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CO-CHAIR KAI: I am Karen Kai, and I am the Chair of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission. It is a real pleasure to welcome you all here tonight for our community forum, "Hate No More: Toward Ending Prejudice-based Violence".

The Human Rights Commission was given the charge by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to develop a comprehensive Hate Violence Reduction Program for the City and County of San Francisco. We feel this is a very critical problem facing the City, and we have been working very hard to develop a draft plan to work toward these Hearings.

But one of the things that we felt very committed to was the fact that it can't just be done by a government body. That is why we are here tonight with another group, the Coalition on Civil Rights, who are also sitting as panelists here. They have been instrumental also in developing the plan and in working on the background for this Hearing, and we are very grateful for their help and assistance during the past months while we've been doing this work.

I would like to also introduce the Commissioners who are here. Starting on the bottom row on my left is Commissioner Lucile Lockhart. Next to her is Commissioner Lenore Chinn. Then Commissioners Larry Martin, May Jaber, Peter Sammon, Isadore Pivnick. And then to my left is
Commissioner Leonard Graff. And on the right is Adrian Bermudez.

This is a very significant time for us to be holding these Hearings. Of course, it is during Martin Luther King Memorial Week, or the commemoration actually, of his birthday. We are also at a one-year point after the shootings at Stockton.

I think we are all very aware that this is a problem that goes beyond the simple idea of a crime, because it is also very personal to many of us. It is something that hits at the very essence of who we are, and it can be a very emotional kind of issue to deal with. We are here because it is so important to us; we know it is important to this community.

We thank all of you who are to participate, either as speakers, as members of the press, as people who want to learn about what this issue is, how we can prevent these kinds of incidents from happening, and what we can do when they do happen.

With that, I would like to introduce my Co-Chair from the Coalition on Civil Rights, Mary Dunlap.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thanks, Karen. Good evening, everyone. I am glad to be here. I am Co-Chair, and pleased to perform that function. I am looking forward to hearing our speakers and proceeding with the Hearings.

Before we do that, there are community representatives on this panel whom I would like to introduce to you and provide you some brief biographical details about.
Michael Wong is a member of Break the Silence Coalition Against Anti-Asian Violence, a local group with connections to national groups who are working on the issue of hate violence against Asians. He currently serves as an aid to Alameda County Supervisor Don Perata.

Debra Quinn-Carpenter is the Director and Communications and Urban Affairs at the regional office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). In this capacity she is responsible for monitoring Bay Area media portrayals of African Americans. She also tracks incidents of hate violence. She is a supervisor of the NAACP Regional Racial Intolerance Task Force.

Jeff Santis is the Assistant Director of the Jewish Community Relations Council. He served as Regional Director of the Anti-Defamation League's Plains State Region during the farm crisis of the mid-80s.

Manuel Romero is Regional Council with MALDEF. He has formally worked with Legal Services of Northern California and was the staff attorney with the National Housing Law Project in Berkeley. He is a long-time activist for immigrant rights.

Robin Wu is the Civil Rights Program Developer at Chinese for Affirmative Action in San Francisco. She serves as Chair of the Intergroup Clearinghouse.

Steve Owyang is the Executive and Legal Affairs Secretary for the State Fair Employment and Housing Commission, the State-level equivalent of the Human Rights Commission. He has held this position since 1983, and has
served previously as Commission Council.

I myself am a civil rights attorney with a personal interest in hate crimes. As a woman, as an open lesbian, I see my future, my past, my present affected by the priorities in the agenda we will be addressing tonight.

Earlier this week I had the pleasure, I could say opportunity, of watching "Eyes II", Henry Hampton's dramatic portrayal of the years 1964 and 1965 in the civil rights movement. During watching that program I was taken with certain words by Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., about violence. He said, "I am tired of violence." And he warned us all against using the method of the oppressor.

Even as we sit here this evening, someone has taken the opportunity to paint a swastika on this building. There is nowhere we can go; there is no place we can be where we can hide from the reality of hate violence.

The purpose of this forum, then, is to get the facts; to hear from people who have been personally and organizationally affected by the phenomenon, to synthesize these incidents, to look at the patterns, to study the remedies that people have tried, to look at the models, to look at the strategies, to try to make sense of peoples' efforts to challenge and change hate violence and provide remedies to its victims.

The goal, as the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have set forth, is for the Human Rights Commission, in coalition with groups such as the Coalition for Civil Rights, to work on the problem by developing a comprehensive - that
means inclusive and coordinated, and I should hope that means
harmonious, willing and mutual strategy - to address hate
cries and hate violence in this City.

I hope that our agenda will be even more vigorous
and more ambitious. I hope that each of us will leave here,
not necessarily feeling better, but feeling better informed
and more enlightened and more aware of the problem and of some
of the things that each of us as an individual and as part of
a network of human beings who care can do about this.

Before I get started I want to do one more thing. I
want to roll the credits, if you will, on this film. Because
we have a two-night hearing format, I want to make sure that
on both evenings, people know who ought to be thanked for
putting this all together. There is always the danger of when
one rolls the credits that someone will be excluded who worked
on putting this Hate Crimes/Hate Violence Forum together. If
you were excluded, please take no offense. We have done our
best to include everyone we were familiar with, but we surely
are human and we err.

First of all, we thank with all our heart, the Board
of Supervisors and the Mayor for seeing to it that this
hearing will occur; for seeing to it that we'll do something
more here than simply pass by the facts. Both the staff and
the membership of the Human Rights Commission deserve the most
vigorouse praise for what's been done, and particular thanks
must go to Karen Kai, Lucile Lockhart, Isadore Pivnick and the
Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission, Peter
Janero.
Among the staff, particular thanks to Don Hesse, and to Norman Nickens, Jackie Hale, Alan Tafapolsky and Panetta Scott.

Among the community organizations that have been vital in the organization of these Hearings, a number of people have come forward, none more important to seeing all this happen, I think, than Lester Olmstead-Rose of the Community United Against Violence, Emily Goldfarb of the Coalition for Immigrant Rights, Mike Wong of Break the Silence, Robin Wu of Chinese for Affirmative Action, Deborah Quinn-Carpenter of the NAACP, Ann Noel of the Fair Employment and Housing Commission, Fred Persily of the Contra Costa Human Rights Commission, Jeff Santis of the Jewish Community Relations Council, Natalie Houseman of the Anti-Defamation League, and Rachel Karp of the San Francisco Police Department. Thanks to each and every one of you for all of the work you did to get this going and to make it happen.

Let me now mention a couple of procedural concerns. We have a transcription reporter, Mary Butler, who is seated in the rear, who is highly experienced in doing these things, but who would appreciate if the speakers would spell their name, their last name, before they begin speaking. And finally, let me mention that the time concerns are real, and so we hope everybody will stay within the constraints that have been laid down so that we can hear from all of you.

Members of the panel will please save questions until the end of the person's testimony so that we won't disrupt them. Let me also mention that members of the public
who have come here to testify or who at some point during the Hearing decide to testify, need to sign up at the table directly outside of the auditorium door, so that we can organize public testimony which will begin this evening at 9:00 p.m. We will also have further public testimony tomorrow evening. It is our goal to hear each and every person who has come here to speak.

So, without any further introductions, thanks or distractions, we'll get rolling on the testimony.

Let me ask, first, if Debbie Clifford of the Montreal Banner Project would be willing to come forward for a few moments. We have a special presentation this evening.

MS. CLIFFORD: I am Debbie Clifford, (spelled C-L-I-F-F-O-R-D) and I am with what has been called loosely the Montreal Banner Project, an ad-hoc group of fifteen women who have gotten together to create this banner. There are fourteen different segments, and those are to pay tribute to the lives of the 14 women who were killed in Montreal in December.

The project itself was made possible through the support of a variety of women's organizations - The Women's Foundation, the Women's Initiative for Self-Employment where I am a staffperson; the Women's Building of the Bay Area, San Francisco Women's Centers, and NOW; and, also with the support of the San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women, and the Advisory Council on the Status of Women in Canada.

We thought it would be appropriate to bring the banner here tonight because, even though this does not
represent a San Francisco hate crime, it is certainly like all hate crimes crosses all those borders and boundaries of gender, race, sex, whatever has originally caused the incident, and reaches out to kind of grab each one of us and demand a response.

So, this is our small response and we are hoping by showing it here tonight that it can sort of gather up some of the spirit of concern of these Hearings, and be sent off with the compassion with which it was originally created and intentioned, and sent to the families and survivors in Montreal to give them some hope that perhaps this is not the way the world needs to be.

So, thank you for your time and for allowing us to show this to you tonight and, hopefully, this will set a tone for the rest of the proceedings. Thank you.

(AUDIENCE APPLAUSE)

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Now I would ask that Reverend Cecil Williams come forward, please.

REV. WILLIAMS: Ladies and gentlemen, brothers and sisters, thank you very much for initiating this conversation of the issues that affect us all in one way or the other, because those who do the hating are just as much destroyed as those who stand by and watch the hatred engaged in.

I come here tonight by invitation from you, but I come here tonight to say to you that 25 years ago I came to San Francisco, became the Minister of Glide United Methodist Church. I thought that coming to the West Coast, someway, somehow, I would not have to go through the ordeals of
bigotry, prejudice and racism that I had experienced as a child in Texas.

I never thought that as an adult and as a minister, as a Black person, African American who has one of the largest multi-cultural churches in America, that I would have to go through some of the incidents - and now I can talk about incidents, it's not one. I want to tell you in a few minutes about something that just happened - incidents by which I would be put in a position where my home would be defaced, and where there would be those who are bigoted and full of hatred, and who think that they must have all the power to rule those of us who are of minority groups and women, and gays and lesbians, and poor people and the have-nots, and people who are desiring liberty and the pursuit of happiness, who want to be liberated, who want to find freedom and great opportunities in our America, who would want to control the destiny of our lives.

We've come today to say that we will not let anybody control the destiny of our lives because we have the power to choose and to move on. And we will not let any bigot or racist destroy that drama that we have before us.

So, here we are, in the City that knows how; in the City that is supposed to be able to let others live and practice and engage in equity and, hopefully, justice. But that's not true.

I don't need to go into what happened this past Saturday night at my home, but I would like to bring you up to date on what happened last night at my home.
I have a neighbor who is Chinese on one side, and one on the other side is White. My Chinese neighbor, John Chu, stood before the cameras on Sunday night and said, "I often take the opportunity to watch Cecil and Jan's house while they are away." His name was printed on the television screen. Someone who undoubtedly had engaged in defacing property, our own property, copied his name, ran it down in the book and called his number. He was not at home, but this message was left on his tape recorder: "Screw that nigger Williams. Free James Earl Ray."

This is San Francisco. This is America. This is the community that is supposed to be tolerant, and it seems to be to work with people in bringing about justice and righteousness for all people. Yet, we who live in this community have bigots who live next door to us, and we do nothing about it. We, who live in this community, have racists who speak in our presence, and we do nothing about it. We who live in this community stand by, and Eddie Wizell has said that "the worst crime that could be committed are those who stand by and do nothing, who let things happen without involving themselves in the affairs of what can occur when people stand together".

I, therefore, say to you that rather than just be the City who will tolerate anything, it is now time for us to stand together.

Tomorrow morning, I will be engaging a number of people and we are going to make some plans; we're going to do some organizing. We are going to get people of goodwill and
people who are ready to stand up, and those who are not ready to stand up, we want you to join together, because we will not be satisfied until every vestige corner of racism is brought and swept out to the center of the stage of life, and we together can stand and truly sing, and say in the words of Martin Luther King, "Free at last! Free at last! Great God almighty, we are free at last!" And none of us is free until all of us are free. Thank you.

(AUDIENCE APPLAUSE)

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Could we hear from Joey McAndrew and Kirk Rettberg, please?

MR. McANDREW: Hi, my name is Joey McAndrew. On the night of December 16, 1989, my boyfriend Kirk Rettberg (right here) and I were walking down Haight Street at the corner of Masonic, and we were holding hands together. There was a group of these young, skinhead-looking type people, who started to make some comments about "faggots go home," and "dicks are for chicks," and "ooh," and things like this.

I have lived in San Francisco and this had never happened to me before, so I was really shocked and I didn't know what to do. So I turned around and I went like that (GESTURE) to them. Then we just kept walking, and we got between Buena Vista Bast and Buena Vista West, where it is completely dark and there's nobody around for miles, it seems. The youngest of the crew that was making these comments, this 16-year-old girl, came running toward us, and she was yelling "faggots go home," or something like that.

It was one thing to sort of have her say something a
couple of blocks back, but it was another thing to have her following us around the City. So, as soon as she got real close to me, or close to us, I turned around to her and said, "Get the fuck away from me." She pushed me, and right then we saw her herd, well actually there were four of them that came running from behind. I didn't see them. There were two of them that were over six feet tall. They were guys.

I just ran down toward Divisadero Street and I was able to get away. I ran into on-coming traffic. I wasn't hit or anything, but I just ran in between cars, hoping that maybe somebody would run one of them over or something. Then I managed to get down past Buena Vista West and I got a cab driver to pick me up. I didn't see Kirk anywhere. I did see them walking up the street back toward McDonald's or whatever, by Stanyon.

I made it to a friend's house on Clayton and called the police, and they apprehended two of them. So, we're still in the process of prosecuting them right now.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you.

MR. RETTBERG: My name is Kirk Rettberg (spelled R-E-T-T-B-E-R-G). At the time that we realized we were being followed, my boyfriend Joey wanted to do something about it. He wanted to approach her because he was ticked off that these people were actually following us. I didn't want him to do anything, because even though I heard just one person following us, I knew that the rest of the gang must have been very close behind.

At the time that she pushed him, all of a sudden
these other four skinheads appeared out of nowhere. We started running, and Joey was fortunate enough to get away without being hit. But I wasn't as fortunate, and was slugged on the head about four times with a spiked ring.

I felt very violated. (Pause) I saw my boyfriend get into a cab and take off and, at that point I realized I was bleeding, and walked back up Haight Street, at which point I saw these five skinheads that attacked us. They were already pulled over by the police. So I went over and approached them, or approached one of the officers, and told them that these five skinheads had just attacked me. The officers were extremely helpful and they were on their best behavior. They were totally helpful, and I owe them a ton of thanks. That's all I'd like to say.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you both very much. Were there questions from any of the panel? Okay, thank you. Could we hear from Rabbi Jacob Traub?

RABBI TRAUB: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Rabbi Jacob Traub (spelled T-R-A-U-B). I come to relate some events from September 16, 1985 which were preceded by events of July that very same year.

In July, one morning we happened to come to the Synagogue at about 9:00 and found a pipe bomb casually hanging on the door of the Synagogue entrance. The bomber fortunately was unfamiliar with the normal Synagogue routine, and he didn't realize that the door upon which he had hung the bomb was not used on a daily basis, but only used when we have some special affairs. It is not the main entrance. Had it been
agitated by anyone who had entered the Synagogue at about 6:30 that morning, and there were a number of us who did for our regular morning services, that person who would have agitated the bomb or handled the bomb would have been instantly killed, and probably the whole front of the building would have been torn away.

That was diffused and taken away, but on September 16th of that year, just a few months later, which was the first day of Rosh Hashannah, the Jewish New Year, my wife, my youngest daughter, a young man of the congregation whose family was away for the holidays and we had invited him for lunch, we all came back after the holiday services for a holiday luncheon. A few minutes after we had sat down, my next door neighbor, a Mrs. Chang, rang the bell and said that something strange was lying in the flower bed that we have in the front of our home. When I went down to check it out, I immediately saw that it was the same type of pipe bomb that had been hanging from the Synagogue door.

I should point out at this point that I and the Synagogue were haphazard victims. The name of our congregation is Adopt Israel. It starts with an "A," and it's the first listing in the Synagogue listings of the Yellow Pages. And my name is listed as its Rabbi. If I happened to be a Rabbi of Congregation Zachariah, I don't think that we would have had any problems. Since my name was listed there, a quick cross-check gave the bomber the ability to find my home; it probably wasn't as easy as he had thought it would be. But the fact that I am a somewhat poor gardener really
saved our lives because now he had put a timer on the bomb, and it snagged in the grass in front of my home, in front of the flower bed, and it was immobilized.

However, the Bomb Unit told us afterwards that there was enough power in there to blow up the entire front of my home, and the four of us at that time happened to be in the front of the home.

So, we were victims in that sense, but the victimization doesn't end there. The good people of the press, unable to comprehend the difference between a holiday and a Holy Day, were relentless. I know they were trying to do their job, but at the same time they were trying to use me, together with the holiday which was publicized in the papers, and it became front-page news, which didn't bother me, because as they used me, I used them. I used them in the sense that I was able to put out a clear and distinct message that we would not be intimidated, neither the members of my congregation or myself, and I would continue to speak out on all matters that were of concern to me.

In some respects, the press was not only relentless, but one especially was irresponsible. In the next day's afternoon newspaper, they actually drew a map showing exactly where my home was, the address of my home which is not listed in the telephone book, in case anybody else would like to try. Now, I was not upset when the editor of that newspaper was shortly thereafter removed from his office, and I really hope that my conversations with the publisher had something to do with that.
I would like to make a recommendation. The gentleman who put the bomb in front of the Synagogue, who was convicted of putting it there and putting it in front of my home was caught because of a police inspector with a good memory. He has since retired. The files on his initial trial, which were in State Court and was an unsuccessful prosecution, those files were shredded after his case. This inspector happened to remember the type of bomb that this fellow made, and this led to his arrest and to his conviction.

There is some sort of a need for a central, permanent computer operation which will tie together crimes of terror, violence, abuse, so that it can be cross-checked throughout the Bay Area and perhaps even interstate. And I would like to make one further statement.

Since this gentleman was put away in 1986, motions have been filed and hearings have been held about the remarkable recovery he is making in Springfield, Missouri. The Federal Judge that heard the case and was familiar with it, God bless him, reheard the case recently upon these appeals. He saw through the speciousness of the arguments and he denied the release of this gentleman.

It is, however, distressing, that an array of psychologists and psychiatrists who met with him at their admission, once, came here to San Francisco to argue for his release. These people - I am sad to say that these people see the federal hospital prison system as a warehouse, and they're interested in moving their inventory out. It was my tax dollars and your tax dollars that flew these people to San
Francisco from Missouri, flew them back again, took up the court's time, and doubtless will do it again when another hearing will be scheduled sometime in the near future.

It is painful to see how the victim, and in this case the victim happened to be me, was really only a minor player in all of this because they never asked my opinion. They never asked anyone of the Synagogue; they never asked anyone who had bombs placed by this fellow, anti-Semitic bombs. I only became aware of the hearings and the proceedings because the prosecutor had the good taste to inform me of these proceedings.

So, in a sense, I and others were victimized again, and this time we were victimized by the employees of the federal facilities who want to recycle their crew. It's only a matter of time before he will be out again and doing his thing, renewed possibly by the relaxing stay that he had at the federal institution, which all of us in one way or another are paying for. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Are there questions? Okay, may we hear from Joanne Gregory?

MS. GREGORY: Hi, my name is Joanne Gregory (spelled G-R-E-G-O-R-Y). My incident started October 18, 1988. I was looking out my window and saw my son with two white males. One of them had their arm across his neck, so I ran downstairs to see what was happening, and went over to the officer, and said, "Why are you treating him that way? What are you doing?" He said, "He is under arrest and if you don't get back, I'll shoot him."
One thing led to another, and about six police cars or six police cars showed up on the scene. They put him in the car and handcuffed him. I was leaving with my friend to go back into the house with my daughter, and one of the officers, the arresting officer, said to "take her too." I turned around, and I said, "You make me ashamed to work for the Police Department". About six officers put me in a choke hold, took me to the Northern Station, handcuffed me to the bench with my son, and I was there about three hours. They wouldn't let me use the restroom. The Booking Sergeant said, "you can use it right there," which was in front of them in a glass holding cell. He wouldn't let the female officer take me to a restroom.

I waited. We went until 8:50. I was booked for inciting a lynching and resisting arrest. My bail was $3,000. That just ended this year, this whole episode.

I just wanted to say that I think it was very unfair what they did to me, seeing how I work with them.

The next day at work, they pulled me out of Communications and put me in the Records Room; I was there for nine months. I was suspended for two weeks after the nine months, and that's about the end of it. I still have to do community hours for 20 hours and pay $250 for a pre-trial.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Are there questions from the panel?

COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: Yes. It sounds as if you were telling us that you were employed at the Police Department?
MS. GREGORY: Yes, I am.

COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: Alright. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Were there other questions, members of the panel?

MS. QUINN-CARPENTER: What, if anything, happened to make you believe that this incident was predicated on racism?

MS. GREGORY: For one thing, they filled out a Police Report which said one thing, and what led to my suspension and pulling out of Communications was in another report which I was never allowed to see.

MR. ROMERO: What kind of help did you seek afterwards, if any?

MS. GREGORY: I had an attorney and my union at work helped a lot for the job (INAUDIBLE).

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Other questions? Thank you very much. Could we hear from Sandy Close?

MS. CLOSE: My name is Sandy Close (spelled C-L-O-S-E), and I am speaking not from personal experience, but as a journalist.

Twenty-one years ago, the Kerner Commission Report described an America that had divided into two societies: one black and one white. Today one gets the sense, listening to testimony that that we've just heard, and reading about hate crimes from Vincent Chinn and Bensonhurst to Charles Stewart, and others -- Synagogue defacement and gay bashing -- that we are not just a generation away from the Kerner Commission Report, we're a country away. And we haven't quite learned how to describe the country we have become.
I speak to you as a journalist who has spent a great deal of time looking at the demographic changes that have occurred in between the Kerner Commission and today, and tensions arising from those changes and their social and policy implications in recently organized, and am organizing a series of forums of young people in Bay Area schools who represent the sort of cutting-edge of this new landscape of race relations, ethnic relations, lifestyle relations, and what it's like to grow up Black, grow up Asian, grow up Latino, grow up gay, grow up mixed race, grow up Native American, and indeed, grow up white, in a society where everyone is now a minority, or a minority within a minority, or a minority of minorities. I want to mention three points based on what I have learned from these young people about hate crimes and make a suggestion.

First, hate crimes clearly don't occur in a void, leaving aside the individual pathologies of which we have heard a great deal, in the case of Patrick Purdy. They really are significant to us to the extent that they show us where the fault lines, the points, the flashpoints of tension are in our everyday lives.

Second, looked at over a broad range of tensions that have turned to hate crimes, what we get is a picture that doesn't fit the conventional categories that we used 20 years ago. It's no longer just white versus black, or black versus white, or anti-Semitic, or homophobic. In a way, you might say that suffering no longer belongs to any one group or just a few groups. It cuts across all racial, ethnic and lifestyle
lines.

What you hear from young people are stories about Mexican-Americans picking on Mexican migrants and undocumented. Asian gangs beating up on whites and blacks. Blacks harassing Southeast Asians. Whites ashamed of identifying themselves as whites. Asians and Latino frictions in communities where Asians are now moving in instead of long being Latino. And in the wake of the Salmon Rushdie incident, a growing anti-Muslim sentiment that leads one to believe that Muslims may be the most despised group in our community.

And the third point is that listening to these voices and looking at the landscape that seems so radically different, and yet in many ways the same as the 60s, there is no conclusion one can draw up than what Reverend Williams drew, and that is that inter-communal tensions are building up, but also that they're forming a mosaic that's far more complex than in the past.

I don't sense that the tensions have necessarily led us to the brink of turning to hate crimes that would then turn to hate wars of the kind we see in Lebanon or Azur Beijung, but they are warning signals that warrant our attention. And unless we focus on the mosaic, on the fault lines of tension, we may end up dealing with just the symptoms rather than the disease.

My last point really is what is to be done. My sense is that there's a very concrete place which is a microcosm of this new landscape that too often gets ignored, and it's the schools. The schools are where these tensions
are playing themselves out day after day, and cutting across all directions. Kids are, in a sense, defining our new race, ethnic and cultural relations, but they're doing it in a void because a lot of our old language of race relations and civil rights don't really apply to their immediate lives and what they're experiencing in a multi-minority setting, where no one group is in the majority.

When you look at what these kids are saying, the prospects are not good. Even integrated schools are the most self-segregated institutions perhaps in our society. But more ominously, they're becoming incubators of tensions that could well turn to hate crimes, that do turn to hate crimes, and that could indeed, at some point, turn into hate wars.

So, not just looking at the need for a special unit in the Police Department to focus on hate crimes, I wanted to offer the suggestion that we need to focus on the schools through a broad civic action, cross-communal program that would really give both access to the adult world policymakers who are the voices of these young people -- voices that I think we adults don't hear and aren't aware of. And I can put on one hand the number of groups, such groups that are now working in schools, or are truly cross-communal, like the Conservation Corps or Peer Resource Counseling. They're very, very few.

The fragmentation in the schools is a reflection of our own fragmentation in the society, and yet oddly enough, it is that world of youth that is the world we are becoming.

Thank you for this opportunity.
CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Are there questions from the panel?

MR. WONG: How successful have the forums in the schools been for actually breaking down some of the barriers between the different groups? Is there a way that the model that you are suggesting can even be used in the neighborhoods as opposed to just for school-age kids?

MS. CLOSE: The forums that we have organized have brought kids from each group to talk at growing up black, for example. We have not tried to make the groups cross-racial themselves, partly because in a way they're explosive.

But the last forum was in growing up white, and what happens is is that the growing up black - bringing kids together to talk about their experience as black youth, or as Asian youth, or as white youth, or as mixed race youth has created a kind of bonding process. The kids don't know each other before the panel, but they know us. And they've helped, I think, give the adults who listen to them a much more realistic grasp that poses new challenges for the agenda for civil rights for the 1990s, that a lot of the issues that they raise are very unsafe and very unorthodox, and yet we need to hear them because they are the reality.

MR. SANTIS: I have a question. How do you train the trainers, the teachers in the classroom who themselves might have their own prejudices and biases? What sort of inservice programs do you have?

MS. CLOSE: That's the question we need to be raising. That's the kind of question we need to be raising.
I don't have an answer for that. What I am specifically focusing on is a need for, in some places bypass the teachers, not out of lack of respect, but because they are so heavily burdened, and what they need are supports. They need an infusion of programs and people who will come in as supplementary counselors. And we also just need to hear what these tensions are that are going on in those schools without making the teachers feel that they are responsible.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Are there other questions from the panel?

COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: Yes. You're a journalist. I am wondering whether you have any written material that you can provide to us at your convenience.

MS. CLOSE: I'd be delighted to do it.

COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. At this point we'd like to thank all of those who have been willing to comment and have the courage and the openness to share their personal experiences and their prospectives on the process of hate violence.

I would now call on our featured speaker of the evening, who is Joan Weiss. She is the Executive Director of the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence. Ms. Weiss.

MS. WEISS: Good evening. Thank you very much for inviting me to come here tonight. I always welcome the opportunity to come to San Francisco. Our office is based in Baltimore, even though we're a national organization.
documenting around the country, to give you a sense of the
range of type of incident, target group and geographic
diversity. I will both start and end with California, and
this is only meant to give you an overview of the kinds of
things that we're seeing throughout the country. This is for
1989, starting in February, and some of these will be familiar
to you, certainly.

California State Poly-Tech, a female Japanese-
American student collided with and was knocked over by a white
male on a skateboard, who shouted, "you Asians are taking all
the jobs away from Americans. Why don't you go back to
Taiwan, Korea or Vietnam, wherever you came from, you nigger
lover?" The skateboarder then struck the woman while she was
still on the ground.

In Baltimore in March, a Maryland Ku Klux Klan
member was charged with assault with intent to murder after
attacking and attempting to shoot a black man outside a
tavern.

In 1984, the same Klansman was paroled after serving
three years of an eight-year sentence for conspiring to bomb a
Baltimore Synagogue. This past August, federal agents seized
21 shotguns, rifles and handguns from his home.

In San Diego in April, a molotov cocktail was thrown
at the office building of the San Diego Jewish Times. It was
a small blaze and two shattered windows. A few weeks earlier,
a rock was thrown through a back window and exterior walls
were painted with graffiti.

In Gaithersburg, Maryland in May, an immigrant from
El Salvador who was beaten was the most recent victim of more than 20 incidents in the same community of Hispanic residents, the incidents including the hurling the beer bottles, tire slashings, broken windows, and assault.

At the University of Oregon in May, gay and lesbian students provided the President of the university with evidence of death threats, shoving matches and verbal assaults. An obscene poster ridiculing a gay candidate for Student Body President was also distributed on campus.

In La Verne, California in May also, as you know, I was referring to earlier, a Middle Eastern couple, an infant, and a black man who was attempting to be of help to them were beaten by skinheads. The attackers thought that the couple was Jewish, first shouted ethnic slurs at them and then began beating them. The black man was the only passerby who came to their aid.

In Brooklyn in June, a Jewish holocaust survivor was brutally murdered by a man whom the victim had accused of scrawling a swastika on his door.

Then of course, in Bensonhurst, the incident we're all familiar with in August, when a black teenager was shot and killed while enroute to look at a used car in a white Brooklyn neighborhood.

In Raleigh, North Carolina, in August, two white men yelled racial epithets and beat to death a Chinese man because they thought he was Vietnamese.

In the Bronx in September, a black teenager shot and seriously wounded a white 19-year old after an argument in
which the black youth told the victim and his friend that whites don't belong in that neighborhood.

In Los Angeles this past November, the Los Angeles Human Relations Commission issued a report on intergroup conflict in the County and indicated that almost one quarter of the incidents during that school year in one quarter, 471 were directed at Latino and Asian immigrants.

Of 956 schools studied, 354 reported incidents of racial slurs, name calling, physical violence, graffiti and destruction of property.

Just a few weeks ago in Silver Spring, Maryland, my home community, a Hebrew High School was extensively damaged and anti-Semitic graffiti placed throughout the building. There was an arrest last week of the perpetrator who was a skinhead who had come from Los Angeles to Maryland to commit the act, and was arrested in Los Angeles last week on armed robbery charges. That incident is the clearest evidence we have that this problem is not only nationwide in terms of what's happening and where, but the fact that none of us is immune from incidents and perpetrators from throughout the country in terms of their travelling around and effecting us elsewhere.

And of course, Reverend Williams spoke eloquently about what just happened here in this community, both to him and to his next door neighbor. I certainly am not going to discuss incidents that happened in this community during the last year, you know them better than I, but suffice it to say that the incidents that happened reflected in places
throughout the country.

I want to make the point, because there has been so much publicity to skinheads and other white supremacists in the news media, that the majority of these incidents are committed by people in the communities in which they live. The majority of these incidents are not committed by members of organized hate groups. The significance of the hate groups is that they are violent, they preach virulent racist and anti-everything rhetoric, and they certainly attempt to influence and recruit youth. But they are not responsible for most of the incidents that occur in this country. And when we focus on the hate groups it distracts us from focusing on the real problem, which is our neighbors and our neighbor's children, and people throughout the community in which we live who don't know how to appreciate the differences among us.

We don't know how many of these incidents are occurring in the country; there is no accurate national data collection. Anytime you see numbers of incidents in the media or anywhere else, trust me, there is no national data collection. All numbers you see are based on community reports, a handful of police reports in the country, a handful of reports to some states which collect data, and constituent-based organizations, such as the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, NAACP, Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, etc. These are not accurate statistics. There are just incidents reported in the media, and to constituent organizations. I think that makes the numbers that we know about even that much more significant, because what we know about are thousands
upon thousands of incidents in this country every year.

In Maryland alone, which has the oldest reporting system in the country, and that's only since 1981, there have been between 350 and 505 incidents reported each year since 1981. These are incidents reported to the police that we know what percentage of incidents get reported to the police; very few.

New York City, which has one of the oldest, and you'll hear from someone - you were supposed to hear from someone from the Boston Police Department tomorrow - but Boston and New York City are the two police departments with the oldest data collection reporting systems in police departments in the country, and I just spoke with the Commander of the Bias Incident Investigating Unit in New York City this afternoon, when I realized that the data I had from New York City was for 1988, and I was hoping he could give me the final year end statistics for 1989, and in fact, in '88 there were 550 incidents in New York City, and in 1989 approximately 540. They still haven't closed out the numbers for December. So we're talking about over 500 in one city, in one state, in this country, reported to the Police Department. Thousands of incidents occur each year around this country.

We have been monitoring incidents on college campuses since September of 1986, and since September of '86 we have identified over 250 different campuses - this is not incidents - different campuses where incidents have occurred. These are only the ones reported in the press. In studies that we have both done and collected by others on college
campuses, we have learned that as many as 20 - 25% of members
of minority groups on college campuses experienced some form
of victimization ranging from verbal harassment to assault in
any given year.

What are the effects of these incidents? When I was
asked to come here I was told to divide my presentation into
three parts - what's going on, which I've just tried to do in
a few minutes, what are the effects of these incidents on
victims that we know about, and what recommendations we have
as a national organization for putting a program of prevention
and response into effect.

I am pleased to be able to share some of our
findings of victim impact with you tonight, particularly
because we just completed a study of victimization in the
country under a Ford Foundation Grant. It was a national
random sample of the population in the country; the first time
it's ever done. It is a research project that stemmed out of
pilot study we did of victims in seven states, and California
was one of those seven states. I personally conducted focus
groups with victims of hate crimes here in California, in
Oakland and San Jose, four years ago. That project, which
gave rise to the national study of victimization which we have
just completed - the results have not even been published yet
- but I will share some of the findings with you tonight.

First of all, it will come as no surprise to those
of you who came here, and one of the problems, of course, with
hearings like this, is those who come are people who come are
people who already know the problem and understand it, so it
really is preaching to the choir, but in fact, the effect of these incidents on victims are traumatic and long-lasting. There is fear, anger and isolation. The costs are often physical, emotional and financial, and the incidents effect not only the victim, but their family members, their friends and others in the community who identify with them.

To digress and give you one personal story, for five years before I came to work as Director of the Institute, I handled problems in Montgomery County, Maryland on this issue, and set up several victim assistance programs. One of the victims I worked with personally was a couple -- black male, working for the Police Department, white wife, who had a cross burned on their lawn. They had a three-year-old child. When the cross was burned on their lawn, they didn't know whether or not the cross was burned on their lawn because they were an interracial couple, or because someone was angry with him as a police officer for something he had done, and this was just one way of getting at him.

One of the points I wanted to emphasize is whether or not an act is based on prejudice is irrelevant in terms of the effects on the victim. The perception of the victim as well as the perception of the community is what the response should be based on, because we can't always be sure what the motivation was. All we can know is what the victim's impressions and the community's impressions are, and the effects are based on that, because we don't always have a perpetrator we can interview or ask.

In this particular case, in Kensington, Maryland,
what happened with this case was not unusual. The family, of course, was terrified, because did this cross burning mean that someone was waiting to get at them and do further damage? They were afraid to let their three-year old child leave the house, even to go out on the front lawn and play, for fear someone would attack her. The neighbors, who were supportive of the family, wouldn't let their children play with this victim's child for fear their children would be present if something happened. So the family became re-victimized by the fact that the community members were terrified about the effect and the aftermath of the incident. The entire community was paralyzed, and it took a lot of work over many months, and then an arrest, which didn't happen for six months, before things started to calm down.

The effects of these incidents ripple through a community and truly undermine and tear at the fabric of the community.

In our current Victimization Project, we interviewed over 2,000 individuals by phone between April and June of this year. The questions we asked pertained only to the prior 12 months. We didn't ask about lifetime victimization because we didn't want to rely on old memories. We asked about immediate experiences, experiences that took place during the prior 12 months. Only one third of the incidents that occurred in school settings were reported to anybody. Forty-eight percent of incidents that occurred in public places or neighborhoods were reported to anybody, and only 36% of incidents that occurred in the work place were reported to anybody. What
does that tell you about what we don't know about?

Sixty-three percent of the victims reported emotional upset, and one of the things we want to do with this study, and we haven't finished analyzing the data yet, but we were comparing -- we weren't just interviewing, understand, victims, we were interviewing a random sample of the population, so we could compare non-victims with victims of crimes not motivated by prejudice with victims of crimes motivated by prejudice -- and we were not surprised to learn that in fact being a victim of violence motivated by prejudice is truly different and more serious.

We had a list of symptoms we were looking at. Non-victims reported on average five symptoms. Victims of crimes not motivated by prejudice, what we refer to as personal crimes -- burglary, theft, other kinds of non-prejudice motivated, vandalism, etc. -- reported nine of these symptoms; and victims of violence motivated by prejudice because of group identify reported 12 symptoms, to the direct line in almost every case.

The symptoms range from psychological, such as higher levels of depression and withdrawal, sleep difficulties, anxiety, loss of confidence, difficulty concentrating, and feelings of helplessness. They included serious interpersonal difficulties with friends and significant others, which they attributed to the incidents and the effects of those incidents. They also feared further problems as a result of these incidents.

Victims of non-prejudiced motivated crimes said in
21% of the cases that they feared a future act occurring. But for victims of group violence based on race, 38% feared future violence.

One of the things that we convinced of, and we need to keep in mind as we create programs to deal with victims, is that victims of violence motivated by prejudice are different because they are always vulnerable; always at risk. It is not the random act that we experience if we walk down the street and we're in the wrong place at the wrong time, it is the act that occurs because of who or what we are, and therefore we never feel safe.

What is called for is a coordinated response. I commend all of you for your efforts to date - San Francisco really has a lot of efforts underway, and I wish as many cities around the country had the beginnings in place that you do. If what comes out of these hearings tonight is a more concerted effort, then you will be far and away ahead of where most places are in the country.

The coordination of a program, and we talk about at the Institute prevention, intervention and response as a multi-faceted approach. A coordinated response is important to insure that all important facets of the problem are addressed, to avoid duplication effort, and to share information on an ongoing basis. You would be amazed to learn that we've gone into communities where we have met with representatives of different government agencies, each of whom tell us something significant, and neither of whom knows what the other is doing. Maybe you won't be surprised to learn that.
Coalitions and task forces are critical, as long as one organization has the overall responsibility for coordination. In many places, that is the Human Rights Commission, and given the role of the Human Rights Commission here, it seems like a logical location or locus of responsibility.

I am going to tell you very briefly what I think the elements of an effective program contains, and then I will entertain questions. Obviously, it's impossible in 20 or even 30 minutes to do something which I usually spend an entire day doing, but I will go through these very quickly, and then trust that anybody who wants to get in touch with me after tonight will have an address and phone number. I see most of you have my newsletter, and certainly Don Hesse of the Human Rights Commission knows where to find me.

Education. The last speaker referred to the importance of education. One of the problems we have with school systems in this country in terms of reporting is that principals their schools to be fiefdoms. No principal wants his or her high school or elementary school or any other school to be seen as the seat of a problem. Therefore, we don't know about many of the incidents that occur in schools. We have to work very closely with the school systems to ensure that there is not a fear that there will be a stigma attached to reporting of incidents. We have learned in many communities that incidents have been building and building and building in a community, and the only time we learn about what's happened in the school prior is when we have an
explosive event with a firearm, where the principal has to call the police, and then we learn that there was six months of smaller incidents leading up to that, where we could have intervened, but nobody knew what was going on.

We need to educate the school community, through PTAs, civic associations and other community groups. We need to use the clergy to reach communities. We need to get them to report incidents. And, within the school system, I talk about the importance of mainstreaming human rights. We have handicapped children in our school systems; we no longer isolate them. We mainstream them in the school system because we know that that's what works best. But we treat human rights issues as an isolated problem, as if human rights were separate from learning about math and learning about English and learning about language, when in fact, none of those subjects matters if we don't deal with human rights issues.

I talk about the importance of infusing the entire curriculum, not only with human rights issues, but mandatory teacher training, because a human rights program is absolutely wasted when there isn't appropriate teacher training.

Second, law enforcement. In San Francisco, you have the advantage of a police department that already has in place a reporting system. I am meeting tomorrow morning with Chief Jordan, and will discuss with him some of the programs he has in place, and possible ideas I have for working with the Police Department. But in fact, you have the advantage of already having a Police Department which is making an effort to deal with the problem.
That doesn't mean that additional training may not be necessary. And one of the recommendations that I have is that there be a Memorandum of Understanding created between the Police Department and the government agency, possibly the Human Rights Commission, which mandates that incidents learned about by the Police Department are shared with the Human Rights Commission and vice-versa, so that community relations work and victim assistance can be provided. The Police Department is not equipped to provide the kind of assistance or community relations efforts that are absolutely critical.

Third, you have State Statutes on the books, both civil and criminal, which are quite good and fairly comprehensive. What you might want to look at is local ordinances. There are some ordinances which exist in other communities at the local level, municipal level, which, for example, provide money for an informants fund, specifically for victims to find perpetrators where there are victims of prejudicially motivated crimes. The reason that it's critical is because even though there is informant's money available in police departments for regular crimes, usually these kinds of crimes are not seen as seriously enough to warrant those kinds of funds. In truth, it's amazing what money on the streets can do to turn in a perpetrator, and very few perpetrators of these crimes are apprehended. So we really don't even have a profile of the perpetrator.

You also need to insure that sufficient funds are available to assist victims with compensation for the damage to their homes and their property. Elsewhere in the criminal
justice system, prosecutors and judges need to be involved. Prosecutors and judges need to be aware of the impact of these crimes on victims, that these crimes are different than personal crimes not motivated by prejudice, and we need to develop innovative programs to deal with perpetrators who are apprehended and convicted, because unless we do, we are not going to be addressing one of the underlying issues, and that is the fear and ignorance that gives rise to participation in these crimes.

We need to have an educational component, because incarceration and community service alone will not have any impact. We need to work with the media; that's already been mentioned, too. Rabbi Traub's words really brought that home when he talked about a map of where he lives when he has an unlisted address ending up in the newspaper. We need to really impress upon the media, those of you who are here and those of you who are not, that we want the information out there and we understand the information of informing the public, but we need to understand the difference between informing and sensationalizing, and we need to understand what alleviates the problem and what exacerbates it. It's called responsible reporting.

We need to do some preparedness with regard to the influx of immigrant groups. We use the term "minority," but within a few years, and even now in San Francisco, that term is meaningless. When you look at the composition, the demographics of California and also of other states in this country -- Texas, New York, etc., we realize that in just a
few years this country is going to look totally different. It's a rapidly changing demographic scene.

We pretend that that's not happening, but it is, and we have to stop using the term minority, and realize we're talking about a majority. We're talking about people who are affected by these kinds of crimes.

We need to do work with housing and with educating people in communities where we are placing one immigrant group with another, where they don't know each other's languages, don't know each other's cultures, and we end up pitting two groups against each other, and then we have what we now call minority against minority violence, but in fact it's two groups neither of whom in a few years will be a member of a minority.

We need to provide effective victim assistance that is immediate and ongoing. And, without going into details about the kinds of programs that are available and could be implemented, suffice it to say that it is absolutely critical to the victim of these crimes to know that someone cares.

When we went around the country and interviewed victims, people said to us, "no one is going to talk to you. People are not going to tell you what happened to them. You're not going to get people to talk to you, either in person or over the phone." Well, not only did we get people to talk to us, but we couldn't get them off the phone.

Everybody wants to talk about what happened, if they believe you care about what happened. And one of the things that was a profound experience for me is how frequently in
interviewing victims people thanked us for listening to their stories. People thanked us for caring.

Finally, in settings like this and elsewhere around the City, we need to speak out -- public officials and non-public officials alike, each of us -- in settings where we're in groups, and in settings where we are part of collectivities, both individually and collectively we must speak out.

Many important efforts are already underway here and we need to keep the momentum going. We can't afford to lose what is already underway. We need to maintain vigilance. And when we get discouraged, as is inevitable, because here we are in 1990 starting a decade the end of which will take us into the year 2000. It gets a little discouraging sometimes. We begin to feel that we've done this already, over and over again. Why are we still here doing it again today?

And when I begin to feel like that, I like to remind myself about an anecdote that was attributed to President Kennedy. When I feel as if there really isn't going to be any difference in the future, and I know that's not really true because I wouldn't be doing this work if I really thought there was going to be no difference in the future, I'm not that masochistic.

But I think about the story that was attributed to Kennedy where a wealthy man had a gardener and asked the gardener to plant a particularly exotic fruit tree, and he asked the man to do some research and find out what was involved in planting the tree and nurturing the tree. The
gardener came back to his boss and said, "You know, this tree is a mistake, you really don't want to plant this tree. And I've done some research and found out that you really ought to look into some other kind of tree." And the man says, "Well, why shouldn't I plant this kind of tree?" And he said, "Well, because I found out that this tree takes 100 years to bear fruit." And the man says, "Well, I guess you'd better begin immediately."

We can't afford, all of us, not to begin immediately. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Are there questions from the panel? We will start with the bottom row and go across. I anticipate we may have several. Are there questions down below? Go ahead.

MR. ROMERO: Do you envision a role through the federal government and, if so, what kinds of initiatives or legislative proposals do you envision?

MS. WEISS: The question is is there a role for the federal government and what do I envision. Thank for asking that.

There is currently pending in Congress the Federal Hate Crimes Statistics Act, which is coming up again for the third time. It passed the House last session, and had enough sponsors in the Senate - the Senate sponsor is Paul Simon - had enough sponsors in the Senate to pass. We couldn't get it up for a floor vote because Senator Jesse Helms held it up.

We now have a coalition of Senators, of sponsors that is such that we think that we can win anyway. If that is
passed, and we think it will this session, then that will
mandate that the Attorney General of the United States collect
information on incidents motivated by race, religion, ethnic
background and sexual orientation. Now, it doesn't say how
they are going to be collected.

My nightmare is that they're going to call my office
and ask me to collect media clippings, or something. But in
fact, the FBI and other agencies in the Justice Department
have been in touch with my office to learn what we know about
data collection in anticipation that this law will be passed.
So, we are hopeful. That is the most significant federal
legislation pending.

Now, the other thing that's happening you should
know is that Attorney General Thornberg in his speech in honor
of Martin Luther King's Memorial, talked about a Justice
Department focus on hate crimes this year. And we do
anticipate that there may be some programs coming out of the
federal government that have not before existed.

I also would like you to know, for those of you who
have never worked with a community relations service of the
Justice Department, I don't know where the nearest office is
- anybody here know? There is one in San Francisco. I have
not worked directly with this office. I have worked directly
with several of the other offices in the country and have
found them to be immensely helpful in diffusing community
tension in the aftermath of an incident. If you haven't
worked with them, I would suggest that you do that too. Any
other questions?
MR. OWYANG: It seems that recently we've been hearing more commentators, I guess basically from the right, saying that one of the reasons for the increased tension and violence that we're seeing is the resentment or reaction against various minority groups either wanting too much or getting too much, for example, Affirmative Action, liberalized immigration laws, domestic partners ordinances, etc. In your experience in this area, do you feel that that is what is causing all of this?

MS. WBISS: Well, I don't feel that any one thing is calling all this. The question had to do with what I refer to is backlash; resentment about Affirmative Action and other programs dealing with minorities, and is that the cause of all this.

There is no one thing that is the cause of all this. Let me say that any one explanation is really simplistic, and I don't have time, but I could spend a half an hour explaining to you some of the things that I think contribute to the problem. I do think that backlash to Affirmative Action and resentment have to do with some incidents in some locations some of the time.

And one of the things that we are seeing on college campuses is that more than 25 years after the passing of the Fair Housing laws, we have as segregated a society as we had before. You go onto a college campus and you suddenly realize, if you've been on as many campuses as I have in the last two years, that you have students that have come from segregated situations, primarily white or primarily black, or
primarily whatever, and they interacted, truly interacted, with very few people who were different from themselves. Then you put them not only on the same campus, but you put them as roommates together, and suddenly you have this situation where there is a tremendous amount of tension and they don't know how to deal with it, and people are saying, "gee, this is a college campus, can you imagine that on a college campus stuff like this is going on?" It's not surprising at all when you realize that you're throwing these kids together who have no understanding of each other's differences.

That is a factor and it has exacerbated the fear and ignorance which are referred to as the twin demons, the fear and ignorance that they come to school with are exacerbated, not caused by, resentments over what they perceive as preferential treatment for minorities. And unless or until we start dealing with the underlying issues, the economic disparity, and the issues such as joblessness and homelessness and things like that, we are not going to be able to deal with the resentment, because we really have this dual society.

MR. SANTIS: I am curious if you organization supports enhanced penalties for hate crimes, and if you do of if you don't what are your views on that? Also, the First Amendment implications.

MS. WEISS: The first question had to do with do we support enhanced penalties for hate crimes, which in most states is referred to as an ethnic intimidation statute, and the second question had to do with First Amendment issues.

I have been on both sides of this issue, and will
tell you if you get ten constitutional attorneys in a row, as
I have, you get ten different opinions about First Amendment
issues, and again, that is too long a topic to go into. But
for now, let me respond by saying that yes, we are in favor of
enhanced penalties for crimes motivated by prejudice, and they
have fairly well stood up in court as far as not abridging
First Amendment rights. We believe they are important because
of the message they communicate to the community and to the
victim as well as the perpetrator.

It goes back to the issue I talked about in terms of
the importance of the message. Enhanced penalties, as much as
anything else, says to the community, the legislation says to
the community, "We care about this issue and we know that an
act of vandalism is not an act of vandalism is not an act of
vandalism, and a cross burning is not an act of arson.

I think that sufficient arguments have been made
that we're fairly well convinced that it's important. By the
way, several jurisdictions in Massachusetts have had
experience where people have plea-bargained the racist
motivation because they don't want to go to prison - think
about this - labeled as a racist. So they will plea-bargain
the civil rights charge and plead guilty to the other criminal
charges because they don't want publicity to come out that
they were labeled racist. So I do believe in the enhanced
penalties.

In terms of First Amendment issues in general, there
is somewhat of a reaction, and we are quite serious about
First Amendment rights at the Institute, and one of the areas
where we take a very strong stand is with policies such as on college campuses, where we do not believe that there should be restrictive policies designed such that people's rights are abridged.

I'll give you the most extreme example. There actually was one college where a policy was put in place that said if a group of non-minority students were standing on campus and having a conversation and a minority walked by and was not included in that conversation, that was an act of discrimination. That's going too far.

We do think that there are other ways to handle the problem, and people are so afraid of the issue that they overreact in terms of instituting penalties. But I do believe in the enhanced penalty for criminal act.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Other questions from the panel?

COMMISSIONER PIVNICK: You talked about mainstreaming human rights in the schools. Do you have an example of that? Have you worked with any school districts in that capacity?

MS. WEISS: Yes. In fact, I met with Emily Goldfarb this afternoon and I was giving her some examples. I do a lot of training of educators, all the way from elementary through college, and I will give you an example, because it actually came to me out of frustration about seven or eight years ago when I was working with a group.

I was doing mandatory training for elementary school teachers, and one of the teachers was saying, "I don't understand what you expect of us. We have to teach all of
these subjects, and every year the list gets longer, and the
d-parents aren't taking any responsibility, and the community
takes no responsibility. We have to do it all. How do you
expect us, in addition to everything else, to teach human
relations and human rights? That's a community problem,
that's a clergy problem, that's a family problem."

And I thought, well, you know, she has a point. And
I don't mean to dump this on teacher, because it is a problem
that belongs to all of us. However, it is possible to teach
good human relations in the context of educating about all
subjects.

I want to give you an example that I gave Emily.
San Francisco's changing demographics are well-known.
Certainly, they are well-known to people who would teach our
children, I would hope. And it sounds so simple but it really
is critical.

I get back to the issues of fear and ignorance. A
lot of what happens among youth particularly is based on fear
and based on ignorance. When we give math problems to our
kids, why do we have to tell them to multiply marbles? Or, if
six people are in this car and there are six cars in line, how
many people are all together? Why can't we give them math
problems that teach them about the changing demographics, and
use real life examples? Why can't we, when they come back
from the summer vacation and we tell them - how many people
know what a student has to write on the first day back in
school after summer vacation? Everybody knows, right, because
we all had to do it, and the kids still have to do it. What
did you do over summer vacation? I went to camp, I went to 
the beach, I didn't do anything, I was bored stiff, right?
Why can't we make them write a story about someone I met this 
summer who was different from me, and what that felt like. 
Why can't we teach human relations in the context of 
everything we teach?

Now, I say that with a caveat, and that's why when I 
talk about mainstreaming human rights, I mean that we need to 
have assemblies on intergroup relations as a routine. We have 
assemblies that are cheerleading parties for our sports fans, 
right? Why can't we have human relations assemblies?

I say that with a caveat, and here's the caveat. 
Some schools will use that as an excuse not to do anything. 
If they don't have to come up with a specific curriculum to 
deal with these issues, that may get them off the hook and 
they say, "oh, well, we deal with this everyday in all our 
classes on a routine basis." Maybe and maybe not.

So, when I say mainstreaming human rights, I am 
serious about it, and I mean show evidence for it. I mean 
come up with programs. We have lots and lots of exercises 
that can be used in teaching to appreciate differences, multi-
cultural education, and also to do conflict resolution. We 
have to teach our children how to resolve conflicts without 
vioence.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you. It is now my 
responsibility to point out to the members of the panel that 
we are running 30 minutes late. We have the wonderful dilemma 
of an outstanding expert; wonderful, excellent questions are
going to flow from each of us.

I would recommend to the members of the panel that you ask only those questions that are the most pressing at this point, and then we would call upon our witness, if she is willing, to answer further questions in writing. We have 13 more scheduled witnesses, plus public testimony, and we're even going to have a break, so let me remind the panel of that fact. Are there burning questions that need to be asked?

CO-CHAIR KAI: I'm brave enough, I'm a Co-Chair. I think because this is an area that to some extent in our planning, I don't know how far we've really looked into this. One of the things you mentioned was the need to address the perpetrators, and going beyond traditional incarceration/rehabilitation programs. I'd just like a brief idea of what types of things you mean by that.

MS. WEISS: Probably this is too long an answer. There's a program that I created in Maryland that is still in existence, called STOP, Stamping Out Terroristic Outbreaks of Prejudice - and I didn't make up the acronym, please. And the only reason I say that is because I like the idea of the acronym "STOP" to deal with juvenile offenders, but I couldn't come up with an acronym and somebody else did, and it's STOP.

Well anyway, it's a program that provides education and community service for first offenders who commit non-felonious acts, for misdeameanors. And it is still in effect, and what it does really is tries to get to the underlying issues. Also, when I created it, and it's still working this way, it is mandatory that at least one parent or guardian
participate with child, because it is premised on the belief that no child acts in a vacuum. Also, we want to see what is going on in the home environment.

I will tell you that this program is not... I can certainly get you more information on the program if you're interested in it. But the problem is not designed for the borderline kid who is about to join the skinheads. We're realistic about that. I don't know of any programs in the country that are successfully aimed at rehabilitating, if you will, members of hate groups which have been arrested for these crimes. But we do believe that it is not too late to really work successfully with the young kids who commit misdemeanors.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Any more truly pressing questions that can't be asked in writing?

At this time, we all want to thank you very much for your testimony, Ms. Weiss. We will hear from the community organizations whose witnesses are prepared to testify, starting with Lulan McGriff of the NAACP. Okay, I don't see Lulan. Is Barbara Cameron present, from Community United Against Violence? Okay, fine, Jill Tregor.

MS. TREGOR: Good evening, I am Jill Tregor, from Community United Against Violence, and forgive me if this isn't too smooth, I am reading somebody else's prepared notes here.

Community United Against Violence (CUAV) has been recording incidents of hate violence for many years now, and this last year we recorded 331 incidents of lesbian/gay hate
motivated incidents in San Francisco and in the Bay Area. These statistics are especially frightening, because it represents an increase of 67% from the incidents reported to us in 1988.

San Francisco is well-known for its highly visible and large lesbian and gay population. We believe that the 331 hate motivated incidents reported to CUAV represent a minute fraction of hate actions against lesbians and gay men.

A San Francisco Examiner survey in June 1989 revealed that there are over 6,000 such incidents yearly in San Francisco, and 45,000 in the Bay Area.

What CUAV does about this problem - CUAV, in its ten years response to anti-lesbian and gay violence, has developed what we believe are some unique programs to empower and educate our community. One of the most immediate needs are when someone who has been the target of an attack, is that we provide direct and immediate attention.

Our Client Advocacy Program encompasses crisis counseling, advocacy through the criminal justice system, and referrals to other appropriate agencies. The counseling component of client advocacy is particularly important, because of the trauma which arises after an attack, which you have really just heard more about than I can say.

CUAV has also developed a Safety Monitoring Program for large community gatherings. The volunteer safety monitors provide a protective zone between the sometimes extroverted police officers who are assigned to events and the event participants. And I might also add that the monitors have
done - in 1984 at the San Francisco Democratic Convention, some people who were anti-gay kind of zealots who were there for the convention were taunting gay and lesbian demonstrators, and it was monitors who provided the buffers so that the national news media didn't have the opportunity to report that gay and lesbians attacked Christian ministers, or something horrible like that. So monitors - it's not always just between police and gay and lesbian community, it can be between people who are anti-gay and the lesbian and gay community.

In addition to our direct services, our education campaigns emphasize personal safety and demystifying who lesbians and gay men are. Our Whistle-Alert System is an institutionalized safety mechanism for the lesbian and gay community, and the whistle has been used in many other incidences. It is now popular in the lesbian/gay community, the women's movement popularized for women to use to protect themselves against rape, and in the early part of this century, Chinese immigrants used it to protect themselves against racial attacks.

The whistle is not only a symbol for lesbian and gay men of our rights to move freely in streets or on buses, but whistle blowing is the signal that someone is being attacked.

Our Speakers Bureau Program is primarily focused on speaking in classrooms of San Francisco public schools and Bay Area universities. Students have an exceptional opportunity to ask lesbians and gay men directly about who we are. It is an opportunity to address the ignorance held about lesbians
and gay men.

In the school year 1988 through '89, CUAV spoke to 3,433 students, 97% of whom are under the age of 21, and I might add that at least 90% of those students remarked afterwards that they had had some change in attitude about lesbians and gay men as a result of that exposure.

Another important example of our education effort are the trainings CUAV does with the Police Academy. Police officers receive a primer about the lesbian and gay community and are hopefully as a result less homophobic, just by knowing just a little bit more information. I think sometimes we think that it's something really huge that we have to do when we're doing education. It's just simple information about who we are, facts and figures about what it is that makes a lesbian or gay man different than a heterosexual man or woman.

The recommendations that CUAV has are multiple. We have been providing essential victim services and continue to do so, but we believe prevention work is critical. Victim services do not prevent future victimization. It is futile to only service victims without attempting to make the changes that will reduce prejudice-based crimes. It is very important for organizations like CUAV to do more trainings of police officers, social service agencies, emergency services, MUNI, and any public institutions which deal with the diverse populations of San Francisco.

I'm going to see how much I can skip here. One thing that I think I would like to mention is that the general public needs a massive public education program about lesbians
and gay men. MUNI ads, outdoor billboards, newspaper ads and public service announcements should be implemented to break down stereotypes about lesbians and gay men, and to educate about the unacceptability of anti-lesbian and gay violence. We also recommend that the District Attorney's office have personnel who specifically deal with hate violence crimes.

We see a critical need for the various communities who are directly impacted by hate violence to develop a coordinated effort in addressing the rising incidences of hate violence. We need to hold government agencies, city government, public schools and other institutions accountable and responsible for each incidence of hate crime in San Francisco. These institutions must join with us in prejudice rejection.

On behalf of Community Against Violence, I would like to thank the Human Rights Commission and the Coalition for Civil Rights for taking this bold and overdue step in identifying hate violence as a critical issue that will be facing us through the 90's.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much, Ms. Tregor. Are there questions from the panel? Okay, let the medium of the whistle be both the metaphor and the message for this forum. We are going to have a break of ten minutes duration, and we really do mean ten, and then we're going to come back and hear from other community organizational representatives, and then from the public on the subject of Hate Violence. We will reconvene at 8:10.

(OFF RECORD -- BRIEF RECESS)
(ON RECORD - TAPE II)

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: I will now ask that everyone else come back into the room so that we can move along. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Okay, we will start again now, but before we do, I just want to remind people who are here who would like to testify as members of the public that you do need to sign up. The sign-up is just outside the door. No? Is it inside, Jackie? Are you taking sign-up? Okay. The woman in the back of the room with her hand up in the air will take the sign-ups if you still would like to speak this evening.

Also, we will have a Public Testimony section tomorrow evening so that we don't go over too far tonight. If you could do your testimony tomorrow night, we would appreciate that.

Also, I want to remind people that we will be taking Written Testimony as well, and that can come in within three weeks time, that is, until Thursday, February 8th.

We will now continue with the Community Organizations. The first speaker for this part of the program will be Lulann McGriff from the NAACP. And, I would like to remind the people who are testifying to please remember to spell your last name for the court reporter. Thank you.

MS. McGRIFF: My name is Lulann McGriff (spelled M-C-G-R-I-F-F), and I am the President of the San Francisco Branch of the NAACP, as you know, the oldest, largest civil rights organization in this country.
I would like to suggest to you that there are some other forms of hate violence going on in this country, aside from the ones that people tend to think are the only ones. I am suggesting that the lack of housing, the lack of jobs, the spiritual demoralization that happens with black people, the emotional violence that takes place, institutional racism -- all of that. All of those things are forms of racial violence as far as the black community is concerned.

Of course, we do have the traditional types of hate violence that everyone perceives as being hate violence, and that is nothing new to the NAACP. We were founded because of hate violence crimes, as you know.

I worked for the NAACP for seven years in the regional office as the Assistant Regional Director. There was rarely a day that went by when we did not have a hate letter or a hate phone call. So, it's nothing new to us.

I suggest to you that one of the reasons that I see very few black faces in this room is because of the lack of faith in the Human Rights Commission to do anything about it; the lack of faith in terms of the City officials to do anything about it. That is why you don't see them here, in addition to the fact of the lack of outreach to our community.

Some of the things that I would like to raise though are that we do have the traditional threats on an on-going basis. I myself receive them at home, hate calls, messages on my phone from the Klan. We receive them in our office. This is an ongoing kind of thing that takes place in the black community.
As you know, the recent bombings and threats to NAACP officials across the country, I am sure you are aware of those. Those are not anything new. In August, when the first bomb threat came to the Atlanta office of the NAACP, one of the things that was not publicized was that the Baltimore headquarters was shot up.

So, these things are not anything new, in terms of what's really going on in this country. And if you think about it, this type of thing comes about because the signals come from on top. The Reagan Administration basically said it's okay to dismantle Civil Rights legislation, it's okay to dismantle Affirmative Action programs, and it's okay not to teach black children in schools.

And so, those kinds of signals say to everyone else, it's okay to do those things. It's okay to do things to people that are ugly -- no longer educating black youth. And if you look at what's happening in our school system right here in San Francisco, where black youngsters were 75% of the students that received D's and F's in the last grading period, where black youngsters are the highest suspended, the highest dropout rate, and where black males are the highest number of students in Special Ed.

I suggest to you that all of those things are forms of racial violence. We need to look beyond the real obvious things where somebody calls you, you get a hate call, or where the graffiti is on the wall. Those are the real obvious things, but there are some other kinds of very subtle, and maybe not so subtle things happening here.
I think when the press decides that they will praise a Superintendent of Schools for doing a great job when black youngsters are failing in the school system, it's another form of racial violence, I believe.

If you want the regular kinds of things, we do have all of those. We get letters where people are picked up off the street corners, the schools. Almost every high school in this City has been inundated with flyers from hate groups, flyers inviting youngsters to join. That's at almost every high school in this city. I have received a flyer from someone saying they found this at Galileo, at Lowell, at Burton -- you name it, it's been there.

Additionally, if you look around the City, some of us when we travel the City we don't bother to look at the graffiti that's on the walls, and I myself am one of those people. But just recently at City College, right there on Fielding and Ocean Avenue there was a huge swastika on the wall, that had been there apparently three or four weeks. I called the Public Utilities Commission head Tom Elsey, and he had it taken off within a day. But that same kind of graffiti was in the bus station at Ocean and Fielding, and it's probably all over the City. The same kind of graffiti was placed on the BSU at City College, in the bathrooms there -- and it was basically swastikas and messages about black people.

I don't know where you got your stats about 20% of the crimes. Well, I guess those are the ones that are reported against black people. I suggest to you that most
black people don't even bother to report the crimes because it is a way of life for us.

My hope is that this Commission will broaden what it considers to be hate violence crimes, and take a look at some of the other things that are going on -- like I said, the lack of jobs, education, housing. And the real thing that bothers us probably more than anything is the drug problem. And I can't think of any more hate violence than that, you know, the community being destroyed.

The final thing that I wanted to mention, and I think it's probably one of the worst things that has happened to the black community since slavery is the foster care system, not only in this City, but throughout the country, where black youngsters are being taken from homes, in the case of San Francisco, placed in Napa with white families, placed where their mothers can't reunite with them, where there is no effort for the family to reunite, and where the department has made no effort to go out and seek extended family members, has made no effort to recruit black families to take care of these kids, that is the absolute destruction of the black family, and probably one of the worst forms of hate violence hate exists in this society right now.

And I suggest that these are some of the things that you want to look at besides who's being beat up. Those are real obvious kinds of things. But there are a lot of other things that are happening that people are not looking at.

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions
from the panelists?

MR. WONG: What's the way that we can kind of re-energize and re-involve the black community into the process that we're trying to set up here?

MS. McGRIFF: For one, the black community has to believe and have some faith in the process, and thus far has had no faith in the process. If you will recall, in terms of the history of the Human Rights Commission, it was the black community that helped start the Human Rights Commission. It was because of the riots in this City.

And the Human Rights Commission has really never done what it was charged to do. That's why the black community has no faith in it. In order to gain that kind of faith -- 1) we asked for the Task Force on African Americans, and I understand the Commission is dragging its feet; can't find money to fund it. That in and of itself tells you that you're really not about doing what you're supposed to be about. Therefore, the community is not going to have any faith in the process.

Anything else? I don't know that I answered your question, but one way to start out would be to at least deal with that task force that we asked for, fund it and make sure that the things that we asked the Commission to do, that those things happen. That would be, I believe, one of the ways to at least begin to get some faith.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: I have a question too. And I may be guilty of a leading question here, and if I am I hope will be forgiven. You mentioned in your testimony that you felt
that in conjunction with these hearings there was a lack of outreach to the black community. What would you say can be done on each side of that question to avoid that problem in the future?

MS. McGRIFF: For one, there was no advertisement in the community. I sent out a mailer to my membership, but it was late getting out because we were late in terms of getting the final date. We send our things out bulk mail. There's the Sun Reporter newspaper -- it could have been advertised in; almost everybody reads that; the Metro newspaper that is also put out by the Sun Reporter as a free throwaway that is given out in almost every black church in this City. Those are just some very simple things that could have happened. Some advertising on the radio, even on Martin Luther King's birthday the announcement could have been at the Civic Center. That was not done. So, just some very basic things could have happened that did not happen.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MARTIN: I'd like to make one comment just for the record. I wanted to let you know about the African-American parity. It is not because of money, and that is moving ahead.

MS. McGRIFF: Oh, it's not because of money?

COMMISSIONER MARTIN: No, it's not.

MS. McGRIFF: That's what we were told. But anyway....

COMMISSIONER MARTIN: As I told you, I told you personally that if you needed to talk to somebody about it,
talk to me. And I'm telling you it's not about money.

MS. McGRIFF: Well, some of your staff informed us that the money was not there.

COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Well, for the record, I just wanted to straighten that out.

MS. McGRIFF: And we have not had a meeting in almost two months.

COMMISSIONER MARTIN: That is correct.

MS. McGRIFF: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BERMUDEZ: Along with the lack of outreach to the black community in terms of inviting them to participate in this event, information that there's no faith at all in the Commission, as well as the local legislators, can you give us some specifics about what you mean by that?

MS. McGRIFF: Well, I think that people feel that over the years the Commission has not done what it was originally set out to do, and it's kind of veered away from its original path -- to go on and set up new task forces. You haven't dealt with the original problem that you were set up to deal with, and that was blacks, in terms of housing, jobs, all of those things. Those things have not been dealt with in this City. But yet you continue to create new task forces to deal with new problems, and you haven't dealt with the problems that you were originally created for.

COMMISSIONER BERMUDEZ: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you, Ms. McGriff. Our next speaker is Kathy Uhl from the Independent Living Resource Center.
MS. UHL: Commissioners. My name is Kathy Uhl (spelled U-H-L). I am the Executive Director of the Independent Living Resource Center. The Independent Living Resource Center is a non-profit, community-based agency which provides support services to individuals with disabilities and frail elderly, to assist them to maintain their independence in the community and be as independent as possible, remain in the community and not have to be institutionalized.

I have to say that when I was first asked to respond to your Hearing today, I didn't think I was going to have much to say. But I'll never go with my first inclination again.

After talking with folks and through a little bit of thinking about the issue, I realized that as the last speaker spoke, we're not talking about the real obvious kinds of things in the disabled community. There are a lot of other types of abuse and violence that's really happening, and I'd like to really speak to that.

As I was kind of putting the incidences together, I realized that there is really four types of violence that individuals in the disability community are experiencing. The first category is one of vulnerability. Disabled individuals have a high degree of vulnerability, and because of this there is a high incident of being the victim of some kind of violent crime. If you're physically disabled and you are using a wheelchair or a walker, canes, crutches, you're seen as a possible victim, someone that can't respond as quickly and as fast as someone else who is able-bodied. You're seen as someone who can't run after your purse, or be as concerned as
someone else about trying to apprehend the person who attacked you.

If you are visually disabled, you have a white cane or you have a dog, it makes it very obvious to someone that you may be less able to see them coming. You always will be less able to identify them in the future. So you again are a potential victim and easy target.

If you are mentally retarded, you look confused, you look like an easy target. You may be able to be conned, tricked, those types of things.

So, I think we have a variety of disabilities that really do find themselves in a very vulnerable position, and these are because of the limitations that the person has because of their disabilities. It is not something that I can ask the Human Rights Commission to solve. The vulnerability exists and we need to deal with the response and the results of that, rather than the vulnerability itself.

The crimes, I think, in this category are really crimes not because the person is disabled, but because they are different or limited, and yet the results are the same.

I think a secondary issue is that 60% of the disabled population in the working 18-64 year-old age range are not working or are under-employed. That means that the disabled community often is on low income, fixed incomes, they're living in a low income or poverty neighborhoods -- again, more vulnerable to high crime rates in those neighborhoods. We have many people who feel prisoners in their own home, like a lot of our frail elderly, afraid to
leave their homes because they will be victims of crime. I think this is something we may be able to do something about.

The second group of victims that I'd like to speak today about are a group that falls into the family abuse category. Many individuals with disabilities and frail elderly live with and are dependent on family members for their care. Abuse in this category ranges anything from verbal to physical abuse to downright neglect. Family members and caregivers are frustrated and exhausted often by the constant demands of caring for a disabled member of the family. They are often caught between demands of their children and a disabled or elderly family member.

They are taking their frustration out, their inability to deal with the situation, on this dependent disabled person. On the other hand, the disabled person feels often powerless, like they have no other choice, that they're at fault somehow. They don't want to go to a nursing home. They won't say anything. They find that they have to accept the situation or the alternative is something they don't want to deal with.

This problem has become so prevalent that we recently, last year, finally had laws passed that require social service and health care caregivers to report cases of potential abuse to the Department of Social Services, just like we do with potential child abuse. It is an unknown and right now still growing population. But again, it's the frustration, it's the dependency of the disabled person that seems to be the cause.
I think the third area is that of social discrimination and verbal abuse. The inaccessibility of a lot of our services in the community, the inability for a lot of people to reasonably accommodate people with disabilities, or their outright refusal to provide services to someone with a disability, as well as the normal schoolyard abuse, of the name calling, and the nasty names as you go by the neighborhood. This kind of constant put-down, name-calling and feeling of third class citizenship because you can't get into all of the facilities in the community does a real emotional damage to people. We are talking about their self-image and ultimately their productivity in the community. If they are not feeling like they are part of the community, the energy and the strength it needs to be a productive employed member of the community is even less.

Lastly, is the downright hate violence that I think a lot of us have been talking about today. The victims of violence simply because you are a disabled person. Someone doesn't like the way you look, they think you are different, you're just in a situation where they can pick on you. And I think that happens - I'd like to hope that that happens a lot less than a lot of the other situations that we've been talking about, but I think it does happen. I think, however, some of you, one through three, the first three categories that I'm talking about, cause a lot of damage, and I don't think we think about that. That's the underground kind of abuse in crime that goes on in this community, and I really today would like to bring that to your attention.
What can we do about it? I don't have all the answers; I don't think anybody does. I think education is part of what we need to do, community education, improving the media view of people with disabilities. In the media, in the entertainment field, seeing people with disabilities that are productive, able, not just the vulnerable model that they have, that will help both the disabled community and the non-disabled community who sees them as a victim.

I'd like to see stronger enforcement of crimes against disabled and the frail elderly. I think this is similar to crimes against children. At some points, they are a group that has been picked on, and I'd like to see, like we do with the police or other folks, targeted individuals, that if you perpetrate crimes against this group of people, the punishment is some way increased.

The last thing I'd like to say is that I think there can be some education done with potential victims. We can talk about how to use better body language, self defense for people with disabilities, how to be more street-wise. Those kinds of educations should be extended and modified so that they meet the needs of the disabled community.

And lastly, I'd like to thank you for your attention and your Hearings on this issue, and for finally including disability under the Human Rights Commission. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Uhl? Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Esta Soler from the Family Violence Project.
MS. SOLER: Good evening, Commissioners and the Coalition. My name is Esta Soler. I am the Executive Director of the Family Violence Project, and I also serve as a National Advisory, a Board Member to WGBH's Violence Prevention Programming.

The focus of my talk tonight will be on violence against women, and I know I have a few minutes, and I will do it very quickly.

The tragedy of violence against women can best be told by this poignant headlines, headlines that you all remember very well.

"Gunman kills 5, flees with three daughters" - the case of Ramon Salcido - Sonoma, California, April, 1989.

Charles Stewart, the paper reports, disturbed that his wife had the upper hand in their marriage, murdered her and their son, and falsely accused a black man of this heinous crime -- Boston, Massachusetts, October, 1989.

Fourteen women were brutally murdered as a gunman exclaimed, "You feminists!" -- Montreal, Canada, December, 1989.

"Husband kills wife after a vindictive rampage of escalating violence -- San Francisco, California, January 15, 1990."

Most domestic crime stories never make the newspaper. The victims of most assaults and most homicides are mere statistics, and they also tell a very disturbing and tragic story.

In San Francisco, over 10,000 domestic crimes were
reported to the San Francisco Police Department in 1988, and 97% of serious assaults were crimes of violence against women. And in California, between 1983 and 1988, aggravated assaults increased by 52.5%, and according to the Attorney General, this increase is due in large measure to the increased reports of crimes of domestic violence.

And perhaps even more insidious is that women are at even greater risk for these crimes of violence when they are pregnant, resulting in fetal damage and miscarriages.

Yet, as a society, despite these statistics and these stories and these tragedies, while we are frightened by street assaults and outraged by violence caused by gangs and by drugs, we remain silent on the crimes of violence against women because they often remain hidden behind closed doors. Yet, the neglected truth is that violence against women causes more injuries and deaths than many of these more visible forms of violence.

The sad truth was brought home to us in San Francisco this past Monday. As most of you have seen, and a few of you who may not, I just happened to bring the Examiner with me -- "Husband kills wife and then kills himself". He killed her as she was on her way to dropping off her nine-year old son to school. He killed her in front of other children, and he killed her in cold blood.

But the question that we have asked ourselves at the Family Violence Project for two days, and the question that I put before you is a difficult one, and that is -- could we have done anything to save this woman? And the other question
that's behind that is -- what can we do to save other women
and to save other lives?

I don't know the answer to that question, it's not a
pat answer, but I think it is one we must ask. And I think
it's something that we can do something about, and I think you
all can help us do something about.

First and foremost, we have to increase our
vigilance against guns. Handgun control and the control of
assault weapons is absolutely critical if we're going to do
anything about this crime of violence.

Two, it's too easy to kill. He killed her easily
and so quickly. And we can do something about that. We have
to improve our police response and increase our support
services. We have to improve our public education efforts,
and I might add that I think it's very important and often, in
fact, a historic note that crimes of violence against women
are included in this Hearing, and I think that's an important
first step of putting it on the main political agenda of
social change. And we need to expand our public education
efforts in every arena to make sure that this crime, it's
seriousness, it's lethality is understood not only in numbers,
but also in the individual tragedy that so many people are
suffering.

And finally, and perhaps most importantly, we must
re-order our priorities. We are currently as a State spending
millions and millions of dollars prosecuting Ramon Salcido,
while we spend few dollars and put few hours into the
prevention of the crime of domestic violence.
I thank you for this opportunity to speak. I applaud you for your efforts of including this important issue in your discussion. We stand ready to work with you on this issue, and I would also like to say that it's a personal pleasure for me to be back here in front of the Human Rights Commission. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions from the panel? Thank you very much.

The next speaker is Osama Doumani from the Palestinian-Arab American Community.

MR. DOUMANI: My name is Osama Doumani (spelled O-S-A-M-A  D-O-U-M-A-N-I). There are over three million Americans of Arab descent in the United States, and it is estimated that between 50,000 and 100,000 live in the Bay Area. A large number of Arab Americans live in a perpetual climate of fear. Prejudice, discrimination and violence against them have increased in recent years. Its level of intensity may lie in relative dormancy for a while, then explode in acts of violence during crisis situations, such as the bombing of Libya, the Marine barracks in Lebanon, or the Iran hostage crisis.

Almost every Arab American I know has been subjected to humiliation, verbal abuse, denied employment, excluded from public forums, or subjected to some expression of prejudice, racism or actual physical violence to them or their places of business.

The more visible members of our community are also the most vulnerable. Perhaps most San Franciscans think of
Arab Americans as their neighborhood grocer. Many acts of violence are directed against the shopkeepers. They experience physical assaults, but more frequently, broken storefront windows. Some shopkeepers complain of unequal treatment by the police -- for example, response time to emergency calls, or in obtaining permits and other relations with local authorities.

Certainly, most Arab Americans are not shopkeepers. But I'm not sure, for example, how Mr. Mitchell of the White House experiences routine prejudice and harassment. I think not much. But like Mitchell, many Arab Americans have changed their names as if to escape a stigma of being of Arab ancestry. Many claim they are members of that they perceive as a less-discriminated against or less hated minority, such as Greeks or Armenians, or sometimes Italians. Imagine the psychological, emotional and moral damage that these people and their children suffer as a result.

Acts of violence are not limited to grocers only. During the seizure of Beirut by Israeli forces in 1982, a doctor of Syrian ancestry who practices at Kaiser was subjected to humiliating remarks by his supposedly educated colleagues. He also thinks that the death threats against him, which were painted on his car, were done by one of his colleagues as well.

Students, civil rights, and political activists suffer one of the highest levels of harassment and violence. They are harassed and blackmailed by federal agents -- for example, FBI and Immigration officials and agents.
The most stark example of violence is the bombing of the Santa Ana office and the murder of the Director of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, Alex Adi (PHONETIC). It has been reported that the FBI files indicate that the perpetrators flew to Los Angeles from Israel, as a matter of fact, wired his office and returned to Israel. So it's not just national in scope, it's international.

Arab American and Moslem institutions - I add Moslems because in the popular American mind the two are synonymous - have also been victims. Mosques have been set afire or vandalized in Los Angeles and Houston, for example.

The American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee is the largest national civil rights and advocacy organization for Arab American Rights. The Organization is less than ten years old. In the past few years, several of the offices of this organization have been vandalized or had pipe bombs placed at their doorsteps. One of these bombs incidentally injured two policemen in Boston who were trying to diffuse it.

The activists of this organization have been systematically targets of harassments and death threats. Acts of violence are not perpetrated only during crisis situations related to government foreign policy. Often, individuals are harassed and threatened with death threats and bodily harm either to prevent them from practicing their civil and political rights, or during such practice.

For example, when the Bay Area volunteers of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee joined Jews, Blacks, Latinos and other activists in putting an initiative
on the ballot in Berkeley to cut U.S. aid to Israel and the
amount that Israel spends to colonize the West Bank and Gaza,
the home of the Director of the office, which was me at the
time, was broken into three times or four times during that
year. At one point, I asked my 9-year-old son never to answer
to telephone anymore, after having answered it and heard a
recording of children screaming, bullets being fired, and
bombs going off. Sometimes they would play the tune, "Taps"
on the telephone. The glass in my office was broken, and we
received many death threats.

Finally, my landlady asked us to leave because,
"Many of the psychologists who share the building wanted to
see the office closed."

The point is that in none of the scores of
documented acts of violence and harassments has any
investigation been seriously launched, or no investigation has
ever led anywhere. No perpetrators, not one, was ever brought
to justice.

Prejudice and stereotyping of Arab Americans is
promoted and maintained systemically and institutionally. At
the height of hype concerning the hostages in Lebanon, a talk
show host on a major San Francisco radio station actually
advocated rounding up the Arabs and putting them in camps, and
got away with it, despite our protests.

Every Halloween you can count on at least one
company coming out with a mask of an ugly Arab, or rhetorical
Rambo doing Arabs in.

The frequency with which TV shows and movies portray
Arabs in negative images is indeed staggering. Finally, it has been impossible for Arab Americans to make significant changes in the California high school textbooks, for example. Mr. Honig has had the last word, and the misinformation, inaccuracies and half-baked truths remain in those textbooks.

What is to be done? Arab Americans need to work with other discriminated against groups to advance the collective causes. Additionally, you can be sensitive to the existence of problems in the Arab American community, get informed about it, and work with its leaders and activists on specific local problems and issues which face it.

Finally, we will mail some literature to you in the next week or two, documentation and examples of what I am talking about. I thank you very much for including us in this forum.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Doumani. Oh, yes. I am sorry. Commissioner Jaber.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Doumani, are you aware of any programs anywhere in the country that helps deal with this issue towards approaching the community?

MR. DOUMANI: A lot of the civil rights organizing that has gone on in the Arab American community across the country has focused on reaching out, combatting the stereotyping, trying to deal with public officials and agencies of all sorts. Not very successful, I would say.

Also, there has been outreach programs to reach out to other groups, particularly black groups and Asian groups
and other groups and others as well, and Jews, for that matter, because of the recognition that the problem exists. It's not going to be solved by Arab Americans as well, in that sense.

On more specific cases, with grocers, for example, a lot of the grocers in certain areas in the country are concentrated in ghettos -- for example, so that there has been a lot of friction between the grocers and the black population in the ghetto, and there has been very, very important steps -- for example, in Detroit, where structures were built between the Arab community and the black community on a continuing basis to deal with these problems.

I would suggest that we have found it extremely difficult to get our population mobilized, pragmatically because of the fear that exists, and also because of the ignorance that exists in terms of what their rights are in this country, when they come in as immigrants and they are, say, on a green card and not quite citizens, and even when they become citizens. The baggage that we bring with us from our countries come with us here.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: I have a question. Mr. Doumani, let me ask you this because you made an observation and I think it's terribly important, about one of the effects of hate violence that pervades many so-called minority groups. You mentioned, if I may call it that, the phenomenon of 'passing', people losing their cultural identity in favor of a perceived if not real degree of safety. What recommendations can you offer us for encouraging people to retain their
cultural identity when to do so is dangerous, when to do so
is, if you will, mark you for a target?

MR. DOUMANI: It is really a very hard struggle.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: And a common one among many of the
groups that we're addressing.

MR. DOUMANI: Absolutely. I am not sure I have an
answer for that, and I don't think there is one answer. I
think it's a combination of factors that make for
circumstances that makes an individual want to react in such a
way, the denial of one's own identity, and so on. The
educational forum is extremely important.

Again, I cannot impress upon you more than inviting
the Arab community and informing yourselves and getting them
in these forums because exclusion is one of the worst
mechanisms that we have come across in terms of dealing with
situations of this sort. We know for sure that no single,
discriminated-against community is going to win that struggle
by itself. Gay, Jew, Chicano, or Arab.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Commissioner Jaber.

COMMISSIONER JABER: Mr. Doumani, are there any
schoolbooks or publications for schools that can be passed
around or that schools can get their hands on?

MR. DOUMANI: I will just answer briefly. I know
there are others waiting. The problem of the educational
system here is not the schools and one textbook, it is the
general approach to the image of the Arab, and the way it
portrays the Arab personality, the way it portrays the Arab
history, the quantity of material that is presented relative
to portrayal of other groups who are of equal size. The
difficulty to put books in libraries, for example. It is
extremely difficult to put in a book if it doesn't meet their
approval of conventional wisdom, so to speak, about what is
true and what is not true about a political situation or a
cultural situation, or whatever. And so, it is a whole
cultural struggle, essentially, that we have to go through
like other groups in order to change these images and change
the effects that maintain this discrimination and prejudice.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much, Mr. Doumani.
The next speaker is Lindsey Jang, from Break the Silence.

MR. JANG: Good evening. I do have some prepared
remarks here tonight. My name is Lindsey Jang, (spelled L-I-N-
D-S-E-Y  J-A-N-G). As I said, I do have some prepared remarks
which I think you all have copies of, but I think I would be
negligent tonight if I did not speak somewhat extemporaneously
about the significance of the Hearings today -- and that is
that today is the anniversary of the Stockton massacre in
Cleveland Elementary School.

One of the things, I want to thank the Commission
and the Coalition for doing tonight is not having hearings
about assault rifles. Let me explain.

This morning as I got ready to go to work, I
listened to the radio. What I heard over and over is the
cycle of the news coming over and over again is about
Stockton. This is an important story today, and what they
focused on a lot was assault rifles and the murder of
children. But I noticed that they seemed to completely ignore
the tragedy in the Asian community, and that got me very
angry.

I realized two things from that. One, that there is
an incredible amount of denial both in the government and the
media about this problem. I know we're small, both in
numbers, and sometimes we're considered quiet as a minority
group, but it has a great effect on a significant community.

The second thing I realized is that the anger that I
had about the lack of coverage in the news was the same amount
of work that both I and my colleagues need to do to address
this problem because the 80s have created an incredible legacy
of violence against Asians. I would like to read just a part
of that national legacy: the Vincent Chinn murder, the tax on
Vietnamese fisherman on the gulf coast of Texas and in
Monterey Bay, California; Firebombings of Cambodian refugees
in Boston; firebombings of Cambodian refugees in Oakland; the
intercommunity conflicts between Korean businesses and black
communities in Washington D.C. and in New York City; the
racist killing of Fong Win in Davis, California by a self-
possessed white extremist youth; and finally, the killing of
Jim Louie in Raleigh, North Carolina.

All of these examples stand as testament to the rise
of Anti-Asian violence. In the San Francisco Bay Area, the
harassment and violence once hidden from view are now emerging
as the community expands both in numbers and in influence.
The Asians have increasingly become the targets of racist
attacks and verbal abuse. Here are some examples:
In 1987, an 18-year-old Chinese-American student was the victim of racist graffiti and death threats written on his home, his school, and throughout the Lafayette business district as the result of a fight which occurred on a high school campus.

In 1988, racist graffiti proclaiming, "Japs and Chinks Only" was found on the door of the Ethnic Studies Department at U.C. Berkeley.

This year, Asian storeowners in Castro Valley were attacked by a group of white high school students for no reason except racial intolerance.

In 1989 in San Francisco, racist graffiti that read "Asians Die" was painted over the Broadway tunnel. Everyday for a week thousands of motorists were confronted with this racial assault.

Also, last year a white racist hotline targeted Asians as the blame for housing and neighborhood problems in San Francisco.

The Break the Silence Coalition has been working over the last several years to educate the community on the rise of hate violence, and to advocate for increased governmental responsibility for hate crimes enforcement and monitoring. We believe that the main work of Break the Silence must be providing more extensive assistance to victims of hate violence, creating joint work with different communities, and fostering comprehensive prevention models.

We would like to underscore the importance of these Hearings in bringing the various components of law
enforcement, government, the schools and the community
together to create a coordinated approach. It is, after all,
the main responsibility of government at all levels to address
hate violence, and it is essential that government take
responsibility for addressing the institutionalized mechanisms
that both create violence and deter justice. Yet there has
been a continual reticence on the part of government
authorities to fully acknowledge the presence of racial
motivation in incidents of anti-Asian violence. One need only
review the response in Stockton in the aftermath of the
Cleveland School massacre.

While many in the Stockton Asian community and the
Asian community around the country were greatly alarmed at the
possibilities of racial motivation in the shootings, Stockton
officials did their best to dispel the notion that racism
could have played any role in the shootings. Within three
days of the shootings, the Mayor's office, the Police and
Sheriff's Departments, the school district and the media all
concluded that there was no evidence of racial motivation on
Purdy's part. Only the State Attorney General's office
followed up with an investigation. At the prodding of many
organizations from the Asian community, the Attorney General
eventually completed a report, nine months after the
shootings. The report concluded that Purdy's attack was
driven by racial motivations, but in spite of this report,
little in Stockton has changed.

Government responsibility must extend far beyond
what has been implemented. Any crime reporting system, such
as those established in 11 states, and our currently pending national reporting system posed in Senate Bill 419, do provide a statistical base of information, as well as prescribing specific hate crimes responsibilities for law enforcement agencies. However, such systems in themselves are not adequate to stem the rise in hate violence.

The key to mounting successful responses to anti-Asian violence, specifically to hate violence in general, lies with communities combining efforts with government. What is needed is the creation of mechanisms to insure continuing governmental responsibility. To this end, certain factors are essential.

Community organizations must work directly with law enforcement agencies and authorities. This will both empower community organizations and build more appropriate and effective responses to hate violence. Asians must continue to work with other at risk communities, including blacks, Latinos, gays and lesbians, Jews and others, to alleviate intergroup tensions and to build a stronger movement against hate related activities. A comprehensive prevention model must be supported; a model that involves all institutions which deal with hate violence in its many forms.

With these factors in mind, Break the Silence recommends the following activities for a coordinated plan against hate violence in San Francisco: 1) specific programs for the regional documentation and monitoring of hate violence; 2) the immediate development of a comprehensive public awareness program on hate violence; 3) since community
organizations are key components of any effective plan, mere
governmental recognition is not enough. An effective plan
must include community organizations' active involvement in
development and implementation, and even funding support in
these organizations; and 4) we'd like to propose the creation
of a special intergroup sponsor and promote events which
celebrate human diversity. This effort can help to eliminate
old antipathies while building new affinities between us.
This may be the most powerful weapon of all. Any questions?

MR. WONG: A number of speakers today have talked
about intercommunity tensions, and you've mentioned some of
those in your remarks too. Are there things that can be done
by this program, or in general the community, to try to at
least address the problem?

MR. JANG: That's a good point, because part of the
essential work of this is to have the different communities
work together. I think we all realize that we can't lick the
problem singularly as single communities. But also, if we
could examine some of the problems that foster the intergroup
tension -- well, for instance we'd like to propose that the
HRC work with some of the community groups to sponsor studies
of... For example, someone in the Asian community would be
interested in looking at Asian businesses in traditionally
black communities. There have been a lot of tensions which I
think are pretty well-known actually, about that. Also, there
might be an investigation into some of the situations that
arise for Asian immigrants in public housing, stuff like that.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much, Mr. Jang. The
next speaker is Claude Stern from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

MR. STERN: Distinguished Commissioners, members of the Coalition and members of the panel, my name is Claude Stern (spelled S-T-E-R-N). I am an attorney in private practice and I'm Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Defamation League's Regional Board.

The Anti-Defamation League is proud to participate in this forum tonight, which examines the nature and extent of hate violence in our community. The ADL, as many of you may know, is one of the oldest civil rights organizations in the United States and in the world, established some 77 years ago.

Since 1979, the ADL has conducted national and state by state audits of anti-Semitic events or incidents that have taken place. The results for 1989 were released today. Those results indicate that anti-Semitic incidents have increased in 1989 from 1988 by approximately 12% nationwide and 92% in the State of California. Incidents of vandalism nationally has increased from 823 to 858, and again, these are reported incidents. Incidents of harassments, threats and assaults have increased from 458 nationally to 594 nationally.

The first question that we've received from the panel is how does the ADL define hate violence, and for the purpose of the audit that was conducted and copies of which will be distributed to members of the panel and Commission, the ADL investigates two areas of violence and of crimes. The first areas is the area of vandalism.

The vandalism is defined as including acts of arson,
attempted arsons, bombings, attempted bombings, or desecration of cemeteries or other religious institutions or facilities. A number of vandalisms that took place in the State of California in 1989 against Jews was 75, that is, reported.

The second area that's investigated and audited by the ADL are collectively called harassments, threats and assaults, and they include any sort of personal attacks against individuals, including murders. There was a national increase of 28% in 1989 over 1988 of harassments, threats and assaults, and in the State of California, an increase from 1988 of 68%, from 49 to 82.

The nature of the violence that takes place against Jews and Jewish institutions are reflecting the sort of violence and hate crimes that take place in the Bay Area. In the San Francisco Bay Area, incidents included the firebombing and attempted bombings of four temples, the vandalizing and destruction of property and scrawling of swastikas and anti-Jewish epithets in several school classrooms. Northern California recorded 22 incidents of ant-Semitic vandalism up from 1988 to 17, and 26 incidents of anti-Semitic Jewish harassment, up from 8 in 1988.

As a brief reminder, I am sure everyone here has probably recalled from the newspapers of 1989, on May 8, 1989, a fire bomb was thrown at Beth Shalom Synagogue here in the City. Windows were broken at Adopt Israel Synagogue. Across the Bay, the Holocaust Memorial Center at Lincoln Park was desecrated by human feces.

In November, cars parked in the vicinity of Golden
Gate were leafleted with stickers bearing swastikas and slogans that read inflationist Jewish, death to race mixers. We will distribute to the panel and Commission the sorts of pamphlets and literature that are distributed throughout Northern California and in the City and the Bay Area.

The sort of literature which contain swastikas and other offensive remarks includes slogans such as "America owned and operated by Jews and Wops. A challenge to white people." "Jewish smugglers for hire." "Attention all filthy Jew pigs of San Francisco," distributed by the Six Million Not Enough Club, distributed in Pacific Heights.

I think Joan Weiss has done a tremendous job of elaborating the effect of this sort of hate violence on various communities, all minorities, and I am not going to go into detail now.

The Jewish community in particular finds these anti-Semitic incidents against it, particularly because these incidents are increasing, to be particularly horrifying, and to provoke painful memories of the Holocaust, in which suffered the slaughter of six million Jews.

What is the ADL doing in response to these sorts of activities, and what have they done?

The ADL has adopted a multi-point charter and program to try to combat anti-Semitism and bigotry in this country generally. We promote security conferences among synagogues, Jewish organizations and other Jewish facilities, along with law enforcement officials, to allow these organizations to better protect themselves and prevent anti-
Semitic attacks. We work on the campus and have worked on the
campus diligently to try to educate students and educators
about the effect of this sort of anti-Semitic growth in the
country today.

We have assisted in developing bias or hate crime
legislation, both locally and nationally. We have developed
and spearheaded the development an educational effort called
the World of Difference Program, which has been distributed in
23 cities and is going to be distributed in seven more cities
this year.

You have asked what the City can do to assist the
ADL's efforts, and I think I cannot elaborate or really add
anything to anything that's been said by my predecessors
tonight. The foremost assistance you can provide is by
promoting education among students, among teachers in the
community. You can assist the ADL in monitoring extremist
groups and hate groups, by promoting its cause. You can
assist law enforcement agencies by assisting and promoting
their efforts to arrest and convict the perpetrators of these
sorts of incidents, and you can keep the community aware of
the development of anti-Semitism in this country.

Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions?
Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER GRAFF: I think the work that the ADL
is doing is of course very important in dealing with the
entire problem of hate motivated violence. I did have a
question which relates a little bit to some of the comments
we've heard from a number of speakers tonight which seems to indicate that probably the main solution to working toward addressing this problem is the joining-together of all the groups that are affected.

It's my understanding that the World of Difference Program specifically excluded dealing with the issue of homophobia, and I am wondering if there's some reason why there seems to be an ordering or prioritizing of the types of prejudice motivated violence within this World of Difference Program, or is this a policy within the ADL specifically?

MR. STERN: With all due respect, the World of Difference Program does not expressly exclude any sort of education on homophobia. The ADL's Charter has been, since its initiation and through its developments, education in the area of ethnic or religious discrimination, and that has been its main focus. The educational programs it has developed throughout its history and today in the World of Difference program focus on the religious or ethnic discrimination that takes place in our society today, and in the United States in particular.

We are trading coalitions with various groups, including gay rights groups, to promote education in the community. But the World of Difference Program was specifically devised to assist and promote the ADL's Charter with respect to ethnic and religious discrimination.

MR. SANTIS: I have a question. What is the percentage, or better yet, are hate groups increasing in size, nationally as well as locally? Also, could you just brief us
particularly students in the secondary schools. The literature that they distribute - we will be distributing this as well to the panel members and the Commission - include pamphlets in which it challenges these students, these young people, to join the White Aryan Resistance to promote white aryanism, or extreme violence against minority groups.

Their tactics are relatively primitive but consistent, and there seems to be a development in the proliferation of materials to secondary schools around the country through WAR and through other skinhead-related organizations.

MR. SANTIS: What is the attraction to some of these things?

MR. STERN: Well, the selling point for the White Aryan Resistance, particularly with respect to Jews, is that Jews have your jobs, the Jews are controlling the country, the Jews control the media, the Jews will usurp all opportunity from you. Incidentally, it isn't directed exclusively toward Jews, it's also directed toward blacks, Italians and persons of Arab descent.

The general attraction is resentment, envy, that these people have something that you don't have, and that if you get rid of these people, you will get what they have.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much, Mr. Stern. Are there any other questions? Thank you.

Our next speaker is Bill Hing from the Coalition on Immigrant Rights and Refugee Services.

MR. HING: Good evening. I don't think you need me
to go over the litany of offensive anti-immigrant violence incidents that you have heard tonight and will continue to hear. That information is quite easily collectible, and I urge you to do that. What I would like to do instead is to give you a little bit of background on how much of this, in my opinion, came about.

The history of primarily Latino and Asian immigrants to this area and to this country deals with a complicated set of attentive and inattentive factors that the mainstream has paid to these groups. Of course, one could say that Asians have received a historical amount of attention, if you point at the infamous exclusion laws that affected various groups at various times. And you could say that Latino groups have received a great deal of attention over the last 20 years in terms of immigration enforcement, and I think that that would be true.

I think it would be somewhat surprising to you to learn that in fact there has been a lot of inattention at the same time, and what's happened is that as a course of inattention, for example, when the 1965 amendment to the immigration laws that pretty much make up what we have today in terms of policy were enacted. In fact, it was intended to continue to exclude Asians and instead Asians were able to take advantage of the immigration laws that were put in place. While the mainstream turned away, Asians entered in large numbers to the tune of today -- Asians comprise about 48% of all legal immigration to the United States.

In the same token, there has been a great deal of
inattention to Mexican and other Latino immigration and
refugee movement to the United States. There were times when
the policies toward Latin Americans was one pretty much of
open borders, and when attentions started being laid on these
groups and their words, the borders began to be closed to
them. So, you see over a period of 20 years, between 1952 and
the early 1970's, 1975, a virtual decrease in immigration
quotas for Latin American countries of about 300%, so that you
started with a period of open borders, and after 1975 a
country such as Mexico was reduced to an immigration quota of
20,000.

So, what has happened is that during periods of
inattention, the social forces of these communities have been
unleashed, and yet popular images and stereotypes of these
communities continue and have evolved. For example,
stereotypes that Asians do well in school, or that they are
politically apathetic. The popular stereotypes that all
immigrants and, in particular, Mexican immigrants are a drain
on the economy; and that Central American refugees are not
bonafide refugees; and that Southeast Asian refugees somehow,
as a matter of volition, choose to remain on public
assistance.

While the Immigration Service has continued to try
to keep Asians and Latinos out, in spite of the fact that
there are laws that on their face are fair, these social
forces of the community have been unleashed through the
unanticipated influx of immigrants and refugees from these
countries. And the absence of any attempt on the part of the
federal government to dispel any of the myths of new immigrant
groups to the United States, the institutionalized attitude of
exclusion that the Immigration Service holds has been
transferred to the mainstream, which has led to the violence
that we're all here about tonight, and which brings me to
proposals that the Coalition would make, and the Immigrant
Legal Resource Center, which I also represent, would make.

Those are that you be cognizant of the fact that
when it comes to, for lack of a better word, Americanization,
that process, we often lose sight of the fact that there is at
least a two-part deal to this. Usually, the terms are
addressed in the sense of what the responsibility of the new
immigrant or the new refugee is. What we all too often lose
sight of is that there is a responsibility on the part of the
mainstream as well.

The mainstream must be challenged to provide for the
new immigrants and refugees educational programs; not the type
that you might be thinking of, but the type that I am thinking
of, Know Your Rights Programs for new immigrants and refugees.
What their rights are in terms of social services, what their
civil rights are, what public services are available, what
their legal rights are.

This body should also heed closely a recommendation
that materials begin to be collected on intergroup
relationships and ethnic group relationships with the
mainstream, and what has already been done, if anything. And
there have been some, of course, to address inter-ethnic group
racial conflicts.
Another recommendation would be to begin to compare
descriptive materials on the various immigrant and refugee
groups and make them available to the general public in
widespread fashion and in comprehensible fashion.

Finally, and certainly not the least, and I am sure
there are other good recommendations that others will have,
that these types of materials be used to modify curriculum
that is available in the public schools, because that's where
this unfortunately all begins, and that's where we must begin
to address it.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions
from the panel? Commissioner Sammon.

COMMISSIONER SAMMON: Mr. Hing, we have two groups
of immigrants that are in our midsts: refugees, one like the
Southeast Asians, the Vietnamese, that come in, and then a
large group of people who are undocumented. Do you think for
the people in our society who are not too informed and are
most likely be subject to prejudice, that for them it makes
any difference whether the people who come have come here
legally or are undocumented? Does that have any effect on it?

MR. HING: I don't think it has any effect at all.
And I think that that's a big root of the problem, is that the
mainstream is not aware of what these groups are, what they
represent, what they are like, what their lives are like, what
they have gone through to get here, what they do; the fact
that they don't receive public assistance, the fact that they
work hard, the fact that they are as American as most of us
would want them to be, and more. It's a gross
oversimplification generally on the part of the mainstream, if
you delve into what their attitudes are with respect to these
groups. I firmly believe that it doesn't make a damn bit of
difference whether or not the new immigrant is perceived as
being legal or undocumented.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Mr. Santis was next, I believe.

MR. SANTIS: One thing which you didn't mention,
which I think is a serious concern for immigrants and anybody
whose first language is not English, and that is the national
movement to make English the official language in this
country. It has passed in a number of states. I lived in
Arizona for two years, and it passed by referendum there,
despite a broad coalition of the Jewish community, the Latino
community, the Black community, and so forth, it still passed.
I believe California has that law, and my concern is how do
you view the English-Only Initiative around the country?

MR. HING: You don't have to go very far to realize
that the English-Only Movement is an anti-immigrant movement.
In fact, the leaders and the developers of the English-Only
Movement, John Tandem and his lot, who spearheaded English-
Only are also the same people who are members of the Board of
Directors of the Federation of Americans for Immigration
Reform, or FAIR, which is the most anti-immigrant group in the
United States.

At a time when, indeed, immigrants and refugees
would like to learn English and would like to sign up for
English classes, instead of funnelling money into some hard-to-
grasp legal concept of trying to force people to learn English
legally somehow, that money ought to be spent on providing
English training programs which, in fact, people would love to
take, and that there are still long waiting lists for them.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Mr. Romero?

MR. ROMERO: Yes. With respect to this whole
stereotype in attitudes that flow from immigrants,
particularly from immigrants from Latino and Asian
communities, what is your view with respect to how that same
stereotype cuts across the entire Asian community and not just
to the immigrant factors?

MR. HING: About 65% of all Asians in the United
States are actually foreign born. But only 15% or 17%,
depending on what statistics you use, of the Latino population
in the United States is foreign born. Yet, I'll bet that if
you ask most people what they think the percentages are, they
would uniformly think that, my goodness, most of the Mexicans
in the United States must be foreign born.

I can't even order a sandwich without having to
speak Spanish or trying to figure out what this Asian person
is speaking. And it's sad because people grossly misapprehend
the actual makeup of ethnic groups in the United States. I am
not about to try to defend the percentage of Asians that are
foreign born in the United States. I don't have to defend
that percentage, in light of the 100 years of sorted and
infamous exclusion laws that were directed against them. Give
me 20 years and they won't be mostly foreign born, is my
answer.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Professor Hing, the last speaker,
Mr. Stern, addressed us to what he believes is an appealing factor of hate groups, and it seems to me it has application for the phenomenon of prejudice against immigrants, and for that matter, non-immigrant individuals who are assumed to be immigrant because of race. And that is the facet of resentment and envy. The idea in the case that the immigrant is taking some entitlement is seizing some "birthright" of the citizen. What would you suggest we could do to address that factor of resentment in our program?

Mr. Hing: Well, again, I may be thinking too narrowly in academic fashion, but I do think that it is a matter of getting public information out, either in the form of newsletters, reports, television media campaigns or whatever, to demonstrate the facts, and the facts are that new immigrants, documented or undocumented to a metropolitan area - and studies have been done in San Diego and parts of Texas and Los Angeles - every one of those studies have demonstrated that the influx of new immigrants, rich or poor, documented or undocumented, has actually bolstered those economies and have helped those economies. That is one notion.

Another notion is with respect to the fact that there is this notion do very well academically, when in fact, in a Chinese community it is the most bifurcated community economically in the United States. It has the poorest group of people, and it has many professionals. It is exactly what Bluestone and Harrison, it epitomizes that theory of a bifurcated economy. It has the most service workers proportionately than any other community, and people don't
realize that.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you.

MR. HING: Thanks for your attention.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you, Dr. Hing. At this point, I just wanted to remind the remaining speakers that we are running a bit late. I want to make sure that everyone from the public, as well as our scheduled speakers have a chance to have their full time, especially if you have written testimony that you will be giving to the panel, if we can ask you to please try to wrap-up your comments after you hear the bell. Also to my fellow panelists, I would like to remind you that we can submit written questions to our scheduled speakers. So if your questions are ones that you feel are really burning, as we referred to it before, please don't hesitate to ask. But we are, by my calculations, running very close at this point, in terms of being able to get everyone's testimony in on our schedule tonight.

Do we have a speaker here from MALDEF? Okay, thank you.

(OFF RECORD - END OF TAPE)
MS. RODRIQUES: Good evening, my name is Anna
Rodrigues, and I am here representing the Mexican American
Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

As most of you know, MALDEF is a national non-profit
organization dedicated to the struggle for full, equal and
democratic rights for all Latinos living in the United States.
As such, our focus here will be on the impact that hate
violence and harassment is having upon the Latino community.

Our testimony will focus on three basic areas. First we will talk about the nature of the hate being
exhibited towards the Latino community. Secondly, we will
briefly examine the underlying causes of this hatred, and
finally we will offer some possible suggestions toward their
resolution.

First and foremost, MALDEF would point out that the
lack of a national and local reporting system along with a
lack of community awareness, that incidents of racial violence
or harassment can and should be reported has resulted in a
lack of data regarding the scope of the problem as it effects
the Latino community. Without question, there is a need for a
central place where complaints can be made, along with a
vigorous community education campaign aimed at informing
victims of hatred of their right.

Nevertheless, despite these two major barriers, MALDEF has received information regarding acts of hatred
towards Latinos. We would like to highlight two of these
examples of harassment and stereotyping. This involves stereotyping of Latinos as criminals or drug dealers or illegal aliens.

The first one involves our newly resigned United States Attorney for this district, Joe Russonello, who held a press conference this morning to announce his resignation. At this conference, Mr. Russonello stated that the Bay Area was a logical place for drug dealers because there is a strong Hispanic community in place that could provide protection and insulation from law enforcement uncovering the enterprise. These comments were caught on videotape by Channel 4.

We find his comments shocking and hateful, particularly coming from a high level federal official who has been charged with upholding the Constitution of the United States. They are also a painful and grave and racist insult to the Hispanic community in the Bay Area and to Latinos everywhere. The Bay Area Latino community is outraged at this unwarranted attack. I would like to at this point announce that MALDEF and other community organizations will be holding a Press Conference tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. It will be at MALDEF. There is a press release in the back that you can pick up, and I also have some copies.

The second incident involves a Latino family whose car was smashed in a hit and run accident by a white male, and another car who was mad at the Latino family simply because they parked in a space that he thought was his. In the process, the white male driver subjected the family, including two children, to obscene and derogatory verbal abuse,
attitudes and stereotypes and form the public opinion necessary to compel the fundamental changes that make equality a reality and not just a dream.

MALDEF is committed towards working with the Commission and others toward ending hate violence and abuse in San Francisco. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you very much, Ms. Rodrigues. Next, we have Mark Schickman from the Jewish Community Relations Council.

MR. SCHICKMAN: Commissioners, members of the Coalition, I will certainly keep within my time. My name is Mark Schickman (spelled S-C-H-I-C-K-M-A-N). I am an officer of the San Francisco Jewish Community Relations Council which represents over 60 Jewish organizations and synagogues in San Francisco and the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties, and has represented the Jewish community here for over 50 years.

The JCRC has been working at the forefront of intergroup relations in San Francisco, seeking to make more strong the common ground among the various communities in San Francisco, and trying to find ways to reduce and ultimately eradicate the real source of hate crimes - bigotry and prejudice.

I won't go into any of the details of the instances of this kind of hate crime perpetrated on the Jewish community, you have heard the statistics earlier. It is important to know only because the history of the Jewish community as being the victims of hate crimes for as long as it has been reported in history, has led to a firm conviction
including calling the family 'stupid wetbacks,' and 'you should go back to where you came from.'

We have more examples that clearly demonstrate that anti-Latino sentiment is reflected in the streets of our city, in the business establishments, in schools and in the workplace. However, due to time constraints, I am not going to tell you them, and you can look at our written testimony to look at those. But the impact on the Latino community is pervasive and all-sided, and means that a person of Latino appearance and persons with a Spanish accent are subject to acts of violence and harassment in virtually every sphere of life.

I am now going to touch on the causes of the hate violence and harassment against the Latino community. Present day anti-Latino sentiments have their roots in the legacy of racism that all people of color have had to endure in the United States. With respect to Latinos, this legacy began with the annexation and conquest of the Mexican people living in what used to Northern Mexico, and continues today as a result of the unequal economic and political relationship the United States has with the countries of origin of the many Latino immigrants fleeing from war, poverty and political repression.

Stereotypes based on racial and national chauvinism run rampant, including the notion that 'spics' are all dirty, stupid and lazy, i.e., always taking a siesta, refuse to learn English, are criminals, etc.

As the U.S. economy has developed and has required
cheap labor for agriculture, railroads and mining industry,
Latino labor is utilized to fill the need, locking out Latinos
from becoming equal participants in all other spheres of U.S.
life, including economic development, land ownership, elected
offices and education.

Today, the debate around immigration has focused on
the myths that immigrants are taking away our jobs and we are
losing control of our borders. The results are racist and
repressive laws, such as the Immigration Reform and Control
Act of 1986, with its enhanced budget for the Department of
Immigration and Naturalization Service, the INS, and employer
sanctions has once again subjected the Latino community to
highly visible INS raids, which portray Latinos as illegal,
responsible for all of the country's ills, including drugs,
unemployment, AIDS, and crime.

At the same time, the resurgence of the English-Only
Movement and groups such as the Federation for American
Immigration Reform (FAIR), continues to portray Latinos and
Asians as un-American, unpatriotic and a threat to their
narrow perception of the American way of life.

The media's role in the portrayal of Latinos cannot
be ignored or undermined. The negative and stereotype
portrayal of Latinos as drug dealers and pushers - 'Miami
Vice' - or as vicious gang members, i.e., 'Colors,'
perpetuates and contributes to the anti-Latino sentiment being
exhibited against the Latino community today.

As demonstrated above, the causes for anti-Latino
hatred is complex, and can be only be understood by examining
the historical development of the Latino community in the United States. Unfortunately, the legacy of the development is one that has been afflicted by racial and nationality discrimination, and which has denied Latinos equal access and democratic rights to participate as equals in all spheres of United States life. The result has been the relegation of the Latino community to a status which forms the basis for ongoing stereotypes and attitudes which contribute to the anti-Latino sentiment.

Now, our suggestions for addressing anti-Latino violence and harassment. I will try and make it short as possible. In our view, anti-Latino sentiments will never be completely resolved until the underlying causes are removed. This means, of course, key changes in U.S. Immigration and foreign policy, which means a posture of viewing immigrants as a drain to one which views them as essential and productive members of our society that contribute to its economic, political and cultural well-being. It also means recognizing that punitive measures, such as employer sanctions and raids will not stem migration. Only a foreign policy which addresses the root causes of migration will stem the flow of migration to this country. Only a foreign policy which views of the country of origin as equal parties will set the basis for viewing immigrants in the United States from those countries as equals, worthy of the same dignity and respect as those from Western Europe. However, we cannot and must not wait until our political leaders develop the resolve necessary to make the fundamental changes that will qualitatively alter
the attitudes regarding Latinos. There are steps which the community of San Francisco can take now.

We believe that there must be a two-prong approach, consisting of enforcement and education strategy. On the enforcement level, we must act to assure that every act of hate violence is punished to the maximum extent of the law. This will send a message that while a person may harbor hate sentiments, there are consequences to be paid for acting on those sentiments. In order to more effectively accomplish this goal, we believe that adequate resources have to be allocated or reallocated to enforcement.

Key components of such an enforcement scheme must include a centralized location where such incidents can be reported, investigated and prosecuted as quickly as possible. If the current state law is inadequate to address certain forms of hatred acts, then we must enact ordinances that supplement the state's coverage and expands liability.

On the educational level, there must be a partnership venture that must be launched between government, community and private sector. A massive educational campaign must be carried out in our schools, churches, workplace and neighborhoods which stress the need to acknowledge and respect the contributions that every group has made and continues to make to our society. Cultural education, which examines the historical enhancement of the different groups in our society must be mandatory in our schools, and must also occur in the workplaces and churches. It is only through a multi-faceted approach that we can hope to erode away at the decades of
on the part of the San Francisco Jewish Community that it
wants to work with this Commission to see that issues and
cconcerns and democratic earlism are allowed to flourish, and
the only way that can happen is if hate crime is abolished.

Towards that goal, there are eight points that we
would suggest, that we would like to work with you on, in
terms of developing a hate reduction plan.

No. 1: A comprehensive effort should be undertaken
to sensitize all elements of the San Francisco community of
what it means to be a victim of hate crime, including
religious leaders, political leaders, educators, the police,
business leaders, a broad representative, so that knowledge of
this issue go to every corner of the City.

Secondly: Existing efforts towards the building of
intergroup relations should be enhanced and intensified.
Specifically, we think that we should have strong and
unequivocal support for the Intergroup Clearinghouse, a group
that specifically can help to solve this problem.

Third: We recommend closer cooperation between the
San Francisco Police Department and neighboring cities, in
order to address hate criminals who operate at different
levels within the Bay Area, so that their impact can be known.

Fourth: We think that there should be an enhanced
unit on the dynamics and special problems of hate crime, which
should be included in the San Francisco Police Department's
Police Academy, and given in inservice training courses within
the SFPD. It is important that officers understand the nature
of hate crime so they don't minimize its significance to the
victim, to the community, or to society at-large.

Fifth: We strongly urge the adoption by the San Francisco Unified School District of a comprehensive educational program whose goal is to combat the prejudice which is often learned at home or in the streets. Of course, such a program should be in the social studies area, but it should not stop there. It should also be incorporated in history and in English and in reading, and it should begin at the primary school level, because if you start it in secondary school, it is already too late.

Sixth: We think that there should be special outreach to the media, aimed at sensitizing media professionals to the problems and the ramifications of reporting hate crimes. Because either under-reporting or exaggerating reporting can have its problems. For example, over-reporting can lead to copy-cat crimes, committed when individuals get the inspiration to desecrate a synagogue with a swastika or burn a cross in front of the home of an African American family, and that inspiration comes from the news. On the other hand, under-reporting can lead to a false sense of complacency in the face of growing intolerance. So the media needs to find the proper balance.

Seventh: We need to have three kinds of guidelines -- a guideline for community organizations and institutions to allow them to deal with media relations when a hate crime is committed. It should answer practical questions, such as who speaks for the community, what do we say, what do we want to accomplish, do we want to publicize it, what is our goal in
reaching out to the media.

Similarly, guidelines should be developed so that public officials are able to present the community's quick, forceful and unequivocal condemnation of hate crimes when they occur. And we also think that we should publicize information to individuals, so that they know what to do if they are victimized by hate crime, in order to enhance the reporting of those crimes.

Finally, as in the case of other kinds of crime, victims of hate crimes feel violated and insecure, and they need to have the availability of counseling to help remedy the real individual harm that hate crimes can cause.

Hate crimes are a problem nationwide, and the extent to which they are a crime in San Francisco was reminded of us by the swastika that was put out in this hall this afternoon. It's as if someone is daring us, Commissioners, telling us that we are not able to cope with the problem. The Jewish community is looking forward to working with you for as much as it takes and anything that it takes to help deal with that problem. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions? And thank you for staying within your time. I think you win the prize for being the first person to do that. Next, we have Dana Cayce from the San Francisco Women Against Rape.

MS. CAYCE: Hi. I am just about pretty overwhelmed, and I think everyone probably is. My name is Dana Cayce (spelled C-A-Y-C-E). My letter from the Commission addressed me on its second page as Mr. Dana Cayce, and I'm not Mr. Dana
Our racist, class, and sexual orientation are just a few of the social systems that divide women, and there are profound divisions. What unites women is that the threat or experience of male violence against us controls our lives everyday. The control is so pervasive, so routine as to be invisible. It is so routine, so much a system of gender relations, that I have to explain repeatedly to intelligent and compassionate agency representatives in San Francisco that verbal abuse on the streets, sexual harassment on the job, incest, battery, rape and murder of women are hate crimes.

They are invisible as hate crimes because they are intimate, private, close to the home and in our homes. They are not about the relations between separate communities, other races and other classes. Hate crimes against women are about relations between just those two groups, males and females.

The women who are victims of daily dreaded and exhausting verbal abuse on the street, and the women who are raped know that it is their femaleness that is being attacked and despised. They know it by the nature of the names they are called, by the curses against them when they are beaten, and they know it because it is their genitals, their female selves that are invaded by a man's fingers, his penis, or a broom handle.

The same man who, over dinner, tells her that she is sexy, she is pretty, she loves him. Later, when she refuses to have sex in the privacy of the bedroom, rapes her, calls
her a bitch who is getting what she deserves. She knows that
she is experiencing the hatred of her femaleness. If she
reports, she will be asked did she consent.

Today’s Chronicle tells us that the San Francisco
Police Department logged 183 reported hate related crimes in
1989. I add to that number the 555 sexual assaults and
attempted sexual assaults as hate related crimes. Using the
FBI estimate that one out of ten rapes are reported to the
police indicates that there were actually 5,500 sexual
assaults in one year in San Francisco.

Author Ann Jones in her book, Women Who Kill, states
that nine out of ten murdered women are killed by men. Three-
quarters of them are murdered by their husbands or lovers.
Time Magazine in 1983 identifies battery as the major cause of
injury to women, more than street rape, mugging or auto
accidents. Some 2,000 to 4,000 women are beaten to death
annually.

Of course, murder victims and murderers are the
extreme. The more common cases are that every 15 seconds a
woman is physically assaulted in her home. Every seven
seconds a woman is raped. Sixty percent of men will batter in
their lifetimes. In the course of their lives, one out of two
women will be battered, one out of three women will be raped,
one out of four girls will be sexually assaulted before she
reaches age 18.

In a successful attempt to capture our attention
about the massacres of the 14 women in Montreal, the
newscaster announced, "Coming up next, the man who hated
women." Just one? As these statistics have shown, this was
just one man acting out in the extreme the violence that
shapes the lives of women every day.

On Monday, Vina Charen, as an example, was dragged
across the lawn at her son's school and gunned down by her
husband. The media characterized this killing as a custody
dispute. Obviously, Mr. Charren did not kill his wife out of
love for his son. This media language subtly contributes to
the myth that crimes like this are about love. It is
inaccurate and dangerous, and it trivializes the lives of
women.

A decent person in our community shrinks from being
labeled a racist, someone who is against the dignity and civil
rights of people of color. A politician in our community who
is labeled a racist fears for her job. A decent person in our
community also shrinks from being labeled a feminist, someone
who stands up for the dignity of civil rights of women. A
politician in our community who is called a feminist also
fears for her job.

After the massacre in the Montreal, I thought long
about the label feminist, and I am not afraid to adopt that
label. In fact, in this climate, I am afraid not to.

My first recommendation is that each of us here,
male and female, think about and educate themselves about what
the principles of feminism really are, instead of the media
hype.

I have two other more specific recommendations. One
addresses the District Attorney's office in San Francisco
making an annual report of how many sexual assaults are reported, and as a result of those reports, how many arrests are made, how many guilty pleas, how many trials, etc.

The second is that any unit that the San Francisco Police Department sets up as a result of this Hearing must include the leadership women, including lesbians and women of color.

I thank all of you for your time, and I also thank all of the staff people and volunteers of the agencies represented here for their time. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you very much, Ms. Cayce. Next, Aga Saeed from the Muslim Community.

MR. SABED: Hi, my name is Aga Saeed (spelled S-A-E-E-D). I am President of Pakistan Democratic Committee, and I also represent United Muslims of America.

Islam in this country, and Muslims, by virtue of their faith, have a slightly different problem than most of the people who have presented the problems they are facing here. The picture of Islam, as most of the people know in this country as pictured in the media, in which Islam almost always is presented through some kind of a conflict.

You would hardly ever see on NBC, CBS, ABC or the New York Times, or the Washington Post any description of Islam that is shown in a normal light, where you see Muslim people carrying out their worship, or their family life, or their lives within their communities, their marriages, their funerals, their normal human concerns are seldom if ever made
a subject of coverage in this country. Therefore, what we have is Islam as a story of conflict. And therefore, the main image of Muslims in this country is that of people involved in violence and conflict.

The second problem, the underlying theme that generates the concept and caricature of Muslims in this country, is Islam is always presented as an outsider. The other, the enemy, the one that is opposed -- an essential enemy of the western civilization and western values where there is no mediation possible, and therefore based on these two main themes, emerges a picture of Islam and Muslims in this country.

May I submit to you, Commissioners, that we have close to six million Muslims who are citizens of this country. And therefore, those Muslims and mostly children bear the brunt of that racism, and pay the price for that.

Just recently, I was visiting a friend of mine and his little daughter, who is six years old, came to the room with a picture that she had just made. I said, "Who is that who looks very pretty?" She said, "No, this is a picture of a very ugly child." I said, "Which child is that?" She said, "That is me."

When I inquired about that, it was at her school that children called her Khadafy, and daughter of Khomeini, and told her how ugly she was, that she had internalized the oppression and the ridicule and the put-down that she was facing on a daily basis at her school.

The second incident that I wanted to bring to your
attention is at a meeting that we had called for all the community leaders in this area -- and we are talking about the problem that we are facing -- one of the persons who is a very successful manager. And since he is a manager he has the mind of a manager, he manages problems, you know, the techniques that he has learned. So he said almost gleefully, "I have told my children to tell the students at school that they are not Muslims, they are Pakistanis."

So that was his way of dealing with the problem that he could not find another solution for. So what we have is today a situation in which no other community could be ridiculed in the San Francisco Chronicle the way Muslims are. The most notable example would be throughout the Middle Eastern conflicts, and a cartoon, if you remember, said, it was a soldier, some young Arab children, and it said, "Arab way of birth control." That is, throw stones, get killed, and that is the Arab way of birth control.

What we have here is, I will submit to you... I feel obliged to go into some of the sources of this hatred, other than the media coverage.

What I would submit to you is the residual racism that is continued in academia in varied forms. I would just like to read you a section of Edward Saye's (PHONETIC) book, "Orientalism". What it says is,

"Sir Alfred Lyle once said to me, 'Accuracy is abhorrent to the Oriental mind. Every Anglo-Indian should always remember that maxim. Ward off accuracy,"
which easily delineates into
untruthfulness, is in fact the main
character trait of Oriental mind.'"

What we had in the colonial period was a generalized
view of the oriental mind now has been made a caricature of
the Muslim in this country and elsewhere. But the Muslim even
in this country is always treated as an outsider, as an other,
as an enemy. And the formula that we have now is that Islam
equals Arabs, and Arabs equal terrorism. Therefore, this is
the formula based on which people relate to Muslims and
especially their children.

The second problem that I will submit to you we have
is that of the structural makeup of the international
information order. I will submit to you during the Iranian
Revolution when Khomeini was about to come to power, everyone
suddenly realized they was going to be a change of government,
and 300 international journalists were sent to Iran to cover
that incident. Would you like to guess how many of those
among the 300 journalists spoke Persian? Only two. So the
result was that 298 of them had to rely on the American
Consulate and other international - the Diplomatic Corps, to
get their information.

So instead of investigating the people that they
were supposed to report on, they were relying on those people
to get their information, and that created the pap journalism.
They had no knowledge of language, of culture, of conditions,
of the problems, of the situation that people have gone
through. These were overnight experts who were parachuted into the country, and that created the image of what had gone on.

The second problem is, according to Nam Chamsky (PHONETIC) in his book, "Manufacturing Consent". There are 25,000 media entities in this country - that means television stations, radio stations, newspapers, journals, magazines. These 25,000 media entities would rely primarily on four international news agencies, including writers, United Press, Agency Press France, for 80% of their news. Only about ten newspapers in this country have international correspondence, like the New York Times, Washington Post, L.A. Times, so on and so forth.

Therefore, only a very small number of people in this country determine what is going to be the image of Islam. And those people who have created this image, I am very afraid to say have not used their journalistic principles with any kind of sense of fairness or objectivity, which I would think is a part of their station and their portfolio.

I will just submit to you two news items, and that will tell you how fair the New York Times and other publications are. The New York Times, by most estimates, defines the outer limits of political discourse in this country. This is New York Times talking about the Middle East on July 17th of last year. Ariel Sharon of Israel have made a call for assassinating Arafat. The headline reads: "Israel asserts tax by PLO in a (INAUDIBLE) bid to revise these plans." It couldn't be a more inappropriate title for a call
for assassination of Arafat. And I will read you what he said actually in this:

"Ariel Sharon of the (INAUDIBLE) Party, having been the most responsible for setting back the government's election initiative said today that his own plan for bringing peace to the region would be to eliminate the heads of terror organizations, first of all Arafat. Yasur Arafat is head of the Palestine Liberation Organization."

Now, the New York Times at this time felt that they must remain objective, they should not introduce any modifiers, they should not choose any adjectives, they should simply report what has happened on ground, and remain neutral. I have no problem with that, if that were to be a consistent policy. However, within three weeks after that incident, when the Israelis arrested a paraplegic person, a person who is paralyzed from the neck down, the New York Times felt obliged to introduce modifiers and to introduce adjectives that would characterize that person in a certain way. The title of that news was, Monday, May 22nd: "Israelis seize militants of the war in Gaza."

And then, Joel Brinkley, who normally is a very good reporter, could not find even a single shred of evidence that he introduced his personal testimony, and that was that he had spoken to this person, Shehamad Diasi (PHONETIC) six months
before, and Shehamad Diasi had told him that yes, he had reflected on these issues.

I could cite you many examples, but for the sake of the brevity, I'll just bring it to a close.

The problem with that is that it created the concept of political and un-political, and also party and un-party systems. We had an Arab person living in Southern California named Alex Udas (PHONETIC), who was killed. At the same time, Mr. Klinghoffer was killed. Mr. Klinghoffer got more than 1700 lines of coverage in the New York Times; Alex Udas got 115 lines of coverage in there. That tabulation was done by Aga Saeed.

More than 50 Arabs have been killed in the Bay Area in the last 12 years. But we have not had a single person that has been apprehended or punished for killing them, and Mr. Alex Udas' killers, according to the FBI, are right now living in Israel, but they have not been pursued with any kind of determination.

The last part is, and I say it with great pain, that we are victims of the victims. The people who have actually, organizationally, consciously, systematically and methodically fanned the flames of hatred against Muslims in this country and especially in this area, include among others, the Israeli Consulate. And the Israeli Consulate, in 1986-'87, sent out this book to the high schools. It is called, "Know the Middle East," by John Leffen (PHONETIC). And when you read this thing, on page 13, it has these subtitles. It says: "Assassination," and under that it says,
"Murder as a political act is a long-established practice in the Middle East and it does not arouse the horror which it causes in the West."

And then it goes on to say on page 31:

"Christians have a built-in disadvantage; they follow a creed which is based on humility and forgiveness, which are poor weapons against the more aggressive aspects of Islam."

Then it goes on to say on page 39:

"Corruption is so commonplace in the Middle East Society that it is a norm. It is therefore difficult and perhaps unfair to make comparisons with Europe and the West generally."

And there are tons and tons of more remarks of that nature, and this was distributed by the Israeli Consulate.

I am even more pained by the fact that the Anti-Defamation League, that has a representative here this evening, in September of last year issued a letter to raise funds. It was issued in New York, it was reported in the New York Times, and in that letter it said, "Arab presence on U.S. campuses poses a threat to Israel." Even ADL promotes anti-Arab hostility in this country. I think we are in serious trouble.

What can we do about that? A lot of things have
been said, and I support most of them, but I would like to
say, naturally I think we should have some action taken from
this side, but I also mean that some action should be taken
from this side.

I would like to offer my services to all the groups
here to organize some kind of a intergroup civic action,
action taken from the civil society, because it will take a
social, psychological transformation, an evolution in
thinking, breaking down of barriers, knowing each other
personally - that will bring the communities closer. And
legislative action and city government action will be
necessary, but not a sufficient condition. I thank you.

COMMISSIONER KAI: Thank you very much, Mr. Saeed.
Are there any questions? Mr. Santis.

MR. SANTIS: I have a statement. It is very painful
that we might be ending on a painful note, but as a member of
the Jewish Community Relations Council I cannot help but feel
that there has been a strong implication made that the
majority of the problems that Muslims are having in this
country is coming from the Jewish community or from the Jewish
state. I feel that this is a very sad note to end this part
of the program on.

It takes two to tango. There are problems, half-
truths. The Sheik Yasin (PHONETIC) is a leader of the Hamash
Organization on the Gaza Strip, an extremist organization
which has called for in leaflet after leaflet the destruction
of the State of Israel, and in that case he is a militant, as
the headline reads.
I am concerned about... I wasn't going to bring this up, but I have to -- the stereotyping of Jews on campuses throughout the region, especially in San Francisco by Muslim groups, by Palestinian groups, the use of Jewish symbols. This is documented, and I think at this point, I will bring the documentation and enter it into the records at some other time.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Mr. Santis, I think that would be proper under ....

MR. SANTIS: The publishing of the protocols of the Elders of Zion, the most notorious anti-Semitic forgery.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Excuse me, Mr. Santis, I think that I would like to end this part, and if you do have the materials, of course we will accept them. We would like to offer that. But I don't think that at this point I want to just accept Mr. Saeed's testimony. I don't believe that he was here in order to make accusations.

I think that there are certain points that of course we will look at very carefully. We'll do that with every piece of testimony... And I think that his final statements in terms of calling for intergroup understanding are well taken, and I think these are the kinds of discussions that we do need to have. But at this point, we can't have it here and now. I do hope that we will take up his offer to continue to participate and to really start forming the bonds that we need to overcome these problems.

MS. SAEED: I'd just like to have the right to respond. One, I did not use the word Jew a single time.
States and people must be differentiated. Everything that is
done by the state of Israel does not reflect the faith of
Judaism. There are political structures, and there are a lot
of political structures among Muslim nations which are
carrying out atrocities, which should not be attributed to
religion.

After all, Hitler was ruling in a Christian country;
we do not see it as an act of Christianity. But I would like
to say again that there was this anti-Muslim hatred which was
perpetrated by ADL, and that is documented. I would also like
to submit it to you.

As to where the New York Times is concerned, calling
Hamash leader a militant, I think here is another example.
And it would be very interesting to see why they did not; you
will see....I'll just read that and then I will end my
statement.

This is from the New York Times, the best of the
best, on Tuesday, May 9, 1989. This is when a Jew was stabbed
by an Arab. At that time, the Prime Minister had gone there
and asked people to lynch them, and I will read exactly what
the New York Times said:

"On Thursday, Prime Minister Yipsag
Shammeed (PHONETIC) visited the wounded
Jew in the hospital and said, "Jewish
citizens must do all they can in self-
defense to prevent murderers from carrying
out plots and from getting away unscathed
if they succeed."
When a Prime Minister of a country calls for doing away with the due process of law and asking people to take the law into their own hands, the New York Times did not feel that they should call him either a militant or an extremist or a fanatic. That is what I call a discrepancy, double standards and (INAUDIBLE). Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you, Mr. Saeed. I want check with the staff at this point. Can we continue on to the Public Testimony, even though it is beyond out allotted time? Okay, very good, we will do that.

I just wanted to take a minute to acknowledge our two American Sign Language interpreters. I understand we had given them some misinformation about our location. I want to thank you for persevering and coming and providing this very important service for us.

Our first testimony is from Alan Seed. Is Dr. Seed still here?

MR. YEE: My name is Leland Yee. Although I am a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, I am here reading a statement from a friend and colleague, Dr. Alan Seed, who is the National President of Asian Pacific American Coalition which is a Pan-Asian, civil rights Asian group. His statement is entitled, "Anti-Asian Bigotry and Violence: A National Perspective." It reads:

Asian-Pacific American Coalition has devoted considerable energy to alert the public regarding the alarming rise of Anti-

Asian bigotry and violence in the decade
of the 1980s. Anti-Asian incidents have both been widespread and numerous. Cases have been documented from San Francisco to New York; from Houston to Detroit.

Each Anti-Asian incident, taken singularly, may be mistakenly dismissed as an isolated event, but each incident analyzed carefully reveals a pattern linked collectively to an alarming wave of Anti-Asian animosity and violence sweeping throughout our state and across our nation. Its manifestations are many and varied. Examples of killings and body assaults include the following:

In 1982 in Detroit, the bludgeoning murder of 27-year-old Vincent Chinn by two unemployed auto workers who mistook him for a Japanese national and blamed him for their job loss;

The 1983 stabbing death of a 17-year-old Hong Hi Wong in Davis California, by a white student who harbored animosity towards Asians;

In 1983, a knife-wielding assault on a
Laotian, taken to be a Japanese, in Iowa;

The 1984 assault on several Japanese youths in Monterey Park by a group of whites, who told these Japanese youths, "Go back to China;"

The 1984 gunshot wounding of a ten year old Cambodian girl in Houston;

The 1984 and 1985 beatings of Vietnamese fishermen in Monterey and Moss Landing;

The 1986 baseball bat killing of a Cambodian leader in Dallas;

The 1987 beating murder of an Asian-Indian man in Jersey City, New Jersey, and terrorization of the Asian-Indian community there by whites;

The 1988 beating of a Chinese American social worker in San Jose, by two white adults, who shouted their hatreds of "gooks" and "commies;"

The 1989 beating of two Chinese American men in Castro Valley by whites.
Attacks on property have been equally prominent in number and ferocity. These include:

1980 KKK vandalism of several Chinese theaters in Alhambra, and the arson of Monterey Park Progress Newspaper, resulting in the complete destruction of the building;

The repeated cross burning in 1984 suffered by a Phillipino family in San Leandro;

The 1983 spray painting of a garage with the word "Jap" at the home of a Japanese American congressman in San Jose;

The repeated vandalization of China Camp, an historical park site in Marin County;

The tire slashing of 31 cars in the San Jose Laotian community on July 4, 1985;

The damage and destruction of 71 Japanese American tombstones in a Fresno cemetery;
The burning and casting adrift of boats belonging to Vietnamese American fisherman at Moss Landing.

An additional manifestation of Anti-Asian feelings was the suspicion of and discrimination against traditional Asian religions. The most overt example was the vicious community protest against construction of the Selai (PHONETIC) Buddhist Temple and Monastery and Hacienda Heights in 1980, it was widely believed that the protest would not have occurred had the facility been a Protestant or Catholic Church.

Other troublesome anti-Asian measures occurred in the following forms:

The return of residential restrictive measures on housing limits, limiting housing development in Monterey Park;

The use of screening of business license application submitted by Asians in Garden Grove;

The attempts to prohibit foreign language business signs in aforementioned cities;
The barriers erected to deny professional licenses of Asian foreign medical, nursing and accounting graduates;

The ceilings established to restrict the entry of qualified Asian high school graduates from enrolling at specific universities and colleges.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Mr. Yee, we're going to have you ask you to try to wrap this up. Thank you.

MR. YEE: The rise of documented verbal and physical harrassment of Asian ancestry students of numerous universities and colleges in America. And lastly, the continual media negative and stereotypical portrayal of Asians and Asian Americans in television and printed media. Our organization, APAC, U.S.A., perceives these manifestations of anti-Asian bigotry as increasing and alarming. We believe that these incidents are as alarming in the San Francisco Bay Area region as it is across our state and nation.

Two weeks ago, APAC, in concert with two dozen civil rights groups, successfully initiated the adoption of a hate crime ordinance in the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. Our organization looks forward with eagerness to proactive measures from Santa Clara County to stem racial, religious, national origin and sexual preference hate crimes in their area.

APAC, U.S.A. similarly pledges our assistance and cooperation to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission in
continuing to fight to establish intergroup harmony in this City. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much, Mr. Yee. I would like to remind members of the public who are testifying that unfortunately we only have two minutes per person. I know that's a very short time. We do encourage you to submit written testimony as well.

The next speaker is Christa Asi of the John Brown Anti-Klan Committee. Is there a speaker from the John Brown Anti-Klan Committee?

Next, Marie DeSantis, from Worldwide Women's Rights.

MS. DeSANTIS: Good evening. I am not going to read all this. My name is Marie DeSantis (spelled D-E-S-A-N-T-I-S). I am representing Worldwide Women's Rights.

Hundreds of prejudices, from the vicious to the blind and ignorant, encourage the increasing gender based violence against women at all levels of all societies. Among the most disheartening and pernicious of these prejudices is the fallacy that domestic violence, rape and women hunting are not political in origin. This misconception unjustly excludes women from the human rights debate itself, and denies women even the most fundamental mechanism for protesting our situation in society.

The planning coalition for tonight's Human Rights Forum consisted of 11 civil rights organizations representing the range of oppressed groups in United States society. Yet, not one of these groups represented the rights of women, despite the fact that even a moment's contemplation indicates
that women are central to any discussion of violence.

Women are half the population, and women raise the children of humanity. Yet, women everywhere are pinned down at the absolute bottom of the economy, no matter how you cut the numbers. In the United States, women are the only adult segment of the population that is not guaranteed equality under the Constitution of the land, and women are the only segment of the population of the United States that is still an unpaid source of daily labor. Most unsettling of all, violence against women is the most prevalent violence in the nation; in fact, rape by itself is the number one violent crime in the United States.

Women are intelligent human beings, we are not in a separate caste, born to serve. How then do you explain that women of every culture of the world live their days by rising early, preparing meals, taking their kids to school, then spending the next eight hours doing the most menial tasks on earth. Waiting tables, cleaning hotels, assembling parts, typing other peoples' letters, while receiving the lowest pay of the economy. And how do you explain that these same intelligent human beings then return in the evenings from their menial jobs of the day, and do it all over again in the home? Scrubbing floors, cleaning the bathroom, serving food, washing dishes and caring for the kids, only this time they do it for no pay at all, day after day, year after year after year.

You here, who are civil rights workers, you understand the dynamics of oppression. You already know that
no intelligent human being in the world would continue to bear such indignities unless there were a pervasive and inescapable political system of violence to enforce it.

It is not only women who suffer the consequences. Those acts certainly are sufficient reason to expose and eliminate that violence forever. But the pervasive violence of men against women is also the mold and the prototype of all other forms of violence throughout society. Children of every race and culture first learn that violence and authoritarianism are sanctioned in the society at large by witnessing the violence and authoritarian relationships between their fathers and mothers. It is impossible to eliminate violence, authoritarianism and subjugation from society without also eliminating them from the family. Women's freedom is central to the discussion and to the realization of all people's freedom. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you, Ms. DeSantis. Is Sheldon Ramsdell here?

MR. RAMSDELL: My name is Sheldon Ramsdell (spelled R-A-M-S-D-E-L-L). I am an AIDS activist from Trinity Episcopal Church, and I am with Mobilization Against AIDS, and also Abduct Treatment Committee.

I was going to speak about recent violence, basically in the Castro, against gays and people with AIDS, but tonight's hearings... I'd like to thank you for your attention and patience. Tonight's hearings shifted my thoughts to the reasons for racism, anti-Semitism and homophobia, and that is, that I grew up in rural Maine, and
all through that period the constant references were to educate us youth to these bigoted ideas. And all the time, the references were always about Jews as kykes; then there were niggers, and there were... I'm sorry, this is not easy just to talk about... and the references to other minorities, and I rejected it. I was called a sissy and put down and threatened because I wouldn't participate in this racism, knowing fully well that I was probably a minority myself as most all of us are anyway, in one form or another.

I went into the Navy, and the homophobia was terrible, but the racism was worse. In the officer's country of the ship, there were Filipino servants and black cooks. I was a photographer; I was not allowed to photograph those two ethnic people types together, for our ship's cruise book. That hit hard.

I was out of the service; I wrote and published a book on Careers in Photography for Young People for Dodd Mead in New York. I was not allowed, after I had gotten my first payments, to publish photographs of people of color in this book. And this book sold in three continents -- United States, Canada and Great Britain, two printings. I am glad to say it is out of print now, and I am ashamed of this book. It should never have been published in the first place, but it took a long time for me to realize the damage that this was doing.

It is true, and now in the media and in the educational community, that young people must be taught, must be trained, must realize what is going on. Check the