preach and your measures of deliverance are abhorrent to them, I mean what would you do? Is that something you would forgive them for they knew not what they did, that type of thing?

MR. DIXON: I would encourage our congregation to collectively and publicly issue a statement of forgiveness, but we would insist upon them being prosecuted to the farthest extent of the law because we have a responsibility to protect society. If it was just us alone, we would totally forgive them, even the penalty.

In other words, we would not try to enact a penalty upon them physically, but because

we have a responsibility to protect society, and it may be your church the next time, or your house the next time. Therefore, if we do not prosecute or insist upon prosecution, then the next time it may be someone else's church.

MR. GRADISON: So the deterrent to hate is basically in God's company? You don't recognize hate as a dimension of crime, or whatever; hate should only be dealt with by God?

MR. DIXON: Yes, but I do not mean to imply that a physical act of violence that is produced from the motivation of hatred, that when the State takes proper action against that individual that it does not deter motive and emotion and even the emotion of hate. I believe it does deter it.

But I believe the problem is that we do not -- as the book of Ecclesiastes says, because sentence against an evil work is not carried out speedily, the sons of men continually set themselves to do evil.

And I want to make it very clear to you that I do not believe that I have a prejudiced bone

I do not practice that kind of thing, within me. 1 but on the other hand I have the ability to hate 2 the sin and love the sinner. Some people do not 3 have that capacity. Some people don't have that But nevertheless, I believe in the old ability. 5 adage, sticks and stones may break my bones but 6 dirty words can't hurt me, and I was taught that as 7 a child and we teach our children. 8 Is there not something in MR. ROSE: 9 the scriptures that prescribes love thy neighbor? 10 And would that apply even if thy neighbor was not 11 acceptable to you or was an unrepentant sinner? 12 MR. DIXON: I'm not quite sure of 13 14 your question. Maybe I'm not clear. 15 MR. ROSE: MR. DIXON: I believe in loving my 16 neighbor. 17 I acknowledge I don't know MR. ROSE: 18 the scriptures like you know them. 19 Well, no, I believe in 20 MR. DIXON: loving -- you've quoted them correctly. I believe 21 in loving my neighbor, but I'm not quite sure of 22

the point that you were trying to make.

23

MR. ROSE: The follow-on would be no matter who thy neighbor is, what thy neighbor believes, or how thy neighbor behaves, in other words if the person was an unrepentant sinner in your eyes or by your standards, would the same admonition of the scriptures apply, love thy neighbor?

MR. DIXON: Absolutely.

MR. ROSE: So that hatred and hate would be something that you might preach against or admonish your congregation not to practice, but there could be no punishment for that except from the Higher Authority, is that right?

MR. DIXON: That's correct, except to the degree that they commit a common law crime and at the point they commit that common law crime of violence against someone's personal property or life or person or personal liberty, at that point the State has the right to use whatever force is necessary to deter that person, and I contend that if that is done speedily and fairly, that it will cure hatred in society and class distinction.

MR. GRADISON: I have one last

question, Dr. Dixon. Just following up with what -- with just the statements Mr. Rose just stated that if you preach the problem from the holy pulpit in your church of hatred for certain people who left God, we'll say the homosexual community, Gays and Lesbians, preaching hatred to those people, I mean how do you deal with that question?

Obviously you think their life-style is sinful, and would you seek to deliver them from that life-style? I mean, how would you approach that? What is it -- if you don't preach hatred from the pulpit with regard to homosexuality, what do you preach, or how do you preach? How do you characterize -- because I know how strongly you feel about that.

What can you preach that says you're loving thy neighbor in spite of all of their sins?

I mean, how do you preach you love them but yet you hate them? I don't understand how you do those two things.

MR. DIXON: Well, we tell them that -- we try to the best of our ability to warn them of their actions, that it's a violation of

God's law. We try to tell them that God loved them so much that he sent Christ into the world, his only begotten son, to die for them on a cross, and that he paid their sin debt in full, and that they can be forgiven and redeemed totally and completely and have eternal life and a home in Heaven.

But we also tell them the consequences of their sin, that the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ, our Lord, and we tell them that whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap, and he that soweth to the flesh will of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the spirit, will of the spirit reap life everlasting.

And we certainly do not advocate violence toward any sinner, quote unquote, regardless of what that sin may be, but being white or black or yellow is not a sin, and I certainly wouldn't want to give that impression in any way, shape, or form. There's a vast difference between race and sin, what people do deliberately.

MS. SCHMITT: I have one more question.

1 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Okay, one more 2 question and then we need to move on. 3 MS. SCHMITT: We have heard testimony today about crimes that are racially or 5 discriminatorily motivated. Let's take that as a 6 Somebody hurt somebody else only because a given. 7 white doesn't like a black, for example, and I'm 8 still struggling with that. 9 Our goal or our charge, rather, is to 10 advise the United States Civil Rights Commission on 11 what ought to be done about this, assuming there is 12 a problem. You're saying that our advice should not be to legislate against it? 13 14 MR. DIXON: That's correct. What would your advice 15 MS. SCHMITT: be then? 16 17 MR. DIXON: To vigorously carry out 18 the laws, the common law crimes in this country 19 against violence against persons and their property 20 and their personal liberty. 21 MR. GRADISON: No enhanced penalties, 22 though, on the basis of --23 MR. DIXON: That's correct.

Ξ

MR. GRADISON: -- acknowledging hate
being part of the element of the crime?

MR. DIXON: That's correct.

MR. ROSE: So in a practical case
that we heard testimony on today, a cross was
burned on somebody's lawn in this city, the family
is terribly intimidated, which was the purpose of
the cross burning, the crime calls for a thirddegree, I believe it is, misdemeanor for
trespassing, with a mild fine, and that's the
extent of the punishment, and yet your testimony
would be that in no way should that be enhanced or
should that perpetrator suffer any further penalty
than a simple misdemeanor trespass, which is the
only statute in which they can presently be charged
with in this state?

MR. DIXON: That's true, sir. Now, if they want to increase the penalty, that's another story altogether, but the problem is in the state of Minnesota someone -- they were trying to charge an individual with burning a cross on their own property, on their own property.

MR. ROSE: That's not a crime.

MR. DIXON: I would hope not, 1 2 although I certainly would hate anyone -- the idea of burning a cross even on a person's own property, 3 but I think they ought to have that right. MR. ROSE: Well, they have a right to burn their own flag but they can't steel somebody 6 else's and burn it, that's theft. 7 MR. DIXON: They want to do it on 8 their own property. 9 10 MR. ROSE: Yeah. CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Thank you very 11 much. 12 Thank you, thank you very 13 MR. DIXON: 14 kindly. 15 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Next we have a group of individuals that have asked to present 16 17 themselves to this committee as a group, so we would ask them to come forward at this time, and I 18 19 will ask that each of the speakers limit themselves 20 to two minutes, in accordance with the limits that we've set on others. 21 What I will do is since I have a list of 22 23 names -- I guess I'm not exactly sure how you want

```
1
      to proceed.
                   Is there a spokesperson?
 2
                    MR. LATEEF:
                                 Yeah.
                    CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Who is our
 3
 4
      spokesperson?
                    MR. LATEEF:
                                 Well, since I'm the
 5
      adult, I'll be the spokesperson first thing.
 6
 7
                    CHAIRMAN HUGHES: What I'd like to do
      is to ask each of you before you start your
 8
      statements if you would identify yourself carefully
 9
      for the record, and in some cases we may need to
10
11
      spell names so that we get them accurately into the
12
      record.
13
                    MR. LATEEF:
                                 Okay. I'm going to
      speak last, so go ahead.
14
15
                    MR. ROSE:
                               Whoever's speaking --
                    MR. GRADISON: Why don't you just
16
17
      speak first.
18
                    MR. ROSE: -- use the microphone.
19
                    MR. LATEEF: No, I'm going to speak
20
      last.
21
                    MR. GRADISON:
                                    Okay. Well, go ahead
      and introduce yourself because they're putting it
22
23
      in their --
```

MR. BUTTS: My name is Dehaven Butts and I'm 12 years old and I go to this community thing and they call it NYB, and they telling me there's a lot of things that was going on in the world.

MR. LATEEF: You got something to say about hate crimes?

MR. BUTTS: Yes, I got something to say about hate crimes. The Ku Klux Klan, they be killing people and getting away with it, but if it's one of us black people, when we kill somebody, we on the ground, handcuffs, faced in the dirt.

The Ku Klux Klan, they get to walk away like nothing happened, just like a free bird. That's all I got to say.

MR. NEELY: My name is Ramon Neely, and I'm also with the Neighborhood Youth Brigade organization, and what I have to say about hate crimes is a lot of -- we've seen a lot of this in our neighborhood, especially with the police action, and not just, you know, singling out white police or black police, but the police in general about their actions and the way they -- what do you

say -- going about their process of handling other 1 people, and there are specific incidents and one 2 is, you know, under investigation right now, so 3 they say, and this is what I have to say about the 4 police and their actions. 5 MR. LATEEF: I'd like to say this, 6 7 too, we don't want any pictures taken. CHAIRMAN HUGHES: This is a public 8 meeting, as I said earlier. 9 MR. LATEEF: We don't want any 10 pictures taken. 11 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: If there is someone 12 who would like not to be officially --13 14 MR. LATEEF: We do not want any 15 pictures taken. It's a part of the same thing that's going on in this city every day. You're in 16 here talking about cross burning when the police is 17 out here with that violence and intimidation. 18 Don't nobody want to have no meetings on them. 19 20 They like to take pictures, carry them back down 21 there to the police station, and intimidate 22 everybody in the neighborhood. That's why we do

not want any pictures taken.

23

1 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Lateef, as I mentioned at the very beginning, this is a public 2 3 meeting. Everything that we do in this meeting has to be open and on the public record. If you do not 4 wish to --5 MR. LATEEF: Why is he taking 7 pictures? 8 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: It's a public 9 meeting. 10 MR. LATEEF: Why is he -- why are you 11 taking pictures, man? 12 PHOTOGRAPHER: I work for the 13 Indianapolis News. 14 MR. LATEEF: And the Indianapolis 15 News has been on every -- and you don't put our 16 pictures in the paper, you don't tell the truth 17 about what's going on in the community, and we 18 don't want the Indianapolis News taking our 19 picture. 20 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Lateef, if you 21 do not wish to have your picture taken, I would --22 MR. LATEEF: This guy right here, he's filming, that's fine. We do not want the 23

Indianapolis News taking our picture.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: If you do not wish to be a part of the public --

MR. LATEEF: If there are any Indianapolis News' reporters in here, we don't want you to write anything about us.

ability, because it is a public meeting, to deter anyone from taking pictures of all people present or from making transcriptions of the record. If you feel that it is inappropriate for you or any of these young people to be officially a part of the meeting, I would respectfully ask that they not testify.

MR. LATEEF: No. We here because it's supposed to be a Government operation.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Because it is --

MR. LATEEF: The Indianapolis Star is not a part of the Government. The Indianapolis Star came down and the Indianapolis News came down on Jeffrey Modisett and told him what he'd better do is file charges on Mike Tyson. Other than that, they weren't going to do that. So what they are,

Department, the Indianapolis Star is, and you can put that on record right there. That's how we feel about that.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: The federal law is very explicit in terms of this being open to the public and --

MR. LATEEF: It may be.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: -- access to --

MR. LATEEF: It may be open to the public, brother, but what we're saying here in this city -- this is why we come down here to this Commission to talk, and not about cross burnings, but about the police violence, intimidation, and murder that's going on around this city with black people. That's why we come down here to talk.

We don't have no grind -- no ax to grind with individual whites. We got an ax to grind with the Indianapolis Police Department, the Mayor's office, and the Governor's office. That's the -- and these people that claim they are the civil rights agencies in this city, that's who we got an ax to grind with.

In the paper they claimed that this was a public, open meeting. We admit to that. We come in here for that, but the Indianapolis Star and News, Channel 8, 13, and 6, is always out here on the street taking pictures of us. Our opinions, our concerns, are never in the paper, so what are they doing with it?

They carrying it back to the editor's office saying "We don't want this in here, but we want this right here in here," and we're not going to allow them to take pictures of us, and what we're doing, we smashing cameras, brother, that's what we're doing, we're smashing cameras.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Lateef, --

MR. LATEEF: I want you to understand it. We've got a serious problem in this city, man, and it ain't about coming up having no meetings in some room. We got a serious problem out here.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Lateef, if you want to enter information and you do not wish to be pictured, there is an alternative, and that alternative is something that I mentioned earlier.

MR. LATEEF: We have come down here

to a public meeting.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Before --

MR. LATEEF: We don't mind coming down here to public meetings.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Lateef, --

MR. LATEEF: We will come to public meetings, but we do not want our pictures up in the police department for them to identify us and have everybody in the neighborhood intimidating us, including the police. That's what I'm saying here, man.

This man right here knows about that.

He might say he don't know anything about it, but

he knows about it. I don't know if the rest of you

all are from Indianapolis or not, but that man

right there knows about it.

He knows about the police murders and intimidation that's going on in these neighborhoods, and when you look in the Indianapolis Star and when you look in the Indianapolis News, a whole different version come out, and every time we try to get our version out in the paper, we never can get it out and he's a

part of that. 1 MS. PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I think 2 the five minutes have been used up. 3 MR. NEELY: She's trying to get us out. 5 No, no, because the --MS. PARKER: 6 MR. LATEEF: We can leave. You all 7 sit up there and ask this man all them questions 8 about churches, how he felt about that, and we've 9 got some serious problems in this city. 10 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Mr. Lateef, I have 11 12 tried to accord to you appropriate respect and 13 dignity. I have listened to you and you have 14 refused repeatedly to allow me to finish my statement. 15 Brother, you have told 16 MR. LATEEF: 17 me what you -- you told me this was a public 18 meeting, that man can sit and do whatever he wanted to do, and if I didn't want to be a part of him 19 20 taking my picture, then I could give you a piece of 21 paper and I could leave here. That's what you said. 22

And I'm telling you, Mr. Hughes, Jr.,

23

```
that we've got a serious problem here in this city
 1
 2
      and we ain't about to protocol or kissing
      somebody's butt, and you have come down here and
 3
      said you come down here to make some
 4
      recommendations to the President and the Congress
 5
 6
      people.
 7
                 That man right there is sitting on your
      side. He knows exactly what's been going on in
 8
 9
      this city. He tried to act like he didn't know who
10
      I was. I come around and shook his hand. Well, he
11
      knows what's been going on in this city. We're
      down here --
12
13
                    MR. GRADISON: I knew who you were.
14
                    MR. LATEEF: Oh, so you was playing
15
      dumb. See there?
16
                    CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Okay, Mr.
17
      Lateef, --
18
                    MR. LATEEF: See there? Look what he
19
      did.
            Thank you, brother, we're going to leave
20
      here.
21
                    CHAIRMAN HUGHES:
                                      Thank you.
22
                    (Off the record discussion.)
23
                    CHAIRMAN HUGHES: We have one
```

additional speaker, and Mr. David Boone is our speaker. I remind everyone, as I have repeatedly done through the day, this is a public meeting, everything is on the record, and the press has every right to be here. Mr. Boone, would you please use the microphone?

MR. BOONE: I'll probably speak loud enough. My name is David Boone. I'm vice president of the Hillside Neighborhood Association. I'm also on the board of directors of the Williams Wright Community Development Corporation and also the Brightwood Martindale Community Development Corporation.

What I'd like to speak about today is just a couple of issues. I was at work today. I heard about this at the last minute, or I would have came more prepared, but some of the issues that I saw that I'd like to address, the first issue that I noticed was the definition of what a hate crime is.

It was noted that there was -- for a hate crime that it was violence or intimidation, and we -- I would like to submit that have we

expounded upon what is violence and intimidation?

For me violence and intimidation also includes

mental intimidation, also includes the intimidation

that is created inherently by the authority that

the police department has. They intimidate people

just inherently because that is their modus

operandi of authority.

So a question that arises in my mind is could we then say all police departments are involved in hate crimes? Have we determined what is what under that situation? Understanding that, I would submit that hate crimes are not only violent, but they're economic.

I get a crime committed on me -- I've had a crime committed on me twice in the last year. That crime was the crime that people will not make a mortgage loan to me on a house that I own clear and free because they say it's not worth enough.

Well, the question is not whether it's worth enough, it's what is it worth and will you give me that? So for me the excuse that my house wasn't worth enough is in itself a hate crime

because they just simply didn't want to give me the money because of the neighborhood that I live in.

I live in an extremely bad neighborhood, and I can give you examples of what has happened in my neighborhood pertaining to the police department itself. One of the problems that we have in our neighborhood is that our neighborhood is all black.

There aren't many times that whites come through our neighborhood except going to work and leaving from work. The windows are rolled up, their doors are locked, their air-conditioning's on, and let me tell you they don't even want to stop.

The most times that we have problems with what I would perceive as hate crimes is with the police department. I can give an example of one evening at 9:00 -- oh, my dates are -- I wasn't prepared for this. At 9:00 I made a phone call to the police department due to some people gambling on a corner. I'm sorry. I thought you wanted --

MR. GRADISON: I've got neck problems, so I have to do this. This pain is

driving me crazy, so ignore me.

MR. BOONE: I called our police department due to a disturbance on the corner from some young men gambling on the corner. I understood that's against the law, and I called the police. When I got to that corner -- the young man who lives on the corner who had called me for fear of not wanting to call the police himself for fear of their intimidation asked me to call them.

When I got to the corner, apparently the young men who were gambling had left, but the gentleman who had called me and asked me to help him out was standing in his yard inside of his fence. There was a policeman standing at the corner. He then kicked a liquor bottle, a half a gallon liquor bottle, kicked it into the gentleman's yard.

The gentleman asked the policeman

"Please do not kick that in my yard. I have

struggled very hard to keep my yard clean. Please

don't do that." The policeman then told him to

"shut the" bleep "up. You ain't got nothing to do

with this. I'll do what I feel like doing."

That's a quote.

So my next question was -- my question was -- at that point I thought I should get involved, and I said "Officer, I need your name and your badge number. You will be reported." He would not give me his name or his badge number. Then when the young man asked him if he would please dispose of the bottle himself, he took the bottle, threw it into his yard, grabbed the young man, threw him against the fence, handcuffed him, and was about to arrest him. That is what I call a hate crime.

This was a white officer who was trying to intimidate a young black man, who had no problem with the police department other than he was doing something that was disrespectful to him. This is what I perceive as being a hate crime, even though it's the authority that the police department has, and to me it is inherently a hate crime because their modus operandi of authority is intimidation.

I would like to note that there were other groups who I perceive that also perpetrate these types of crimes. I would note that our

banking, our banking and savings and loans institutions commit these types of crimes against blacks, young blacks, old blacks, any blacks, even any minority, on a regular basis by discriminating against them, not allowing them to get loans because they red-line the neighborhood.

The neighborhood -- they will go in -- I was told that I could get a mortgage on my house.

My house was appraised at \$21,000. I bought it for \$3000. So, hey, I've made a lot of money already.

That's fine. But when I got to the mortgage company to get that loan and they saw -- I believe that when they saw who I was, that they decided that they would up the limit for getting the mortgage because I was told originally that it was 20,000, but then suddenly when I got to the offices the manager comes out and tells me it's 35,000 and I can't get a mortgage loan.

So I would submit that there are a lot of different groups that are committing hate crimes against minorities right now; that there's nothing that's being done about these people because they're doing within -- they have bent the limits

of the law so far that they can't be touched.

Mr. Dixon noted that we should not do anything about this. Dead wrong. We have to do something about this. Okay. I would also submit that one of the problems I perceive with hate crimes is that they are directly relational to the economic well-being of our country. When we have an economic downturn, hate crimes rise, and this has happened over the years. I'm a student of history. Over the years, at each downturn in the economy, recession, depression, whatever it may have been, hate crimes rose.

I would also submit that -- I would hope that -- I note -- I've been in off and on during the day because I was at work next door and I couldn't just come in and stay all day, but some of the testimony that was given was pertinent to crimes that are being -- that have been committed recently.

I would submit that in a true review of what the problems may be, that we may need to go back further than just the last two months or the last six months; that if you -- I would submit that

if you could go back to the time when the economic downturn began, that you would get a real perception of what is happening with hate crimes in the United States and in Indiana especially.

I would also submit that hate crimes in Indiana are done on a different basis than they were in the South, and we all know what happened in the South. I've always believed that it is something that I can deal with if someone will be up-front with me. If he comes to my face and tells me "You're a nigger, I don't like you," I can deal with him because I don't have to deal with him at that point.

But in Indiana we have come to find out that hate crimes are committed behind our backs. We don't know what's going on. We don't see it evidently. It's not somebody hitting me over the head with a bat. It's someone hitting me over the head with a denial on my loan. So I would submit that, once again, it all goes back to the idea of what a hate crime boils down to. I guess that's all I've got.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Questions?

MR. ROSE: I have to make a couple of comments and questions because part of your testimony dealt with housing, which is the field and endeavor in which I make my living, and I would dispute that the mortgage application turndown that you had was a hate crime by any definition that's in any statute.

MR. BOONE: I agree.

MR. ROSE: However, there are very effective federal regulations in effect under the Fair Housing laws that protect you if you have been genuinely discriminated against, and if you have not taken that action, I would recommend that you do.

MR. BOONE: It's being pursued right now.

MR. GRADISON: Good.

MR. ROSE: The second part which had to do with the policeman's treatment of your friend which you immediately categorized as a hate crime because it was white on black, and every time there is a racial confrontation of a mixed race situation, that's the way it's perceived.

_ _ _ _

I have to tell you that that's totally analogous to what happened to my son, who's very white, who was working in one of our offices where we have an alarm system for the protection of the employees.

He was confronted by a party who made a threat, serious threat. He pushed the burglar -- or, the robbery alarm. Two white officers responded immediately, or almost, within 2 or 3 minutes, with drawn weapons, and the suspect had already left.

They immediately took my son, slammed him against the wall, handcuffed him, and were taking him downtown for making a false robbery in progress report. Nobody could claim racial discrimination because there wasn't any. The police are human beings subject to a lot of error. He had to do a lot of fast talking, as apparently you and your friend did before they took the handcuffs off.

MR. BOONE: You betcha.

MR. ROSE: And we look -- I mean, I can't say, nobody can, whether the incident you

*

cited was or was not overt or covert racial discrimination. Whether it had been any different if both parties were of the same race, we'll never know, but I'm telling you it's not exclusive to the situation you described and my personal experience can testify to that.

MR. BOONE: Let me rebut that for one second real quickly because I know my five minutes are up. I don't want to be like everybody else. I am not inferring -- I am not trying to -- and if you took that inference, I'd like to rebut that. I'm not inferring that there was racial discrimination there, only inherent discrimination that is created by the authority that the police take.

MR. ROSE: Agreed.

MR. BOONE: Not necessarily that it was a white on black. I did mention that he was a white officer, and that's agreed, but I do not intend to infer that the discrimination is very simply racial.

That is discrimination that is inherent to their authority, because just as your son got

treated that way, I've seen my white friends be treated by Marion County sheriffs worse than I have my black friends in my community, I've seen that.

So I'm not inferring racial discrimination, only what you say here, hate discrimination. This man didn't like this gentleman because of the way he was dressed, because of the way he looked, not because of the color of his skin, because Calvin, my friend, he's got teeth knocked out.

But he has tried his best to make it.

He's got a house, he's got a family, and I respect
him because he takes care of those things. I

respect him because he stood up to this officer who
tried to intimidate him at a point where he should
not have even been harassed at all. So, no, I'm
not inferring racial discrimination, believe me,
not in that instance.

MR. ROSE: Well, I'm not saying -I'm not trying to discount the fact that it exists,
that's why we're here, because it exists.

MR. BOONE: Undoubtedly.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: I think the point

that you make, Mr. Boone, is that authority can be intimidating and to an extent perhaps there is a certain element of intimidation built into authority, otherwise authorities wouldn't have any significance.

.6

MR. BOONE: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: I think the point that I would like to make is that to the extent that authority abuses its authority to mentally intimidate based on -- and has as its motivation some bias, hatred, or prejudice based on characteristics of the victim, it would be appropriate for it to be covered by the actions that we are looking at at this point.

Your item and discussion of economic discrimination is another form of violence, but not quite in the context that we are dealing with it today, and that's something that I'm sure some of us will take a look at, but not quite in the context of the hearing that we're having today.

MR. BOONE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: I appreciate your sticking around and coming back and forth and

participating in these hearings. 1 If I MR. BOONE: Okay. That's fine. 2 had known, I would have been here earlier and I 3 would have been much more prepared with many 4 incidences that we have that could have been 5 presented to you. 6 MR. GRADISON: I think your 7 predecessors have done a good job. 8 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: If you have 9 additional information --10 MR. BOONE: Oh, that's right. What 11 was the zip code for that? Well, I can get it from 12 him? 13 CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Yes. 14 MR. BOONE: Okay. 15 MR. GRADISON: Mr. Minarik in the 16 back of the room. 17 Thanks very much. MR. BOONE: 18 Thank you. Well, CHAIRMAN HUGHES: 19 members of the committee, it has been a long day, 20 but I think the end is in sight. We are now at 21 that point where we have -- we are concluding our 22 open hearing, our open session, and we'll revert 23

back to a brief discussion with the members of the committee.

We've got a lot of information to analyze. Our procedure, as we have outlined it, is for us to await the transcript of this meeting and copies of the video, which I understand will be six hours long, and then after we have received that information -- and there may yet be additional information. Many of the people who have presented information today implied or stated that they would provide additional documentation to us, so there will be more information.

At the time that we receive that it will be our collective and individual responsibilities to begin an analysis of this and to start to formulate information for a report.

As we discussed yesterday evening, it is my expectation and that of the staff that the information that you present will be detailed and not short, cryptic kinds of statements, with one exception, Mr. Rose, who is going to write all of our headings and leads for our report.

But the more information you can

provide, since you have generously bestowed on our staff and myself the responsibility for pulling all of this together in a collective format, I implore you to please take the time to contribute to the process by giving us as much extensive information and written narrative as you can provide in terms of the format for this report.

will also try to provide some kind of general outline for how we're thinking about doing it. It will not be a final kind of thing, but at least a guide that we can kind of work from to structure this information, and along with that will also come a time table where we can identify a couple of -- several dates so that we can try to set a date for our next meeting, at which time we'll come back and examine this information.

MR. ROSE: Do you want to adjourn and go off the record? Are we all finished?

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: We're still on the record at this moment.

MS. PARKER: One of the things that's left me a little bit concerned is the lack of and

yet it appeared to me the need for more information from the Evansville/Vanderburgh County area.

and I'm not sure whether we can ask the staff to try to explore ways in which we can contact others down there that we might have to interview personally or to submit information, because I believe from what we've heard there might be some other groups that we might need to really go after to look into that situation because I felt the scope was large but only one person addressing it. We need to look for it, and there may be other parts of the state, but since that was a portion that came, it looked like to me we needed some more information.

MR. GRADISON: Yeah, and it's pretty narrow when I think, you know, one area. We might be -- arriving at conclusions based on the testimony of one person I think might be a little awkward. I wouldn't feel comfortable without having a lot more input.

I kind of agree with Doris. You know, you can't say well, someone -- one person said this

was going on there, that that really -- we've had so many other people here who basically said "Yes, this is happening here," and several people have testified to the same kinds of issues and the same kinds of incidents, even very well the same incidents, and therefore we were somewhat reassured that's happening. We've had law enforcement people here, but I think Evansville is getting slided if we base any kind of conclusion based on the testimony from one person.

Would want to suggest is that the focus and the scope of all of our findings are not specifically related to individual cities but are related to the entire state, and while we may have incidents from Evansville, I don't feel that we are considering focusing in on Evansville.

The problem that I perceive is that as we examine almost any report from any one area, there are probably other areas -- Indianapolis is the only area of the state that has been broadly covered today.

If you can identify sources -- and that

3 4 5

is going to be the difficulty, identifying the source and then getting them to respond in the time frame that we have. The record is still open until the end of August, so we still have additional time to do that.

MS. PARKER: If it's going to be a statewide report, I guess maybe you're right, that maybe we need to be looking at trying to get some information from other places to give it a state appearance, because if you're only going to -- then it's not a report of the state of Indiana because all we really have is from Indianapolis and then a city in southern Indiana.

I thought, and I guess my effort was, if these were going to be the two that would be the basis for what we say might be reflective of the state, then we should make those as comprehensive as possible in developing a statement that reflects some of the concerns as it relates to the total state.

These are two large communities within the state of Indiana. It's not as if we were talking about another very small isolated

community. This is a large Indiana community.

Some of the things that he identified could say to us that we might need to talk, if nothing else, but to the Mayor and the police departments about some of those concerns that have been raised.

MR. ROSE: Can I make a suggestion?
CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Certainly.

MR. ROSE: In our last meeting, although it wasn't focused on hate crime, we had a lot of testimony from across the state which dealt specifically with specific hate crimes.

There was a man from LULAC, which is the Hispanic organization, talking about a murder that occurred in northern Indiana, and if the transcript or record of that previous meeting can be researched and those people can be contacted and asked for a report which could go into this summary, I think we'd get that input, or even if that transcript itself, those parts can be ferreted out and put into the report. It is part of the record. Although it didn't happen in this meeting, it was put on the record previously. That would give us a broader scope of statewide activity.

But in the final analysis, we can only deal with what we know, and if what we know is all from Marion County, then that's what we report, and if there's smatterings from elsewhere, we can either make assumptions based on that or we cannot determine what the committee decides to do.

But for me we've heard enough to know that Marion County is not peculiar, nor different, than anywhere else. If it's happening here, it's happening elsewhere, or vice versa, so others can put their own interpretation on it.

Between these two meetings we've had testimony from all over the state, from northwestern Indiana, from South Bend, from the Fort Wayne area, previously from Vanderburgh County, which collated could make a pretty broad picture.

MR. GRADISON: We had the State

Police, we had state organizations that did

testify. Even though they may be based in

Indianapolis, I think we got a larger picture from
those organizations.

MS. SCHMITT: The Indiana Civil

Rights Commission.

MR. GRADISON: Pardon?

MS. SCHMITT: We had the Indiana Civil Rights Commission.

MR. GRADISON: Yeah, we had Karen here. Karen speaks for the whole state. She dealt with an incident because it had just happened, but it is, I mean, reflective to the kinds of problems elsewhere, so I thought we had statewide organizations here that happen to be based here but they can speak to the entire state.

CHAIRMAN HUGHES: I appreciate your point, and my point was not to limit the issue or any additional information, but merely to address the practical side of how we actually get at it in the time frame that we have available to us.

I'm just afraid that in the final analysis there will always be more information that we could have gotten, and we're going to have to sit down and take a look at what we have and make some generalized statements.

But for me, I think that certainly given the fact that the key data points are just now in

```
place or will probably not be in place for a while,
 1
      this may be something that will have to be
 2
      revisited at some point.
 3
                     MR. GRADISON: And we can conclude we
      don't know enough.
 5
                     CHAIRMAN HUGHES: There are lots of
 6
      interesting conclusions that are --
 7
 8
                     MR. ROSE: Well, you can always say
      that. At any point you can always say we don't
 9
10
      know enough, but that sometimes is a cop-out.
                     MR. GRADISON: And sometimes it
11
      isn't.
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Any additional
      information or inputs? Well, I want to thank all
14
      of the members of the committee for a full day.
15
16
                     (Off the record discussion.)
17
                     CHAIRMAN HUGHES: Unless there are
18
      any objections, this meeting is adjourned.
                    MR. ROSE: I'll second the motion.
19
20
21
22
23
                  (WHEREUPON, at 6:10 p.m., August 8,
      1991, this hearing concluded.)
```

CERTIFICATE 1 STATE OF INDIANA 2 ss: COUNTY OF HAMILTON 3 4 I, Marjorie A. Addington, the undersigned Court Reporter and Notary Public residing and maintaining 5 offices in the City of Carmel, Hamilton County, Indiana, do hereby certify: 6 7 That I reported to the best of my ability in 8 machine shorthand all of the words spoken by all parties in attendance during the course of the 9 ensuing proceedings; 10 11 That I later reduced my shorthand notes into the 12 foregoing typewritten transcript form, which typewritten transcript is a true record to the best 13 of my ability of the hearing; 14 15 That I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, and that I am not financially interested in this action. 16 17 18 IN WITNESS HERETO, I have affixed my 19 Notarial Seal and subscribed my signature below this 28th day of 20 August, 1991. 21 22 Notary Public 23 County of Residence: Hamilton My Commission Expires on: August 23, 1991