textbooks, check the history books, and - this is not coming out the way I intended it to exactly - but my point is, being a privileged WASP, I am being discriminated against as a homosexual; as a person with AIDS.

I have been assaulted several times, I won't go into it now, but I was just the other night sprayed in the face with something from a car. It wasn't acid, thank God, but the point is that we must get into our educational system and teach the youth. We did it in Key West, we did it in Greenwich Village in New York, we stopped them by making them understand that there was really no difference between the races and the religions basically as human beings.

The government now sanctions and pays for the murder in El Salvador of nuns and priests, laypeople and others, which must be stopped, and that is an example of from the top, or how much we can tolerate. We're inured to violence; it seems perfectly normal in this society. It must stopped.

Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you, Mr. Ramsdell. Next, Ms. Ashley from the NAACP. Okay. Robert Williams? Dr. Schwartzman.

DR. SCHWARTZMAN: Good evening. I have waited four and a half hours to talk to you for two minutes.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Could you also spell your name for our court reporter?

DR. SCHWARTZMAN: My last name is Schwartzman, it's S-C-H-W-A-R-T-Z-M-A-N.

I don't have any prepared remarks; I didn't know of
your meeting until this meeting until this morning's Chronicle
came and I read the article. I know the Lieutenant who was
mentioned there, because he recently investigated the theft
and arson of my car about a month ago.

I am reminded of a New Yorker cartoon I saw which
shows a Professor on Commencement Day looking very mournfully
at the graduates, and the caption reads: "I have so much to
say, I don't know where to begin." In two minutes I really
can't do anything of justice here, except to identify myself
as a resource person to you. My phone number is 282-7583.

I profess that I am probably more expert, at the
risk of sounding as if I'm bragging, with the matter of
violence that anybody here today and probably than anybody
that will testify.

In brief, some of you may know my name. I was the
psychiatrist at Napa State Hospital who was fired a few years
ago -- the Chronicle and Examiner covered my story, and
numerous articles - for refusing to submit to government
pressure to discharge violent mental patients. I was in
charge of the Violent Unit at Napa for a year and a half, ran
the violent wards at General for about six years, spent 10
years at San Francisco General handling the emergency room,
where you can imagine in this city I saw most of the violent
people that were brought in.

In brief, I am also raised in the Bronx, have been
here 30 years, the father of two children, and I think,
without mentioning who I'll identify -- I think I am older
than anyone on your panel, with the exception of about four or
five of you.

(LAUGHTER)

This is the first laughter I have heard this evening.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: How would you like that to cut?

DR. SCHWARTMAN: I would like that to cut, and I am speaking primarily as a father of two daughters who I've raised in the San Francisco school system, who live in this city with me. In the 30 years I have been here, I have been appalled, as I am sure many of those like Reverend Williams who has been here almost as long, at the lack of significant change. I have heard one bell, I will go to the second, and the other speakers have, and then I will stop.

In brief, I would like to raise your consciousness. We have had the space age, where we have made space a frontier, and some have made the ocean a frontier. I would suggest that you make the inner space, the world of violence, a frontier, and raise your sights as a Commission. This is a massive national issue.

I had the opportunity of meeting with John Van de Kamp, who settled my case. I received $300,000.00 about three or four months ago. It is the largest settlement of a civil rights case in the history of the United States; nobody has been able to find a larger one. And it is long been buried, because the issues have remained unfocused. Mr. Van de Kamp has focused on AK-47s and dragged them into the Legislature. We have heard an array of witnesses speak about the victims, but I would like to mention a neglected group.
The violent mentally-ill are a serious problem, and briefly, most victims, as when it is heard from most of the people who have testified today, have focused on the victim groups. The perpetrators, who are male, who are young children, as a former child psychiatrist, I would say that the key solution to this problem, and I would urge you to focus on it, is education at the earliest levels in school.

The male child, the WASP male child, is probably the neglected minority that needs to have very complex kind of attention focused on him. I could speak at length; I hope you will call me, and thank you for your time.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Dr. Schwartzman, thank you for your offer of help, and I believe that we will be in contact with you. Finally, Karen Elcaness, the coordinating attorney for Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic.

MS. ELCANESS: Hello, my name is Karen Elcaness (spelled E-L-C-A-N-E-S-S), and I am the coordinating attorney for the Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic. We offer free legal assistance to battered women in San Francisco in getting restraining orders against their abusers. Last year, we helped 600 women to obtain restraining orders. I am grateful to have this opportunity to speak to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission and the Coalition for Civil Rights.

Women must be included in any protection that this body recommends. We are targeted for crimes because of our status as women, for who we are, and for our role in society.

The home is privatized and isolated, but it reflects, or is perhaps the source of, this society's hatred
of women when we step out of our predefined role. Some statistics which bear repeating: Wife abuse names and murders more women annually than do automobile accidents.

In 1987, over 13,000 calls were made to domestic violence crisis lines in San Francisco. During 1986, the San Francisco Police Department reported approximately 8,000 calls for emergency assistance from domestic violence victims. Domestic violence murders were the single largest category of homicides, 23 percent, in San Francisco in 1986. We recently had a brutal reminder of this a few days ago, when a man shot and killed his wife in front of their son, and then took his own life.

Why is this a political problem, a community issue? Why isn't this and other cases like it the result of the perpetrator's individual mental imbalance? Because the man committing acts of violence towards his wife is not deranged, he is average. Violence against wives will occur at least once in two thirds of all marriages. Not all men hurt their wives, and all of those who do are not necessarily monsters. The batterer is responding to his need to control, when things in his life is out of control. He is being a man by using brute force. He is asserting his proprietary rights.

Women are the victims of severely limited role stereotypes based on gender. We are termed weaker and inferior. We are easily identifiable and targetable as a group. We are the victims of violent hate crimes of which domestic violence is sadly but a part, because of our status as women.
This Commission must include women as a protected class under any future legislation or policy it recommends, and I strongly endorse the suggestions and comments so eloquently offered by Esta Soler, Dana Cayce and Marie DeSantis, and hope that this Commission will work with Women's groups of this community to develop its policy. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much. Finally, I would like to thank everyone who is still here, and that includes panelists. I know this has been a very long evening, and we have another one ahead of us, but I think the testimony we have gotten tonight has been extremely valuable.

I would like to extend an apology, too, to everyone, because we had to cut things so short. I know everyone who testified could have given us a lot more information, and it all would have been valuable.

So, thank you all very much. We look forward to getting your written comments, and to getting back in touch with all of you. I hope we will see a lot of you here tomorrow, especially panelists. Thank you and goodnight.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: I would like to make a suggestion. Given the reality of hate violence and the swastika, that when people leave the building, they don't leave as individuals. Make sure you leave in a group of two or more people. That's a good policy suggestion, and I hope you're going to follow it.
(The January 17, 1990 session of the Public Hearing of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission and the Coalition For Civil Rights was adjourned at 10:43 p.m.)
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CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Good evening, and welcome to evening No.2 of "Hate No More", the joint hearing of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission and the Coalition for Civil Rights on hate violence. It is good to see you all here this evening. I am Mary Dunlap; I am one of your Co-Chairs for this evening.

Before we begin with the substance, I wanted to say just a few words about the Coalition for Civil Rights. I had somewhat erroneously taken for granted the idea the idea that people knew what the Coalition for Civil Rights is, and I have been disabused of that notion. So I wanted to say just a little bit about the Coalition, and give you some idea of why the Coalition is in this enterprise with the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, working on hate violence.

The Coalition is an association of organizations, groups, and individuals concerned about the maintenance and the advancement of human and civil rights in the 90's. It began as a response to attacks on Affirmative Action during the infamous Meese Administration in the Department of Justice. It grew stronger in a challenge that it helped to wage, along with other organizations, against the candidacy of Robert Bork for the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Coalition has been on the scene, involved in active and aware about many of the civil rights anti-
discrimination issues that are faced in this community. And if I were to go on and enumerate them all, I would become a witness, which I promised not to do.

If anyone has questions about the Coalition, you would be welcome to approach any of the community members of the panel during the break, and we would be glad to try to answer those. If you wish to communicate with the Coalition, you should communicate with it through the San Francisco Lawyer's Committee for Urban Affairs, which is at 301 Mission Street, 4th Floor, 94105, or contact, as I said, one of the community members.

With that, Karen Kai is going to chair the first half of this evening's proceedings, and I'm going to turn it over to her.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you, Mary. These Hearings are called as a Joint Session. We are doing this under a mandate from the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, that we are very appreciative for. Our mandate calls for us to establish a comprehensive and coordinated plan for the City and County of San Francisco to deal with problems of prejudice related violence.

What we are hoping to do is to look at a very complete plan that will address education, that will address the law enforcement response, health, all sorts of services. We intend this to be a partnership with the community, and that is why we have a Commission and a community group, Coalition for Civil Rights, working together. And the Hearings are beginning, actually it's sort of midway through
the beginning. There has been an awful lot of planning that has gone into this Hearing. There will be a lot more work that this panel and other individuals will be engaging in to synthesize the materials we're gathering here, to develop plans, to get that information out to agencies, to the communities for feedback, and eventually to the Supervisors and the Mayor again, for approval and implementation.

What we are hoping for is to make some real progress, to move along steadily, and to be working together always in a very positive fashion.

At the outset, I want to give some thanks on behalf of all of us who are here today, but first thanks belongs, I think, to members of the public, who have come, who have shown an interest. We're going to be coming back to you and you're going to be holding us responsible, and that is a very big responsibility, and we thank you for that.

We do indeed thank the Mayor and the Supervisors for giving us this task. I'd like to thank my fellow Commissioners, because they have taken this project on very seriously and very much to their hearts, and I think at this point I'd also like to introduce them.

Starting in the front row, to my left is Commissioner Peter Sammon. Next to him, Lucille Lockhart, then Lenore Chinn, May Jaber, Isadore Pivnick, who is also the Vice Chairperson of the Commission, and Frankie Gillette.

On the upper tier, there is Commissioner Adrian Bermudez, who is sitting next to Mary Dunlap, and Leonard Graff, who is sitting to my left.
We also have had tremendous support from our Human Rights Commission staff. We'd like to especially thank Don Hesse, who has been the primary organizer and responsible for more details than anyone should ever have to be responsible for. We've also gotten excellent support from our Executive Director, Peter Jamero, and staffmembers Norm Nickens, Jackie Hale, Alan Tafapolsky and Panetta Scott.

As I mentioned, this has been a joint project, and we have had the pleasure of working with members of the Coalition for Civil Rights, and some of the people, and I hope I'm not leaving anyone out, because this whole group deserves a great deal of credit. The work has been fantastic, and it has been a real joy to be working with these individuals.

First of all, and truly foremost in our hearts, Lester Olmstead Rose from Community United Against Violence; Emily Goldfarb from the Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Michael Wong from Break the Silence; Robin Wu of Chinese for Affirmative Action; Debra Quinn-Carpenter from the NAACP; Ann Noel of the Fair Employment and Housing Commission; Fred Persily from the Contra Costa Human Relations Commission; Jeff Santis of the Jewish Community Relations Council; Natalie Houseman of the Anti-Defamation League; and Rachel Carp of the San Francisco Police Department.

In carrying out these Hearings, we have also had some excellent help. We have had a team of video people who have been really wonderful to us from the Focus Video Collective. They are Chris Fa, Mike Lee, Bileen Lee and Byron Spicer, and we want to thank them very much for their hard
work both nights.

We also have had Sign Language interpreters from St. Benedict's Interpreting Center, and tonight they are Christopher Kleffus, who is interpreting right now, and also Laura Winnick, who will be interpreting later on. You'll see them both, and we thank them for their skill and real commitment and dedication.

Finally, and certainly not least, we have Mary Butler, who is doing our transcription and reporting. And for all of you who are speaking, we are going to ask you to please spell your last name, so that we get it right in our transcripts and our reports. And with that, I will also go into a few other things we are asking of our speakers.

The main thing is time. Like most public agencies, there is always a tendency to want to hear everything for as long as possible, and I think out experience last night was we were getting so much valuable information we did not want to cut anyone off. However, we are on a time schedule. All of you have been scheduled to speak have been given a specific time. We do have a bell person who will ring a bell as a warning for you, and we ask that once that bell is rung, please try to wrap up and keep within your time.

We will have a Public Testimony session at the end of the scheduled testimony tonight. If you would like to testify as a member of the public, we have a sign-up at the back, just outside the door, and your testimony will be given in the order that you sign up. We also ask that when we have your bell rung for the end of your testimony time that you do
please try to wrap up.

One unfortunate thing that I have to announce is that we do not have our featured speaker from the Boston Police Department. I am sure that all of you are aware of the shootings that took place in Boston, which involved accusations basically of a racial nature, which have really set Boston in a very tense racial situation. Our speaker has been asked to remain in Boston to help them deal with that situation, and so he cannot be here tonight. We hope that we will be able to get his input nonetheless, and be able to pass that information on and incorporate it in our final report.

At this point, I think we'll just start into our testimony. As I mentioned last night, we had a lot that we listened to, and we did not quite finish with all of our speakers from the community. So our first speaker will be Vu-Duc Vuong, who is from the Center for Southeast Asian Refugees. I want to thank you very much for agreeing to come back tonight and give us your testimony here.

MR. VUONG: Actually it is a pleasure. And also, I thank the Commission and the Coalition for Civil Rights for the accommodation that you extended me today.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Mr. Vuong, before you start, could I ask you to please spell your name for the court reporter?

MR. VUONG: Yes, my name is Vu-Duc Vuong, and that's spelled V-U-O-N--G. Yesterday, I would testified that it was the first anniversary of the Stockton tragedy. As you recall, on this date last year, five elementary school children, four Cambodian and one Vietnamese, were killed as they lined up to
get back to class after the morning recess. Twenty-nine others of their friends and one teacher were also injured by the same gunman, who killed himself.

I would like to start my testimony tonight with a minute of silence in memory of the five slain children. I will read their names and birthdates one by one. So, with your permission, I will begin now:

(The audience held a minute of silence for the five slain children, whose names are spelled phonetically in this transcript. The witness will provide a subsequent list of names with accurate spelling to the Human Rights Commission.)


Thank you very much. As we mourn children and share the grief of their families, we also make two solemn vows. One is to keep the memory of these five children alive as a part of our heritage and also as a part of American history; and two, to build a constructive, meaningful monument out of this tragedy, so that the children will not have died in vain.

Consequently, yesterday we launched the Southeast Asian Community Development Foundation, that will last forever, and that will encourage young people of Southeast Asian descent to pursue fields of study that can benefit directly the development of our community. I have a copy of that announcement today for your record. It was also run in the New York Times yesterday. (Pause - Submits copy to the Commission)
This is what it looks like. It will be run on the
(INAUDIBLE) yesterday, and also Asian Week this weekend, and I
hope by next week there will be more papers that run it.

Now, on with today's forum. I will submit written
testimony, so I will just speak briefly, for the sake of time.
I will limit may remarks basically to three areas that
certainly are important, but also something we can do about.
They are: 1) demographic changes in our society, and
particularly in this city present both a challenge and an
opportunity for all of us; 2) the stereotyping of ethnic
groups that still goes now; and 3) the needless and deplorable
violence among minority groups themselves. It's not just
whites against minorities.

First of all, the demographic changes that force us
to make adjustments in our attitudes and actions, as well as
also in neighborhoods, to build a truly pluralistic and
harmonious society. I am not going to enumerate all of the
demographic changes. I also am not going to discuss the
changes in the dramatic influx of goods and money from the
Pacific Rim. But as our economic predominance fades away,
frustration and resentment thrive. Thus, we see a kind of
blind, random type of violence that takes place, motivated by
little else than the personal prejudice, on a racial basis,
most of the time.

So, we saw Vincent Chinn, who was actually Chinese,
was taken for a Japanese and beaten to death in Ohio. Ben Lu
(PHONETIC), who was actually Chinese, was taken for a
Vietnamese and was also killed in North Carolina. The
Stockton children last year, most of them were Cambodian, but they were taken for Vietnamese, and shot and killed.

That kind of random violence, it's coming more and more in today's society, and I think partly we are tolerating more violence somehow, but also probably it's the general texture, the general context of the world economy that affects the American economy and then it turns out that people take revenge out on other minority, especially in this case, Asians.

But we also witness at the same time the shrinking of the world as the awakening of the new method of resolving human relations. I think from Beijing to Bucharest, from the Soviet Union to South Africa, from Afghanistan to Nicaragua, we can reasonably hope that the new age has just begun. A new age where the democracy and the free flow of information and sometimes just plain people power can overcome violence, tyranny and oppression. That's what we are seeing happening in Eastern Europe; that's what is happening in many places in the Philippines, and we hope that will be the trend for the future, so that we need not fight, need not kill, need not shoot at one another to resolve our conflict.

In that context then, our city, San Francisco, reflects very well the demographics of the world. We have culturally every continent here. We would be in the prime position to find a way, and if we are successful in finding a way that we can live together, we can work it out among our different communities, then it would be in a sense a model of some sort for the rest of the world, in which we are walking
into the 21st Century.

The second point I would like to make is that the stereotyping of minorities in general, and of Southeast Asians in particular, is still going on. The entertainment industry is the first culprit, and I was glad to pick up on the way in a brochure from GLAAD, the Gay/Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation. That is the kind of picture we have to fight. We have to fight the stereotype that Asians are either very smart, very computer wise, but inarticulate, that Asian women are submissive; that kind of thing. That Asians are now coming in and buying everything in the country. We do not want that kind of thing portrayed, certainly not seriously, but also not in the entertainment industry. That is the second point.

I just wanted to bring up one example. One of the Bills last year that came to the California Legislature, 1842, which outlaws eating of dogs and cats. Now, I ask you, how many dogs and cats of this State have been killed for food? There was one, in 1989. That shows that this is not a big issue; also it shows that education has taken care of the transition for many newcomers, and yet it has become a law, and is pointing fingers.

I'll just conclude today with a couple of hate letters that we have received, basically accusing Vietnamese and Southeast Asians as dog-eaters. It is not a pretty picture, but the point is because the Legislature thinks that they need to make a law to protect them, it gives the pretext of people with hate and prejudice to rely on that and play on
those feelings.

I think I will save the third point for the written testimony. It's only about minorities, and I think the case in San Francisco especially is of the Housing Authority, where the African American and the Asian live side by side, especially in Bayview Hunters Point. Incidents have happened since 1982, we hope the Human Rights Commission, the Mayor's office, and I think, the Police Department as well, will work with the community to find a solution, so that the Asian and the African American need not fight one another for a place to live in the Housing Authority.

Thank you very much for your patience, and also for the accommodation.

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

Before we go into our Government Agency speakers, I realize that in shifting our roles back and forth as Co-Chairs from last night to this, I have neglected to introduce the members of our panel from the Coalition for Civil Rights. I hope they will forgive me, and I will try to make up in small way by introducing them at this point, starting with the person shaking his head no.

Michael Wong from Break the Silence; and seated next to him is Debra Quinn-Carpenter from the NAACP; at the right hand end of this upper podium, Robin Wu, from Chinese for Affirmative Action; down in the lower tier on my right is Manuel Romero, from the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund; next to him, Jeff Santis, from the Jewish
Community Relations Council; and next to him, Steve Owyang, from the Fair Employment and Housing Commission.

So, thank you all, I am very sorry for that omission.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: That's alright, Karen, they got to go first last night, anyway.

CO-CHAIR KAI: And I didn't introduce Mary Dunlap either.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: You don't have to do that.

CO-CHAIR KAI: You introduced yourself, okay.

Well, now, I'll begin with the government agencies, and our first speaker is Captain Jim Arnold, of the San Francisco Police Department.

CAPT. ARNOLD: Good evening. I am Captain Jim Arnold, and I would also like to thank the Human Rights Commission and the Coalition for Civil Rights for giving us this opportunity to speak before you tonight.

Several years ago we met with representatives from various community groups who felt that our department's response to prejudice based acts of violence was adequate, and they were right. Since then, the San Francisco Police Department, under the leadership of Chief Frank Jordan, has responded in a positive way that I think has demonstrated our commitment to documenting and investigating hate crimes.

In the past two years, our department has issued a training bulletin which defines a prejudice based act of violence, and establishes and lists criteria for reporting these incidents. It lists appropriate penal and civil code
violations and provides referrals to various organizations for support or additional information.

We have revised incident reports to include a prejudice based box, which allows us to collect data on prejudice based incidents. We have in place a training program at the Academy about the Ralph Act, that all officers, recruit and veteran, are required to attend. We have also completed a video, a training film, that is shown to every officer in the Department, acquainting them with the Ralph Act, and their responsibilities in reporting and investigating these incidents.

Last year the Police Commission adopted a Department General Order, which established policies and procedures for recognizing and responding to criminal incidents motivated by hatred or prejudice. This General Order specifically states responsibilities of the patrol officer responding to the scene of a prejudice based incident, making the initial report and conducting the preliminary investigation. It states the responsibility for the supervisors for reviewing the report for accuracy, the Investigations Bureau for preparing the cases for prosecution, the Community Service Division, for meeting with neighborhood groups and providing safety and protection information, and to conduct public meetings on prejudice based threats and violence.

The Criminal Intelligence Division receives reports of hate crimes, gathers statistics, forwards them to the Chief and to the command staff, and also forwards this data to the California Attorney General's office.
Based on the statistics we have gathered last year, there were 183 reported prejudice based crimes; 41 of these resulted in arrests. The remainder of these were not prosecuted, due to insufficient evidence or lack of witnesses. These incidents are classified as "follows." Seventy-six were gay-related, 65 were racially motivated, 27 were anti-Semitic, the remainder were ethnic related or other religions.

These statistics show an increase in activity beginning in July and continuing throughout the remainder of the year. We believe the statistical increase is due not only to the increased activity of certain groups, but also because of greater public awareness of hate crimes, greater advocacy by community groups, and more familiarity by police with our reporting procedures. What I think we are seeing is a results of the training that we have provided for the officers of the Academy and at the station level.

In August of last year, numerous flyers of racial and anti-gay nature were found in the Richmond, Park, Taraval, and Northern Police Districts. Some are believed to have been distributed by the White Aryan Resistance, and a skinhead group called the American Front. In September and October, there was a steady increase in hate literature, predominantly in the Richmond and Taraval Districts. These flyers were attached to telephone poles, inserted under windshields and placed on buildings.

Each month a statistical breakdown of prejudice based incidents is sent to the Chief of Police, the command staff, the Community Services Division, and to all District
Station Captains. This monthly recap includes individual incidents, case numbers, dates, Districts of occurrence, and any emerging patterns or trends. With this information we can deploy our resources effectively, and respond proactively, by meeting with community groups and individuals to prevent these incidents from escalating into more serious acts of violence.

Although we feel we have accomplished a great deal in the past several years, there is much left to do. We are working towards getting the maximum out of our recurrent policies and reporting system, through continuous training and greater frontline supervision and accountability.

We hope these actions will more accurately reflect the scope and nature of this problem, and send a clear message to the community that enforcement of hate crimes laws is a priority in the San Francisco Police Department. What we hope to see in the future and what I hope will come out of this Forum is greater public awareness of the problem through more community outreach, and a comprehensive plan to deal with hate violence, which includes not only the police, but the schools, community groups and other public agencies. As the public recognizes that hate crimes are being handled sensitively and investigated thoroughly, we hope that victims and witnesses will more willingly come forward, and with the help and support of the community and other public agencies, we can work together in eliminating hate crimes from our neighborhoods.

That is the end of my testimony, but I really would be remiss if I didn't give my thanks to those community groups
who really pressed us into action several years ago. We met with representatives Lester Olmstead-Rose, Jill Treger, Mike Wong, from Break the Silence, Robin Wu, from Chinese for Affirmative Action, representatives from NOW and the ACLU, who brought these concerns to us. And really, it was through their actions that really pushed us sort of into the 20th Century, and now we find that San Francisco has a very progressive, I think, reporting system. So my thanks to those agencies personally.

Now, I would like to answer any questions.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Yes, Captain Arnold, you mentioned that there's been a perceived increase in hate crimes or alleged hate crimes starting in about July, and you attributed that to the increase of activity on the part of certain groups. Could you be a bit more detailed?

CAPT. ARNOLD: Well, I don't have the specific information about those groups, but I had Ms. Sandy Gallant from our Criminal Intelligence Division, who tracks that data and has much more information about these groups, and if you would permit, I am sure she would gladly come up and give you some information.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: I didn't mean to be vague in my question, what I am getting at is is the increase attributable to what we would call organized or associational behavior on the part of particular groups, or are we talking about particular populations of people?

CAPT. ARNOLD: These hate crimes - you know, we made two arrests in December of people who were passing out these
types of racist literature in the Taraval Districts, and I am sure it is attributable to these groups. I don't have that much more information about these groups; I am not really clear about your question.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Well, are we talking about the White Aryan Resistance, or are we talking about -

CAPT. ARNOLD: Yes, these two groups that I mentioned here, the White Aryan Resistance, and the other one was the American Front, these are the literature that we got from them.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: I appreciate the details. It's not always an easy thing to identify the group involved, but when we can do that, it's useful. Thanks a lot.

MR. SANTIS: Yesterday two speakers, two witnesses had a great deal of compliments for the Police Department, in the way they handled the reporting of a prejudice motivated crime against them personally, which I was very pleased to hear. I am wondering what more you think the Police Department can do, in addition to what it's already doing, what resources you would need to expand or to have other programs to continue the work that's already begun.

CAPT. ARNOLD: Well, our greatest resource is the community, and we always look to the community for support. We invite them to come to the Academy for our training programs - as a matter of fact, now we rely heavily on them during the Community Awareness Week to train for recruit officers and veteran officers. We really would like to see more support from the public agencies. Generally, when we are
called to respond to, for instance, if I could use an example, the situation we're having at public housing now, with the Asians and the black families, pitting minorities against minorities, what I would like to see is contact people from each agency that we could call right away to respond to these incidents. Generally the police are looked upon to solve all the problems and respond very quickly, and we do that, but too often the response from other agencies is very slow. Relocating families, boarding up the doors to prevent further acts of violence, those kinds of things.

I would like to see more responsible reporting by the media. Too often they sensationalize the coverage, not only of these prejudice based acts of violence, but gang activity, which sends a message that all blacks that wear running suits must be associated with gangs, or all kids that hang in the neighborhood, those kinds of things. So we'd like to see more responsible media coverage.

I would like to see a reporting system that's very comprehensive, a comprehensive response to this problem of hate violence, where there would be some follow-up from other agencies. Many times victims of violent crimes are reluctant to call the police, hence the disparity between CUAV statistics and our statistics.

Greater community advocacy and encouragement by the community groups to report these incidents to us, even though the victim may wish to remain silent, this gives us an opportunity at least to identify where these problems are occurring, and an opportunity for us to deploy our resources
effectively.

CO-CHAIR KAI: I think Michael Wong was next.

MR. WONG: Captain Arnold, can you give us an idea what the response from patrol officers has been to the training as well as the reporting procedures that they have to go through on the incident reports?

CAPT. ARNOLD: Well, the response has been very good. It was a great change to require officers to get additional information, and we find it takes some time before they are comfortable with the process. We have revised incident reports to include a prejudice based box that officers are required to check, and we require them to explain in the narrative why they believe it's prejudice based. Our General Order is very comprehensive, and it goes into quite detail about what's required of them. But I think the other things we've done; the video film, the training at the Academy, all helps to enhance the reporting system, and I think now they're more comfortable with it, and they are reporting more incidents.

We talk about this issue during the line-up, so we find a lot of training. With the media coverage from this Conference, I am sure it will result in additional training and reviewing of the film that we've shown before. So, I think that the reporting is increasing, due to the familiarity by the officers with the reporting procedures.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Next, Mr. Santis, and then Ms. Quinn-Carpenter.

MR. SANTIS: I have a question regarding your filing
system. One of the victims who testified yesterday was a Rabbi Traub, who was victimized by two pipe bombs, one placed at his synagogue and a few weeks later at his home, and he said that he had a lot of praise for the Police Department, but if there was one criticism, it was the filing system, by which he meant that if it had not been for their memory of one specific Inspector, who remembered the specific type of bomb and the specific types of explosives, it would have been much more difficult, if not impossible, to catch the bomber, because his files had been routinely shredded. And one thing that the Rabbi had suggested was a central permanent computer file for terror and hate crimes. Has that been addressed, or has the system been changed?

CAPT. ARNOLD: I don't think the Police Department has ever routinely destroyed any material. Like baseball, we just thrive on statistics, and we have reams and reams of this stuff. We are computerizing our record keeping, and we do keep records for years and years; we are required to do so by law, because of the possibility of it going to trial. I have no knowledge about that specific act, but we are computerizing our record keeping system, and we do keep these things for years and years and years.

We are making some changes in our data collection method for hate crimes. We will be able to be more precise about the kinds of data that we get. The Criminal Intelligence Division will begin to develop pen maps that they can send to District Station Captains, alerting them to exactly where these things are occurring, times and dates, so
we can be very specific.

So, I think that as we become more familiar with the system and reporting increases, we will be able to get a better idea of what's going on; a better grasp on it.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Ms. Quinn-Carpenter and then Commissioner Gillette.

MS. QUINN-CARPENTER: Captain Arnold, we also had testimony yesterday from a woman from the African American community who stated that she and her son were subjected to an arrest by San Francisco police officers predicated on racism, and that they were treated with unreasonable force. What is the procedure within the Department when complaints of this nature come to your attention against police officers?

CAPT. ARNOLD: Well, when they come to my attention, of course, I can handle it several ways. If it is a serious problem, I naturally take all the information and forward it to the Office of Citizen Complaints for investigation. If it is a matter of discourtesy, it's something that I can handle at the station level, then I will do it, and I do it by speaking to the officer, speaking to his supervisor, and perhaps, if it's appropriate, making a notation in his pit binder, an evaluation system for officers that we use monthly. But if it's a serious complaint, a complaint of brutality, I forward it to the Office of Citizen Complaints.

If it is a criminal complaint regarding criminal activity on the part of an officer, we treat it as a criminal matter. We make the appropriate reports and we forward it to our Investigations Bureau for investigation, or the Management
Control Division.

MS. QUINN-CARPENTER: Are any statistics maintained with regard to those kinds of complaints against officers?

CAPT. ARNOLD: Yes they are; they are maintained by OCC, and our Management Control Division.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Commissioner Gillette?

COMMISSIONER GILLETTE: Yes, Captain Arnold, I want to ask you about legislation dealing with arresting and protecting citizens in this way. I know some cities have ethnic intimidation laws. Would you comment on the kind of laws which allow you to prosecute, and whether San Francisco needs to have a specific ethnic intimidation law?

CAPT. ARNOLD: You know, the Ralph Act and the main Civil Rights Act provide us with an effective tool in the Penal Code which provide enhancements for crimes committed motivated by prejudice and bigotry, and that seems to be an effective tool. I think any legislation to be passed in that regard, whether it's a city ordinance or a state law, is effective. Perhaps the representative from the District Attorney's office could comment more later on that, but I think the laws we have now are effective.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Are there any other questions from the panel? Yes, Mr. Romero.

MR. ROMERO: I have a question that relates to the record keeping and the data that you gave out (INAUDIBLE) the cases in terms of the types of work. How are anti-immigrant crimes documented, and do you allow for crossover, for example, we may have both a race and religion based violence?
CAPT. ARNOLD: The process is when an officer takes a report, and it's prejudice based, it's reviewed at different levels. If it's marked as prejudice based, it goes to the record room, that report is directed towards our Criminal Intelligence Division, in which the officer assigned to it will double check to make sure it is prejudice based and make sure that the information contained in it is accurate. If it is not marked as prejudice based, but it is indicated in the narrative that it may be, this report is routinely sent to the Investigations Bureau for assignment, and upon their review, if it is prejudice based, then it is then returned to the Intelligence Division to be properly coded, and then sent back to the appropriate agency, or the investigations detail to be investigated.

Am I answering your question?

MR. ROMERO: Let me get more specific. In terms of the categories you related, where would the anti-immigrant crimes be categorized? Would it be under the race related, or would it be under the other?

CAPT. ARNOLD: I don't know. Sandy, do you have -

MS. GALLANT: Most likely it's going to fall under ethnic. It would be very difficult to give you a general answer to that, because each report is looked at and evaluated on its own merits. The decision is made usually based on the wording of the suspect in a particular case, what kind of attack is he making in his wording. Usually there's some type of wording of a racial nature, or anti-Semitic nature that will come through. So, each report will be evaluated for
that, the wording and then the act, and then a determination
will be made as to what category it's going to fit in.

Sometimes you will find a crossover between racial
and ethnic, and it would be a decision on my part as to which
it will fall in.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Commissioner Lockhart.

COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: This is a category question
also. Around Christmas time, a number of people, I guess
about 70, received letters that were full of hostility and
obscenity, and I was one of the people. I was very impressed
with the way the officer took the report. My question has to
do with how it was categorized. It started off in general
words, and then I called to give an additional piece of
information, and I was told that it was assigned to sex
crimes. And I can't imagine why. I mean, there were sexual
terms, but there was no sexual threat. So, I wondered whether
- are you familiar with this group of letters that appeared to
be people mostly who were connected with City government.

CAPT. ARNOLD: No, I am not. However, later on we
could get together and I could find out for you. I could call
the detail and get information about it, unless Sandy has
information on that.

MS. GALLANT: I am not even aware of this. This
never even hit my desk. I am not aware of it at all. You
will find that that will happen on occasion.

CAPT. ARNOLD: I will be glad to look into that for
you and get back to you.

COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: Alright, thank you.
CO-CHAIR KAI: I guess I will close this questioning. Also, last night we had several women testify, and one of the things they mentioned was that crimes against women, such as rapes, are not considered hate crimes, and they are not tracked in that regard. And their concern was that they should be, from their point of view that they feel, as the persons who are being subjected to these acts, that they should be hate crimes, and should be recognized as such. Is there any way to do that, or any plan to do that?

CAPT. ARNOLD: That's a matter that has come up for some discussion at the Attorney General's office. The response that I got when I asked that question last year was the fact that they felt that the crimes against women were severe enough; it didn't warrant additional enhancements or an inclusion in the prejudice based acts of violence. That was the response I got from the Attorney General's office.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Has there been any policy discussion on the City level?

CAPT. ARNOLD: Not that I am aware of.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much, Captain Arnold. Our next speaker is the District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, Arlo Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much for the opportunity to address you this evening. You know, traveling around this state as I have been recently, I found out that we all know, unfortunately, in a very personal way, that intolerance and bigotry is with us.

I left San Diego one Saturday afternoon last summer
after giving a speech to go to the Gay Pride event, the first
one in Orange County, and was going to go on to speak in
Riverside County. I was with another young man, and we missed
the turnoff and we got mixed up as to where we were going to
go, so we stopped at a gas station and asked how to get to
this particular location. There was a young man who was about
to get into his car, and after I told him the location, and he
said, "You don't want to go down there, there's nothing but a
lot of 'spics' down there." As we reacted in horror, he
immediately got in his car and drove away.

When we arrived at the scene of the gay pride event,
we were greeted, as I am sure you read, by all kinds of
picketers - not just picketers, but people with slogans
directed against anyone entering there, with epithets directed
against gays, and against anyone who would dare go into that
event.

But unfortunately, intolerance is not simply in
Orange County. It's all over the State, and as we know,
unfortunately is here in San Francisco.

We have had a number of cases involving anti-gay
violence in this city; we have recently seen the incident
involving the Reverend Cecil Williams, with the nazi stickers
and threats; we have seen the bombings of the synagogues and
the desecration of the Holocaust Memorial in Golden Gate Park.

You know, in a sense we're all responsible. We've
got to speak up, we've got to do what you're doing here. But
I think that there's a national sentiment that is adrift.
It's been adrift because of the leadership in Washington,
where our President in the last ten years has taken a kind of a 'let be, hands off' policy, and worse, a don't care attitude, towards these problems. The dismantling of the Civil Rights Commission; all the kinds of tones that are set for this nation, which are in the wrong direction, that encourages this kind of flaking on the part of certain segments of our nation. That is why I think the Hearings you are having here today are important. It is important that we all speak up and that we all become involved in educating the community and raising the awareness of this intolerance, and making clear that we will not tolerate it.

You made it clear, I believe, in the District Attorney's office, we will prosecute vigorously and to the limit any hate crimes. In fact, you may recall, John O'Connell, who was murdered here on Polk Street a few years ago; we prosecuted the two young punks who came to San Francisco to "bash some queers." The jury here in San Francisco convicted them of murder. Unfortunately the Appellate Court said that the conduct involved was not murder, but only manslaughter. We appealed the case to the Supreme Court and they refused to hear it.

We filed a number of actions involving civil rights violations at our Civil Division, including one against Health America, a health insurance corporation that thought that they didn't need to insure anyone in San Francisco. They redlined us. Any individual applying in San Francisco for health care was automatically trashed, their application in the basket, because they didn't want to incur what they felt were going to
be additional costs for AIDS care and AIDS related care. We filed an action against them and we got a judgment, which paid for $250,000.00 in medical care for indigents, and part of that money went to the City.

We worked with CUAV, of course, it's partly funded through the City budget and through the District Attorney's office, who are doing a great outreaching into the community and educating the public on how to protect themselves, particularly the gay and lesbian community. We have worked with other organizations to try to solve some of these offenses, with the police and the with community organizations. Because you know, these are acts of cowardice, which are committed in covertly and cowardly ways, that make it difficult for the police to uncover, and that is why I had a joint press conference with Anti-Defamation League after the desecration of the synagogues and the Holocaust Memorial, in an effort to get citizens to step forward, who had any clues that could help us to find out who was involved in that kind of conduct.

I had assigned, some months ago, a member of our staff to work with the Attorney General's office in coordinating the hate crimes area. But I have decided, and we've been discussing the matter for some time, that we need to do more. Because in our office we have criminal matters that come to the Misdemeanor Unit; they come to the Felony Unit; we have citizens who come in and complain; we have matters that come into our Special Operations, which file the civil actions involving discrimination.
What we need to do, I have decided, is to bring these things together, and to have one focal point in that office for all things involving hate crimes, discrimination of all kinds, civil and criminal. So, we will be setting up a Civil Rights Unit, consisting of one attorney and one investigator, David Moon, whom I am sure many of you know, who has worked on many of these concerns in my office, and will be heading that unit. The idea will be to work with the police, to work with schools, to work with citizens who complain, to reach out to both schools and the community, and to work on legislation that is needed. But also, to be sure that we coordinate our efforts in the District Attorney's office, particularly in our misdemeanor area, where police bring us some 40,000 cases a year. We have a lot of matters that are rape, murder, child abuse, and many other matters that require close attention, and when you get to a misdemeanor level there is a risk that that case might fall between the cracks. That will be one of the assignments of that unit, to be sure that those cases are overseen and followed through so that they do not fall through the cracks.

I am confident that this will improve the coordination in our office, and hopefully help to raise the consciousness of the community through education, and through our efforts. I believe it is the only and first such unit created in the District Attorney's office in this State.

If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer them. If I can't answer them, David can.

COMMISSIONER GILLETTE: Yes, Mr. Smith. You
indicated that this new Civil Rights Unit would have several responsibilities, among them, working on any legislation as needed. Would you comment on what kinds of legislation you feel would be helpful at this point?

MR. SMITH: Well, I think, for example, right now it's probably too early to gauge the effect of the new hate crime legislation; we are now beginning to work with it really for the first time. It may well need some honing down, and I think that it's an open question. I have nothing specifically in mind at this point.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Mr. Wong.

MR. WONG: District Attorney Smith, do you have an idea of the number of cases that have been filed, either in the Ralph Act or the Dana Act, and a related question. Is there going to be a pleabargaining policy on hate motivated crimes?

MR. SMITH: Number one, I will be happy to get those numbers for you. I am not so sure - that's one of the things that we started to do when I sent Jerry Eisenberg to coordinate with the Attorney General's office, to keep these figures, because right now you are right. They are lost and neither the City's computer system nor any other system picks these cases out, and that's one of the things we're going about doing. I will attempt to get that data for you and give it to you.

As far as plea-bargaining is concerned, every case in the District Attorney's office is evaluated, and looked at based upon the facts of that case, and the seriousness of the
offense, the background of the individual, prior conduct, and then determined what is the proper disposition. We, in some cases, refuse to enter into any kind of a negotiated plea leave it up to the court. But that can result in uneven results, because you jump from court to court to court. So we do kind of set what we feel to be appropriate standards to insure even-handed administration of justice, even when we do not accept a plea. You cannot stop an individual from pleading guilty or pleading nolo.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Are there any other questions? Ms. Dunlap.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: I would like to ask you the same question, essentially, that Karen Kai asked Captain Arnold, which is in the analysis of what constitutes a hate crime, why is gender not a factor? For example, the Federal Hate Crimes Statistics Act, which has yet failed to pass because of the work of Jesse Helms, if it ever does pass, is not organized in a way that enables us to keep track of gender based violence. What is the position in the District Attorney's office on the problem, both analytically and practically?

MR. SMITH: Our policy is - let me read it. This is our written policy:

"All criminal offenses of violence, intimidation, or harassment, based on racial, religious, ethnic background, or sexual orientation, shall be viewed as serious, and prosecution shall be considered a high priority."
That is in our statement. We consider sex violence, or any crime based upon sex as a case that deserves high priority, and of course, some of our civil actions have been based upon discrimination based upon sex.

Rape, of course, is already treated very seriously, by both the Police Department having assigned a special unit for rape investigation, and the District Attorney's office, having a special team assigned to handle rape cases, we call vertically, that meaning that one attorney is assigned to handle the case all the way through from the beginning, when the police bring it in, to the prelim, to the trial, to the motions, rather than horizontal, which just means that the (INAUDIBLE) system, which is more efficient in terms of man-use of your staff - a platoon to consider the complaint, a platoon to bring the case to prelim and a platoon for trial.

So, we don't bounce the victim around from attorney to attorney. We do those things already. We already keep statistics, of course, on rape and other sexual assaults, and we treat them with high priority, whether or not they should be, when we do the final statistics, put them all together, typing something that should be considered.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Well, just to follow up, gender based violence is a form of hate based violence, just like any other kind, and there is an analytical problem, which your office obviously doesn't share with Congress and the State Legislature and elsewhere. The problem is that these gender based crimes tend to be separated out, perhaps because of the numerousness, and not treated as an analytical matter, as
hostility based. What I am trying to get at is whether your 
office has gotten a different angle on that. It sounds as if 
you have.

MR. SMITH: Well, we do. We've already, as I said, 
in our policy, treated sex based crimes in the category of our 
hate crimes. There's no question. Rape is not a sex crime, 
it's in the category of our hate crimes. There's no question. 
Rape is not a sex crime; it's a hate crime against women. No 
question about it.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Mr. Romero.

MR. ROMERO: Yes, following up on that same point, 
insofar as you indicated that you will now have a one 
attorney/one investigator unit, I was wondering whether you 
believe that that is sufficient or adequate to address the 
problem.

MR. SMITH: I hope that it is sufficient and 
adequate. Every year we've been asking for additional staff, 
and I don't want to get into that, but like most agencies, 
we've suffered a loss of eight investigators and four 
attorneys in the last two years. I hope that that will do it, 
and I would be willing to go in and ask the Mayor's office for 
additional staff. But I think we'll be developing some 
numbers that will be the basis for any future requests.

MR. ROMERO: And included in those numbers will be 
gender based.

MR. SMITH: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER SAMMON: Mr. Smith, you made a comment 
I'd just like to comment in turn on. If you wish to respond
to it, fine, but it's more a comment. Part of our problem is
the lack of sensitivity on the part of the federal
administration, the Presidency, and people in the government,
and people in the various departments, I would add to that.
And I think that we face the unique position in San Francisco
where the City of San Francisco, which tries to be sensitive
and tries to do things like we're trying to accomplish here,
is facing an administration which not only neglects this, but
sometimes has policies that actively promote the opposite. We
now have this conflict today between the top lawman for the
federal government, Mr. Russonello, and the Hispanic
community, after what he said, and his handling of the
immigration issue, that's simply a reflection of what he has
done, from my own personal viewpoint of that.

We also see that we have legislation, we have the
Mizzoli-Simpson Bill, and the California State Employment
Commission, this last week on Friday announced that they found
out that because of that, the I-9 requirements, that there is
grave, grave discrimination against people because if they
aren't the right color, or speak with an accent, employers
don't want to hire them, and that's a creation of not only of
the Senate, but of the INS, which has been very enthusiastic
about it as a solution to all the problems as they define
them.

We had a City of Refuge Resolution in 1985, and last
year in 1989 an Ordinance, which now is of course a law, and I
recall very vividly in both occasions, the federal government
told the City of San Francisco it had no right to try to treat
people fairly and respect their human rights, that that was
the federal government that was supposed to do that.

So, we find ourselves in an adversarial position,
and his might sound, I don't mean to put these in the same
category, but we have not only with the two groups that
Captain Arnold, but with the federal authorities on the other
side, who are fighting against their human rights. And I say
that because I think it's important for the City of San
Francisco to hold up its head proudly and say, yes, that's
where we are, as we did in the City of Refuge Ordinance, and
to recognize that, because some people would try to tell us
we're trying to legislate something that's not our business,
and it is our business.

MR. SMITH: I couldn't agree with you more.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Panelists, I unfortunately feel that
we have to keep to our schedule. I want to thank you very
much, Mr. District Attorney, for coming and giving your
testimony and answering our questions. If the panelists do
have additional questions, I am sure that we can send them to
District Attorney Smith and get a response.

Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Next to speak, from San Francisco
Emergency Services, Flo Stroud.

MS. STROUD: Thank you. I am Florence Stroud, and I
am Deputy for Community Public Health Programs. I am not
prepared tonight to discuss Emergency Services; I think if the
Commission is interested in having a report on Emergency
Services, I can make sure that you get a written report on what the policies are, and practices.

Rather, my testimony is going to be restricted to three general areas that were mentioned in a letter to me about the Hearing tonight, and it has to do with whether or not the Department has perceived an increase or decrease in the problem of hate crimes or bigotry or prejudice, and secondly, to describe some of the Department programs that we have that anticipate some of the behaviors that find their way to the Police Department or the District Attorney's office. And then thirdly, to make a few comments about the proposed plan.

Before I start, I think I would like to comment, as did other people, about some of the assumptions we have in the Health Department in terms of programs that we have in place. I think some of these assumptions, stated and unstated, sort of hinge on the fact that we have in our labor force a number of people who bring with them prejudices and biases, etc., and that we will probably all be dead and gone before many of those people change those prejudices and biases. But we have a responsibility within the Department to create an environment that will not allow any kind of discriminatory behavior that is based on some of those beliefs. And so, most of our programs really are based on that assumption. In some instances we're successful in changing attitudes and changing beliefs, but we do not delude ourselves at all that they are there, and that should the environment change or should we get managers who will allow certain behavior, there would probably
be more in the way of overt acts from some of our employees.

We don't have a central reporting system in the Department, so that we do not have statistical data on the prevalence, so I cannot really say with any kind of accuracy whether or not there has been an increase or decrease. We have a very large department, and there are numbers that are reported in a variety of places, and I will talk a little about that, but in terms of a central reporting system that would track incidents of discrimination, incidents of hate crime, etc., we do not have that. That is one of the very attractive things about your model plan. Even though it is a complex undertaking, I think a reporting system would go a long way, not only in addressing perpetrators, but also in helping people like us at the Health Department anticipate and try to prevent some of the problems before they end up in the Police Department.

So, I would certainly support a reporting mechanism, and one of the things we discussed at the Health Department was a way to consolidate information from our EEO Unit, from our Sexual Trauma Unit, from our Gay/Lesbian Health Services Program, from our Black Psychiatry, Latino Psychiatry, Asian Psychiatry programs at San Francisco General, so that if you adopt a reporting system, I think this Department would stand ready to support you by initiating internally a departmental reporting system.

How then does the Department respond, and I am just going to mention three or four programs that we have in place that anticipate and respond to complaints of discrimination.
Like most departments, we do have an EEO Unit that will respond to specific allegations of discrimination, and that office has a process whereby they will assign an investigator and the investigator will investigate the charge. The goal always here is try to resolve the issue at the lowest administrative level.

In the last year or so there has been an increase in the number of complaints, and it led that unit, along with several other units, to initiate a series of trainings that deal with working with diverse populations and working with people who have different values about health, different values about life, etc., so that our staff are more sensitized to people who are different than they, and can better manage employees who may not have the kind of respect and sensitivity for the diverse kinds of people who come and use our health services.

So, the EEO office has been instrumental in sponsoring some of these trainings; instrumental in spending a great deal of time with new employee orientation, so that people understand that working in San Francisco is not really the same as working in a community like San Diego, or working in another community, but that there would be certain things to expect and certain things that would not be tolerated.

A second program we have in place is the CASARC Program, which is the Child Abuse/Sexual Assault Resource Center, which is located at San Francisco General, and at this program, we see first-hand victims of hate and victims of crime. CASARC serves approximately 550 clients, ages 0 to 17
years of age, who have been sexually abused, and all of the
clients usually come from the City and County of San
Francisco, and they represent a variety of ethnic and
socioeconomic backgrounds. That program provides medical care
and counseling services to clients, and the whole goal there
is to try to empower victims and to try to assist victims to
deal with this horrible assault that they have experienced.

The investigating and counseling approach doesn't
usually include questions surrounding the incidents, and
whether or not there was any prejudice involved, or prejudice
based violence that could be pinpointed in the incident.
However, staff have made some observations that you may be
interested in hearing.

One, they are very concerned about gender based
violence, because over the last year, they have had an
increase in the numbers of gang rape, and these are teenagers.
The question that comes up in their minds is whether or not
this is gender violence, whether or not this is drug related,
or just what is this. They have some hypotheses, but they are
very concerned about the increase in gang rape. And some of
the gang rape that they have observed happens to occur among
minorities; minorities raping other minorities. There is a
real concern that given an environment that seems to tolerate
acting out on people's beliefs, that the pecking system is
such that you will find minorities are being violent against
other minorities, and that's a great concern. And the
violence is also one that they believe can be documented as
gender based.
They see the worse cases in the City; those cases where women and children can finally get up the nerve to go in and be counseled and be helped to prosecute the perpetrator. But that center feels that the environment out there needs to be changed in some way, not only for families, but also for youngsters in school, so that they can express themselves in ways that will not result in hate violence.

Another aspect of the Department is the Gay/Lesbian office that was established there some six or seven years ago. While there's no specific hate crimes training, there is a great deal of training of staff within the Department with respect to gay/lesbian issues. This includes new employee orientation, it includes human sexuality, it includes homophobia training. The office also provides consultation to other City departments with respect to gay/lesbian issues.

Our Health Commission, about three weeks ago, had a hearing, and were alarmed to learn that youth who are gay and lesbian have a particularly difficult time, both in school, with their families, and often are the victims of violence. The testimony was such that we in the Department were seeing only the tip of the iceberg; that what really happens in families and what really happens in school settings is a great deal of violence to these young people who are trying to assert themselves and assert their own sexuality, and as a result, the Department has decided in this year's budget that one of the special initiatives will be to provide consultation throughout our primary care network and our mental health services for youth who are gay and lesbian, and who are having
real difficult times in coming out.

Let me just briefly end by commenting on your plan. As I said before, I think the reporting is excellent. I think if there were a central place where data is collected on a regular basis about numbers and types, that it would be very helpful to those of us in departments that deliver services. It would be helpful in planning trainings; it would be helpful in detecting symptoms; I just think it would be very useful. I think it is a very complex task, and one that will certainly require funding if in fact you are going to do something with the data.

The second aspect of the plan I wanted to comment on is the aspect of conflict resolution, and I know that throughout the community there are groups that do community conflict resolution, and I would like to support the need for a better coordinated Citywide group of people who could be involved in conflict resolution.

As a side product of a project we had in our Sexually Transmitted Disease Clinic, we decided that youth who were contemplating gang activity often did so because they felt that they had no other options. It was our intent to pull together a kind of Citywide effort, where kids could come together, learn about AIDS, learn about drugs, learn about a number of things, in the process of learning, do something that they thought was important and they thought was fun. And it served to be a real conflict resolution kind of experience, as kids Citywide came to compete in a dance contest, or came together to compete in a rapping contest, or came together to
compete in a poetry contest. There really isn't enough of
that, and enough of it that is sustained over time so that our
young people early on get a chance to communicate, have fun,
do substantive things with other people from other
communities. I think that anticipates conflict resolution,
and so I definitely support the concept of conflict resolution
for all ages.

And then, the business of prevention, I think is
also critical. In most of the work I think we do in the
Health Department is in the area of prevention, and perhaps
some conflict resolution. There are people in the Health
Department, either through our community programs or mental
health programs, or at San Francisco General, where there are
focused programs that deal with African American issues,
Hispanic issues and Asian issues. There are people on staff
whom I think are very skillful in prevention and very skillful
in detecting racism, discrimination, and very skillful in
helping people come to grips with how they are. So I think
the prevention part of the plan is very important, and I think
the Department would love to work with you in any way it can
to advance the aspects of prevention and conflict resolution.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you, Ms. Stroud. Are there any
questions from the panel? Commissioner Lockhart, and then
Commissioner Gillette.

COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: I am an alumnus of the
Health Department, so I have a special interest in what you've
been saying, and I am delighted to hear you say that someone
on staff could work with us. When we get to that point, would
we contact you?

    MS. STROUD: You could contact me, and I could refer
it to the appropriate person. If the expertise is not in our
Department, we do have access to people outside and we often
call on them to come in too.

    COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: I think we could use both.

    Thank you.

    CO-CHAIR KAI: Commissioner Gillette.

    COMMISSIONER GILLETTE: Yes, Ms. Stroud, I was very
interested in what you have to say, and particularly your
comment regarding the training emphasis, which is not so much
on changing attitudes, but in assuring that services are
provided appropriately. I am wondering if that kind of
training which the Health Department does is done by other
City agencies, or is there any Citywide training?

    MS. STROUD: I think through civil service there are
training efforts. How extensive they are I can't comment on,
but there are training programs that are provided through the
Civil Service Commission. I suspect they would be spread
pretty thin. I know we felt we had to internally develop some
programs, because of the kinds of problems we were facing.

    COMMISSIONER GILLETTE: Is your training mandatory?

    MS. STROUD: No, it is not mandatory, but we use
other powers of persuasion.

    (LAUGHTER)

    CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much for your
testimony, Ms. Stroud.

    CO-CHAIR KAI: Our next speaker is Amalia Mesa-
Bains, from the San Francisco Unified School District.

MS. MESA-BAINS: I am very pleased, and I thank both
the Commissioners and the Coalition members for inviting the
District to participate in this particular forum.

As many of you know, the District has operated under
two major legal jurisdictions for a number of years, the
Nichols v. Lau, which protects and supports the linguistic
rights of students, and the Consent Decree, which deals with
the immigration effort within the District. And so both of
those have resulted over the last ten or almost 11 years with
a variety of programs.

The issues related to prejudice based violence I
think are things that we are dealing with both directly and
indirectly, and so, in the testimony today, what I would
really like to provide is some summary of the monitoring, our
policy, and particularly I think, those things which pertain
to young people, that is, the instructional and interactional
practices that we support in the classrooms, the kind of
training that helps teachers deal more effectively with
diverse students.

The context of a learning environment is one in
which in a very hopeful way we have the opportunity to deal
with attitudes, beliefs and lives that are really forming
their characters and the ways in which they view one another,
so that it is the aim of the District to try and provide for
teachers who may not themselves have been raised in diverse
setting to come to a better understanding of the lives of
their students and consequently improve the relationships
there. Because we understand that prejudice and violence and the resulting conflicts that come out of differences can only be handled when people come to understand their similarities.

I would like to begin by noting, mea culpa, that we do not have a strong monitoring system in terms of effectively identifying the prejudice based violence. We identify violence in terms of student-to-student, school violence, violence against teachers in particular systematic ways. When counseling is provided in those circumstances, or follow ups, such as the mental health psychologists or the Center for Special Problems at San Francisco General, we do come to understand what the roots of those conflicts may be, but we as yet do not identify them in a systematic monitoring system. These are the prejudice based violence.

We are effectively implementing an anti-slur policy which is one of our first steps in beginning to deal with the implications of that violence, and so we'll only read you a small section, and I have provided a binder of materials that you might be able to share to get a better idea of the policy and program.

"The Board of Education has adopted as its policy for the San Francisco Unified School District and each of its official employees, Board of Education, members and agents acting in their official capacity, to treat all persons equally and respectfully, and to refrain from the willful and negligent use of slurs against
any person on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation or disability. A slur, as used in this policy, is a word or combination of words that by its very utterance inflicts injury, offers little opportunity for response, appeals not to rational faculties, or is an unessential or gratuitous part of any exposition or fact or opinion. All persons are entitled by law to the right of equal treatment and respect. Slurs deprive members of the protected groups of this right by holding them to public contempt, ridicule, shame and disgrace, and causing them to be shunned, avoided or injured in their occupation by promoting ill will, and rank or slurs diminish peace and order."

And then it goes on to set about the ways by slurs can be identified and the ways by which the District may respond to people found in some way implying or imposing slurs on others.

We have been talking with a number of community groups about a way by which we could develop a training model for furthering the understanding of the anti-slur policy. We had some conversations last year, and we're not able to go forward with that particular training model.

But I would like to describe some of the other models that we use to deal with what I call the indirect
avenue, which is improving classroom climate, reducing conflict between students and teachers, and beginning to bring about a better sense of self esteem for youngsters and for individuals of diverse backgrounds. We work in what we call interactional practices, and that means that students also develop in an affective way as they do cognitively, that each of us learns often through our feelings and our sentiments. The scholars knew many years ago, when they talked about learning by heart, that they meant not that we learned by rote, but that the way in which our emotions are open and comforted is the way by which our accuracy and cognition is even higher, so that when people are anxious or disturbed or feel the hostility and prejudice of others, they are not good learners. So, the interactional practices that we support fall into several different categories.

One is called Teacher Expectation and Student Achievement. It's a specific model of 15 behaviors in three areas; the areas of response, opportunities for response, feedback and regard. Meaning that I find ways by which I do not exclude you in the classroom; ways by which I understand and support your ability to respond back to me, and ways by which I show you regard.

These 15 behaviors are taught in a variety of teacher training models over a nine-month period of time. We have over 45 schools who have gone through the training, and who are implementing in their schools the TESA model.

We have models in regard to something called Cooperative Learning, and Ms. Stroud referred earlier to
conflict resolution, and preceding that is the notion of cooperation, and when that doesn't work we find ourselves in conflict. Cooperative models are models by which teachers learn to group students and configure them in ways that they can shift roles, so if they are low status they can gain better status, in which they learn to share decision making; in which they must pair to help each other.

I think it's very important, and you will see in the backup material that the documentation shows us that as the school years past students do less and less friend making with people outside of their own racial groups. That is not necessarily an inevitable part of growing up, but in fact they are documenting that in integrated schools where cooperative models have been employed, and in which conflict resolution skills are taught, that in fact does not occur. That students are able, in spite of all the demands of adolescence to cross over and have friendships with diverse individuals. So, when we talk about the cooperative models, we talk about specific models that train teachers and train students how to be better workers and how to work together.

I think that for many years we have held to the notion that school is a process by which an individual learns to work alone on tasks in a quiet way, producing a product competitive with others, and that model often does, in fact, initiate conflict, so that we are trying to balance those models out with cooperative ones that can help young people see how working together can be productive for them.

Following on that, we do a widespread training in
conflict resolution, and we have a program that we have been assisting in developing by community boards, which is the Conflict Managers Program. These are young people who are training themselves to be arbitrators. They are taught active listening skills, they are taught paraphrasing and clarifying skills, they are taught to mediate and arbitrate conflicts. They wear little t-shirts, they go through a training process, and when there is a conflict on the schoolyard or in the hallways, the students know to go and get them, because they will help settle the difference of opinion. And that is another one of those preventative models that I think we as adults could look well at, in terms of serving our own conflicts and our own problems with violence and prejudice.

The conflict resolution skills are also skills that we are beginning to bring into training for teachers, because we found that we couldn't ask our youngsters to do something that we as adults were unable to do, and that the degree of conflict that was existing in faculties between teachers, between parents and teachers, between administrators and teachers made that difficult for us to achieve.

In addition, we also provide training in something called Cultural Language and Learning Styles, in which we look at the learning differences between African American, Asian American and Latino American students, and find ways by which teachers can gain skills in dealing with particular world view and attitudes related to social behavior and play, and the expression of language.

We are also developing strands that have to do with
cultural diversity itself, which is providing history, social studies and expressive art information and training from a variety of points of view, because we have found that the textbooks are at least ten years behind the demographic reality of our State and of our community.

We have special programs that cross over into gender and sexuality issues in collaborative training with the AIDS Curriculum and Health Project, in which we provide cross-cultural information on attitudes about sexuality, and we are engaged in developing, and have been for the last four years, an advisor's program, which are adults who advise in middle and elementary school crisis intervention for at risk youth.

We have a section here that documents the ways in which we provide linguistic support for youngsters from immigrant and refugee backgrounds, because we have found that our new scapegoat consists of two groups; one has to with the issues of homophobia and gender, and the other has to do with the immigrant or refugee students. Those two areas are areas that we are beginning service in, but I think have probably, if we were going to self-critique, the longest way to go. We have dealt with some gender issues; we have not been able to find as easy a way to deal with sexual lifestyles, because we are dealing with sometimes traditional communities whose own attitudes and values about sexuality, vis-a-vis religion and lifestyle, often make it hard for us to adjust those differences of opinion.

I have emphasized heavily the training, because I do believe that we are engaged in a future movement; that the
youngsters who come through our doors now are the future of this country and of this state, and the demographic shifts and the gender shifts and the economic shifts that are taking place mean that we cannot give them skills based on our own life experiences, but we have to give them skills for a life we have not yet imagined. That means that we are struggling a bit ourselves to loosen the blinders that we have, and to find new ways to reach out and to provide that kind of support.

I will leave the binder. The binder has in it a number of the particular training models that we used. It has catalogues that will provide for you the video and print material that we use, and I really don't have time to respond in depth now to the proposal. But like the mental health system, I think we, too, are in positive support of the notion of assistance in monitoring prejudice based violence, so that we can be more specific about how we direct our responses in interventions.

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

COMMISSIONER PIVNICK: I have two questions. One is at what age or grade level do you begin your conflict resolution skills?

MS. MESA-BAINS: We begin them in elementary schools, so we have some schools in which first graders have been trained. Part of it relies on language ability, the ability to talk to another student, and to negotiate the problem, so we have found that going below first grade is often not as easy. But we have introduced a conflict
resolution curriculum for all students, and that is 17 skills that are part of a world view of ways of looking at relationship, interaction and conflict, and the resolution of it, that we don't want to eliminate conflict, but we want to put conflict in a resolving potential for these young people. The curriculum goes all the way from kindergarten through high school.

COMMISSIONER PIVNICK: My second question. You indicated a great deal in the way of training for teachers and administrators, and I am very pleased to hear that. The question is, are teachers obliged to enroll in those classes, or is this voluntary on their part?

MS. MESA-BAINS: This is that big mandatory question. We do not have staff development that is mandatory, but we have targeted schools that are under court order mandate, and in those particular schools, we can in fact more effectively provide and emphasize the training. Also, some of our training models, such as TESA, really do rely on the voluntary notion. So we do a lot of orientation and preparation, sometimes a year before we try to introduce a training strand. Because some of these really rely on individuals identifying in themselves a need that they have to learn to be different, for their teachers to identify that they want to change, and to simply put it on them we have found gets us nothing more than resistance and in the end a kind of wasted effort. So, we try to balance between mandatory practices and engagement in empowerment processes with the school staff.
COMMISSIONER PIVNICK: I'd like to make a statement related to that. In the beginning of last year, I was invited to come to a school and serve as a moderator, and shortly after I was there one of the teachers raised his hand and said, "I don't know why we're going through all this, we don't need this." He definitely needed it. I am a little concerned about those who profess that they don't need it when in fact they do, and how it's possible to get at that type of teacher or administrator. It is a real concern.

MS. MESA-BAINS: It is the unending difficulty of any staff development program, but it once again goes back to the notion of having the resources to work with people in settings in which they do not feel obliged to defend their sense of inadequacy by maintaining that they don't need something. We have found that the very same people that have said that to us, given the opportunity for us to come in and work with them in small planning groups, will in time reveal to us in fact that they have need. But in large scale groups with large scale interventions, you will almost never reach the people who in fact really need to make the change.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Mr. Owyang, did you have a question?

MR. O sails, did you have a question? I wanted you to comment on something, but I wanted to give you a little preface first. I attended the public schools here in San Francisco before the integration lawsuit and before Lau v. Nichols, and the elementary school I attended was, I would guess, over 95% Chinese, so I couldn't have had a white friend, or a Latino friend or a black friend if I had looked for one. By the time
we got to high school, I think we were so set in our patterns
that we essentially self-segregated. My guess is that a lot
of high schools are still like that. If you go into the yard
or to the cafeteria, kids will be sitting with kids of their
own groups.

Given that background, some of these things that we
talked about sound good, and very positive, but I wonder if
you can comment on whether San Francisco parents like myself
can really have confidence that these things are working, when
we read in the papers that the School Board is divided into
two factions; the white ladies and the minorities. Are these
things really having a positive impact?

MS. MESA-BAINS: We like to think we act better than
that.

(LAUGHTER)

We are very aware of the fact that those shifts are
taking place. A perfect example is within the Chinatown area.
The Commodore Stockton School, which was for many years 99.5% Chinese. The largest community going in there are Latinos.
They have some things in common, they have some very different
attitudes about discipline, some very different practices in
child rearing, different linguistic bases. So, there are
things that we have to do. Simply moving bodies around
doesn't make it happen. The only time integration takes place
when we are trying to develop new, inclusive attitudes, is
when we can work in a very specific and targeted way with the
communities that are represented in that school. Often, it is
the adults, the parents, the teachers who have been there for
ten years, the paraprofessionals who have been there for 25 years, who have the hardest time changing, and it is rarely ever the youngsters. The youngsters are still at a stage in which their openness and their enthusiasm for each other is quite great. By high school, those things are set in, but that's specifically why I think, and I brought some material on student advisory councils, the immigrant societies, the groups that pair newcomers with kids who have been here a long time. All of those projects in secondary schools; the student advisor's programs are really essential in finding structured ways by which students can come together. Because if you leave people to their own devices, given their upbringing and given the conditions of their community, they will not necessarily come together. So, I think that we do in fact have a great job ahead of us.

I do believe, and perhaps it's overly optimistic, that the public schools are the only place in which the concentrated effort to prepare for the 21st Century in terms of world citizenship can ever take place, because it is publicly monitored and it is publicly accountable. And the funds that go in must in fact document certain practices. That is not true in private areas. And so, I feel very strongly that if we as a society are sincere about preparing our youngsters, then we need to put our efforts and our energies and our focus on public schools. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much, Ms. Mesa-Bains. Our next speaker is Professor Ken Monteiro, from San Francisco State University.
MR. MONTEIRO: Good evening, I am Professor Kenneth Monteiro, Department of Psychology, San Francisco State University and also a member of the University President's Commission on Human Relations, which focused on racism and other forms of discrimination.

I think I may have been invited as slightly different from some of the other members. I am neither here as a direct representative of the President of the University, nor as a specific spokesman of the Commission. I think I was invited as a member of that community who was available, who happened to be familiar with what was happening with the Commission, which has a charge that overlaps with, but it may be more expansive than the group here, and has concerns that are similar.

So, I put that out there first so that you know when I narrow my comments and I do not make broad, sweeping generalizations about all parts of the University, or speak on behalf of the University. I won't be doing those sorts of things. I am not talking about from the perspective of someone who makes policy at the University.

First, but I know that you did want me to comment partially on my involvement in the Commission. We are interested, concerned and sometimes even appalled by what we find in terms of violent actions that are motivated by hatred, prejudice, or other forms of discrimination, and so I find your panel both very important and timely that you're dealing with it here in this city.

San Francisco State has a population of students
that looks very much like the City of San Francisco. The staffing, faculty and other administrative structure of the University do not necessarily represent the same breadth and diversity. I think that is also similar to the City of San Francisco. Within that kind of a context, we face the same sorts of difficulties in trying to address the varied needs and to protect the varied interests of our student population, as our institution is only beginning to evolve to reflect that group.

Our Commission was set up a little less than a year ago, and our report in due in two months. I will not be giving you hints of what the contents of that report may be. More what I'd like to do today is tell you how we came about, what our charge was, how we went about looking at the charge, because I think that that has some impact on the kinds of information and what you can do with the information that you get, and some observations from that experience that came after being part of the process.

Our Commission, very quickly, determined that we needed to have a very broad based study, a very broad based look at race related and other forms of discrimination, in terms of gender, sexual orientation, religion, sexual harrassment and disability. I begin with race because the motivation of the Commission originally came from a study that was derived from criticisms brought by several ethnic minorities about race related incidents on campus. That was added by another study associated with sexual orientation with a gay/lesbian organization, who brought issues to the
importance, but not that flavor.

So we included open forums similar to these, which do give us sometimes information, but people tend to be a bit more academic, even when encouraged, a little vague and a little protective, not only of themselves, but sometimes out of a politeness, protective of the person who actually might have committed the insult to them.

There are also confidential hearings, and also the community is encouraged to do anonymous write-ins of descriptions of things that may have occurred to them.

The variety of forms brought us varieties of information, maybe even more dramatically so than we expected, and informally I can tell you that in talking to students, faculty and staff, depending on how extreme the incident was to them, the more extreme the incident, the less likely you were to get it into public forum; the less likely you were to get it in any case where the person's identity might be found, because often times their concern was not only with the original incident, but that the possibility of exposing themselves that way may be dangerous to them. And that's an issue of not only the violence that is perpetrated against an individual, but in coming forward, are they protected in a way that more violence or other sorts of acts cannot be perpetrated against them for being so open. That was a concern of the Commission and continues to be one, a very serious one.

Subject matter. I already mentioned race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability,
and sexual harrassment was taken out as an issue related to
gender, but somewhat separate from it, because it appeared to
have an importance that wasn't just about discrimination, it
wasn't just about dislike or subjugation, it also had to do
with a violent act that needed to be studied independently.

Who did we study? And this is probably the most
difficult, and I'm not sure how satisfied we could be with who
we studied. It was very difficult; we wanted to study pure
peer relationships among students, among staff, among faculty.
We also wanted to cross those categories, faculty/staff,
faculty/student. We wanted to look at our classroom
situations, our services, and in so doing, study both the
formal structures and the informal descriptions of what
happens when someone walks into that setting. That also meant
that the Commission found that we were in the position of self-
study. Before we even walked out of the rooms we found
ourselves with the difficulty of how does one get through the
defenses that are immediately brought up when the light is
turned on itself.

How satisfied, I will see in a couple months when we
do our report, but an important part of that process was to
understand that without the self study, even initially, the
other studies were not going to make an awful lot of
difference, because we were always going to be looking under
someone else's lamp post. That will also mean that they will
be dimming the lights under their lamp post when you come.

The recomendations. Though I can't speak to the
types of recommendations or the actual recommendations that
were made, the types of recommendations I think I can speak to
without saying anything that will be out of place.

One is, we do know that we will be making
recommendations in changes in structure. That means personnel
and policies that allow better oversight of the specific kinds
of things that people told us were happening, not just the
sorts of things that we thought were happening. In a change
of structure, we're not only going to be recommending such
structures that would watch these changes, but also changes
that would put teeth in the regulation of these changes. And
I start there because if there is no obvious structural
change, it will be difficult to communicate to our community
that serious change is occurring. If we're not willing to
change what's on the books, and we're not willing to change
what's happening in our offices, we can't go out to the rest
of the community and say, well, what we'd like is people to
sit nicely, talk nicely, and maybe we wouldn't hit one
another, hurt one another, harm one another.

Some changes in training to sensitize; workshops,
seminars that are mentioned in other proposals, and also,
because of the nature of institution, not only in relationship
to our students and our faculty, but in the fact that we are
socializing adults to come back out into the community. There
will be recommendations about changes in academic preparation.
Explicitly, and this is hopefully going to get me to my wrap-
up comment, the academic preparation, not just that we
sprinkle a few points about sexual orientation, about culture,
about race, about disability, into our classes, but that in
fact we change the nature of the training about the
empowerment and the validity of each of these groups in the
academic curriculum, such that when you leave the University,
you don't think about it as nice to deal with some other
unique or exotic group, but that you understand that another
group empowered with full responsibilities, but also rights,
is what sits across the table from you. And that challenge is
the greatest one for the University, because that's the nature
of our enterprise.

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

COMMISSIONER LOCKHART: Regarding your study, I
wondered if you would give just a few facts about the
duration, and whether it was in-house, and something about the
number of person hours or what you think it may have cost.

MR. MONTEIRO: Some of those things I can answer,
some I can't. It's a year-long study total, in terms of the
amount of time for the whole study. Much of it is in-house in
that the Commission itself is in-house; it's University,
faculty, staff and students. The survey and some of the data
collection and analysis is not done by the Commission, in
other words, we farmed that out to a consulting agency that
does that. The exact cost on that I couldn't give you, but
they're available. The person you might contact is Olive
James, who is the Chair of the Commission, who is unavailable
right now, but she would be in another week or so, and she'd
have the exact figures on what the surveying costs were.

A year, though it appears to be a long time, since
the Commission, our Commission is a set of people who have full-time jobs teaching at that University or working there, it turns out that the amount of information that we were collecting, it was a rapid pace. Unfortunately, if you really want to impact policy, you do need to move that fast or faster, probably. We have a little bit more luxury at the University, because studies usually at Universities take years, not one year.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Ms. Wu?

MS. WU: I just had a quick question in terms of -- does the University have a mechanism for people in the community to report hate crimes, or prejudiced biases against them? And do you think the University will be committed to carrying out what you recommend in your report? Or do you think it's just kind of window-dressing?

MR. MONTEIRO: The first question - the Commission is open to comment from anyone, actually. We did not go off campus to study activities that were happening off campus, because that was not part of our charge. But there are people that come to the University who are not necessarily in one of those few categories, in yet they experience the community. One example is that we have people who may come on campus for services. They may, and I think in a couple of cases did, bring information to the University, but that's rare.

The second point, which is an important one, is will the University act on it. The President has given his - well, the President is who convened the Commission. Now, whether the President or the rest of the University will act on our
recommendations or not, I can't tell you that. What I can
tell you is that members of the Commission are also active
members of that academic community and the broader academic
community, and we are not only seeing ourselves as the writers
of a report, but we also see ourselves as the people who will
be there after the report is published, to ask for
accountability.

Now, accountability does not guarantee that you will
get it, but it seems that the Commission's report is being
brought into the community that is waiting for it, and with
enough active forces in it that inaction will not be ignored.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much, Professor
Monteiro. Our next speaker is Ann Noel from the California
Fair Employment and Housing Commission. Before you begin to
speak, Ann, I just want to acknowledge and thank the State
Fair Employment and Housing Commissioner Georgia McGee for
coming tonight. It has really been extremely helpful for us
to have the participation and assistance of the Commission
staffpeople, and we greatly appreciate your interest and look
forward to working together.

MS. NOEL: My name is Ann Noel, and I am Commission
Counsel, as you said, with the California State Fair
Employment and Housing Commission. I would like to say that
it has been our pleasure working with the San Francisco Human
Rights Commission and also the Coalition for Civil Rights, and
we thank you for holding this Hearing.

We are the State civil rights agency, and we
adjudicate discrimination complaints on the basis of
employment and housing under the Fair Employment and Housing Act, public accommodations under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, and specific to what we're here about tonight, the right to be free from prejudice based violence, under the Ralph Civil Rights Act.

The Ralph Act provides that all Californians, all person within the jurisdictions of the State, have the right to be free from any violence or threat of violence committed against their persons or property because of their race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, political affiliation, sex, sexual orientation, age, disability, or position in a labor dispute. These categories are considered illustrative rather than restrictive.

I wanted to tell you and also the audience that there are penalties for violating the Ralph Act, and redress for victims of hate violence, and those include actual damages that a victim of hate violence suffers, plus the possibility of three times that amount, at the discretion of a jury or a court trying the case; a civil penalty of up to $10,000.00, which goes to the victim, and the possibility of a restraining order against the perpetrators of the violence. That restraining order can be sought if there is a pattern or practice of discrimination by the District Attorney, or the City Attorney in San Francisco.

As part of the our Commission - in my presentation, when I say Commission, I just want to be clear, I'm talking about the Fair Employment and Housing Commission. I know it can get confusing. As part of our duties, we take public
testimony, and we also conduct hearings on issues such as the problem of hate violence. And we have held such public forums in all parts of the State, and specifically, two detailed hearings in the last three years in Oceanside in San Diego County, and also in Concord in Contra Costa County.

We've also monitored testimony that the Attorney General's Commission on Racial, Ethnic, Religious and Minority Violence has conducted, and I can tell you that from that we have heard testimony, to cite just only a few examples, of violence such as we have experienced in San Francisco, all over California; this is a Statewide problem. We have heard about violence blacks and migrant Latino workers in San Diego County, Asians in Santa Clara County, gays and lesbians in San Francisco, and Jews in Los Angeles County. We have also heard testimony of cross burnings on the lawns of black families in Los Angeles, Alameda, and Orange Counties, and of swastikas painted on synagogues throughout the State.

We have also heard testimony, both pro and con, about efforts that different communities are making to respond to and prevent hate violence, and we try, wherever possible, to get involved in working on that, and hence our work in San Francisco.

From that testimony and the Commission's own work and the work of others, we are devising a comprehensive packet of information and suggestions for strategies for communities to use to respond to and prevent hate violence. The packet will include model protocols for school districts, police departments, and District Attorney offices, culled from those
developed by several different communities in the State.

A key to our development of this packet we hope will be the model plan devised by San Francisco Human Rights Commission and also the Coalition for Civil Rights. We are very excited about the development of this, and we really see San Francisco as a great model for the rest of the State.

We hope to include in this packet also a brochure that we have developed, of which I will leave copies for the Commission, which we worked with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, which is our sister State agency that accepts complaints of discrimination. It's called Your Right to Freedom From Violence - What California Laws Protect That Right, and I'll get into it a minute for benefit of Commissioner Gillette and also the other Commissioners - the answer to your question about what laws are needed or what laws are available to deal with this problem, criminal laws as well as civil.

We intend to distribute this along with hopefully a resource bibliography list of various useful agencies, experts and publications in this area. We will draw on the expertise of the Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, a representative from whom we heard yesterday, and also, we hope, information on how private attorneys can represent hate crime victims.

When the Coalition for Civil Rights initially got together about a year ago to discuss doing work in this area, one of the motivations, as Mary Dunlap knows, and others who worked on this, is that we wanted to figure out how private
attorneys could represent hate crime victims. We haven't forgotten that as part of our interest and charge, and we are going to work on that, and we hope to work with people in San Francisco on that. Finally, we want to update this information periodically, as appropriate.

Other things that the Commission is involved with, and we hope to work with others on this, are our public service announcements, which we hope to put out statewide on the problem of hate violence and possibilities of what people can do. We have also worked closely with the Attorney General's office and also the California District Attorneys Association on educating District Attorneys statewide on taking these cases seriously. Also, we are working wherever possible with other Human Rights Commissions besides San Francisco's, to develop information. We spoke at the Statewide Conference of Human Rights Organizations last year on this. We are also trying, wherever possible, to work with other community groups.

Obviously, we consider this a very important problem, and we are really eager and anxious to work wherever possible with others.

Finally, I'd have to say that one of our pet projects is to develop a victim hot line, to take calls in this area to coordinate information.

I wanted to say to those of you in the audience who have been victims of hate crimes, I only have a few copies of this brochure with me, but if I don't have enough I will take your name and make sure that you get one. The brochure goes
into telling you what you can do if you have been a victim of
hate crime, in terms of possible penal code violations that
might be applicable, and also how to deal with it civilly.

To go into what Commissioner Gillette wanted to know
about the penal code and potential laws that are needed or not
needed or are there already that deal with this, the Attorney
General two years ago sponsored the Baines Civil Rights Act,
which a couple of people have referred to, and it provides for
enhanced penalties in a number of areas, to change from
misdemeanors to felonies crimes where the person's motivation
is because of prejudice, in a number of different categories.
It also provides that it's a misdemeanor to interfere by
force or the threat of force with a person's constitutional
rights, because of a person's race, color, ancestry, national
origin, or sexual orientation.

This law was designed to fill in the holes, and
really provide a very comprehensive model to deal with this
problem, so that people weren't falling through the cracks
because there wasn't a penal code section that applied, and
also to take into account that defacement on somebody's
property, because of, for example, because of someone's race
or religion is a very different crime than just someone coming
along and scrawling their name in general, and it has a very
different effect on the victim.

So, this is supplementing other laws that were
already on the books, and one of the things that we've done in
conjunction with the Attorney General's office is try to get
the word out to Police Departments and to District Attorneys
to take these sections seriously and to use them, or otherwise they don't do any good.

Another Bill that has passed through the work of the Attorney General is Diane Watson's Bill, which requires all police departments in this State to now record hate crimes as statistics. There is other legislation which I don't have time to get into right now - and I'm going to have to heed the bell - that did not pass in the last session, that should have passed, and a lot of it deals with really requiring teaching tolerance in schools. And from the testimony that we've heard from Amalia Mesa-Bains, that may not be needed in San Francisco, but it's certainly needed in other parts of the State.

Finally, I'll just say in one sentence, I'd like to acknowledge, since Marty Mercado up in the AG's office could not appear here tonight, she's ill, that the Attorney General has really been a leader in this area. We have a lot of these good laws on the books because of the leadership of the AG's office. They've had a commission in effect for several years to look into this problem called the Racial/Ethnic/Religious/Minority Violence Commission, and even though the name doesn't indicate it, they've also tracked violence against gays and lesbians, and they've also had a Commission on Asian/Pacific Islander issues of violence against those groups. I can't say enough, actually, for the work that they've done, and we very much appreciate it and enjoyed working with them in this area.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much. Commissioner
Gillette.

COMMISSIONER GILLETT: Thank you for that information. Now I want to ask you do you have any statistics that would indicate the number of times those sections of the penal code were used to prosecute, and whether it was successful?

MS. NOEL: No, we don't, and part of the reason why is that Senator Diane Watson's Bill just passed this last Session, and so there were no statistics kept. We have the possibility of getting those statistics from the San Francisco Police Department, because they have kept track of those statistics from the last few years, and also in Contra Costa. I take that back - Los Angeles County's Human Relations Commission has kept statistics. So we have some information. We do not have Statewide information. Hopefully in the next couple of years we will have that information. We will monitor it.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Commissioner Graff.

COMMISSIONER GRAFF: Does the Department handle individual complaints under the Ralph Act?

MS. NOEL: The theory is yes, that they do. The practice has been no, they do not. It has changed, and they are saying that they will now accept those cases. We are monitoring that, because we are concerned that we are putting information out that might not in reality be the truth. But they supposedly are accepting those cases.

COMMISSIONER GRAFF: It has been my experience in working with the Department that frequently the message
doesn't get down.

MS. NOEL: Yes, I am very well aware of that, yes.

COMMISSIONER GRAFF: Has the problem been the uncertainty of the directive, or not enough resources financially; not enough people? Can you talk about that?

MS. NOEL: In the past, I can tell you that the policy was that they didn't want to accept Ralph Act complaints because their feeling was their consultants were not criminal investigators and they did not want to subject their consultants to dealing with perpetrators of violent crimes, and so that was the reason. Also, the difficulty of when you have an anonymous perpetrator, figuring out who it is. But where the perpetrator is known now, they are supposedly handling those cases, and, when they do not, they are supposed to consult with the Attorney General's office, which has said that they will handle the cases.

I am asking anyone who attempts to go file a complaint with the Department to let me know and check back with me, so I will know if it got accepted or not.

COMMISSIONER GRAFF: And if the complaint is successfully prosecuted, does the Department have the authority to issue an award of damages and counsel fees?

MS. NOEL: Yes. The Department doesn't; the Commission does. And I'm hesitating only because we have actually handled a case, because they have never brought us a case. So they've all been subtle, which with any court system, and administrative agencies are no different, we have very few cases that actually come to you; the majority are
settled. But there have been so few cases of Ralph Act cases that we have not yet seen a Ralph Act case.

COMMISSIONER GRAFF: So, part of your public information campaign now will also be to make sure that citizens are informed that they have the right to file this kind of complaint with the Department.

MS. NOEL: Yes, and that's actually in this brochure, which was prepared with the active assistance and work of the Department, which gives me hope that maybe it's going to change. And I know that they have done training of their consultants in San Francisco now, so they're supposed to be expecting the cases.

COMMISSIONER GRAFF: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Ms. Dunlap.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: I just wanted to make sure that Ann Noel doesn't leave here tonight without knowing that every one of us on this panel greatly appreciates the work that she has done to make sure that this forum happens. We are really grateful, Ann.

MS. NOEL: Thank you. With the people I have been working with, it has actually been fun.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Thank you very much. We do have a scheduled break, and I want to stress that tonight we are going to try to keep very strictly to ten minutes. I want to especially ask panelists to be back here in ten minutes, because we are running behind, and we are going to try to stick to our schedule. Before everyone leaves the room, if you want to give public testimony, please be sure
to sign up at the table that is right outside the door. And also, if you did not sign in when you came in when you came in this evening, we would ask that you do that, even if you signed in last night. We're just trying to keep track of how we're reaching people.

Thank you very much, and we will reconvene in ten minutes.

(OFF RECORD -- BRIEF RECESS)
CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: We will continue with our testimony at this time. I have asked Alan Tafapolsky to come forward.

MR. TAFAPOLSKY: For the record, my name is Alan Tafapolsky. This past summer, I worked as an intern at the Human Rights Commission of San Francisco, and one of the principal tasks which I undertook was to investigate what kind of comprehensive programs existed elsewhere in the United States, in order to combat growing incidents of bias related "hate violence," or bias related behavior.

After making a sweeping, but my no means thorough survey, I realized a shocking thing, and that was that San Francisco, the so-called most progressive City in the country, was in fact one, two, and in some cases ten year behind other major metropolises in terms of its ability to respond to and to prevent occurrences of hate violence.

Now why has San Francisco lagged behind such cities as New York, Boston, Baltimore and St. Louis, and counties such as Montgomery County in Maryland, or San Francisco's neighbor to the east, Costa Contra County?

Are the concerned populations of those aforementioned areas more politically active than San Franciscans? I don't think so. Are the politicians, city and county agencies more efficient and more morally committed to a prejudice free and safe society than San Francisco's agencies? I don't think so.

The important factor, the common denominator which inspired the genesis of all these other hate violence
reduction programs was tragedy. Busing in Boston, the Howard Beech incident in New York, Klan organizing in the Baltimore area, and what will be San Francisco's tragedy that will finally move this City to organize in order to respond to a disaster that could touch off widespread community violence?

I will leave the scenario to your imagination, but believe me, it's out there in the form of gay bashing, anti-Asian violence, anti-Semitism, abuse of undocumenteds, the list is really too large to enumerate. Behavior in the City has already reached new levels of tension, in both the level of force used by law enforcement to quell these protests, as well as the disrespect shown for officers of the law by dissidents, contributes to a situation where sole reliance on the police force to assuage the situation is at best questionable.

The time for comprehensive action to avert such a disaster is now. The model of action needs to be specific to San Francisco's unique problems and demography, but pieces of other already implemented programs in the country provide valuable resource tools for a San Francisco concerted plan.

There are two fundamental features to any effective hate violence reduction model. Each hate violence model must have a reactive and a proactive capacity. The reactive capacity includes features that help the victim of a bias related crime or incident. This might be an expedited police response, it might be assistance to the victim in terms of support groups or mental health counseling, as well as timely and diligent prosecution of the civil rights offender.
The proactive capacity consists of the education and the organization of a community in order to warn off prejudicial acts and promote bias free behavior. A hate violence neighborhood watch, multi-cultural education programs in the schools, and the existence of extensive reporting systems and tough penalties for would-be perpetrators are some of the features of the proactive side of the model. And of course, the proactive and the reactive overlap and work symbiotically in order to produce the whole hate violence reduction program.

I will now give some synopses of a few hate violence reduction programs that exist elsewhere in the United States.

Boston - From busing to today's Stuart case, Boston has been the focus of much media attention. It has been labeled a racist city; quite frankly, I believe that there are living in Boston who are racists. I also believe that in every other metropolitan area, including San Francisco, there are racists. The difference is that in Boston there are citizens, public agencies and law enforcement officials working together organizing a fight against bias related behavior.

The Boston program utilizes a bureau of its Police Department, the Community Disorders Unit, as the hub of its plan to battle hate violence. The Community Disorders Unit consists of 12 officers, four detectives and two sergeants, as well as a civilian staff consisting of secretaries and translators. It acts in a proactive fashion, by organizing neighborhood hate violence watches, participating in minority
community meetings, visiting schools at all grade levels, and training fellow police officers in the Massachusetts area in dispute resolution, cultural sensitivity, and in a thorough understanding of the procedures to be followed when a civil rights law has been broken.

As part of its reactive capacity, the unit charts bias incidents and bias crimes, and keeps accurate statistics of those figures. The unit has its own hate violence hotline response mechanism, which is separate from 9-1-1. It cooperates with the Human Rights Commission, mental health agencies, and maintains close liaison with the District Attorney's office in order to provide victim assistance.

Now, while, as we can see from the Stuart case, the Boston Community Disorders Unit is not a perfect program to combat hate violence, statistics show that its existence and its efforts have helped to decrease the amount of incidents of hate violence in the Greater Boston Area.

New York - New York has two problems. It has the manifestations of prejudice; racism, homophobia, anti-Semitism, Black/Hispanic gang wars, and it also has the problem of having more people in its jurisdiction than any other city in the United States, thus magnifying the scope of the problem. Its method of attack against these disadvantages is organization through a hierarchical structure. The Board of Education, the New York Police Department and the City's Human Relations Commission have organized in a Task Force coordinated by the Mayor's office. This Task Force in turn organizes the clergy, schools, community organizations and
community boards, and particularly hate violence prone neighborhoods, in order to respond to an atmosphere of bias related tension.

The trained community then more readily responds with reactive and proactive programs to stem the flow of hate violence. It prescribes solutions unique to each particular area of the city and problems which confront that area. Also, in a reactive capacity, the New York Police Department has a central bias-related Crimes Unit, and on the proactive side, as of this year has implemented a long-term multi-cultural educational program for all grade levels, which promote bias free learning from kindergarten on.

Montgomery County in Maryland - and this is the initial program that Joan Weiss set up some years ago. Montgomery County does not deal with the problem of proportion that is uniquely New York's. It instead attempts to reach every member of the community by direct contact, either by the Sheriff's office or by the Human Relations Commission, or by both. The HRC and the Police Department share information on all bias related incidents and crimes. The police and the HRC both work with the schools' specially formed Human Relations Department, as well as Network of Neighbors, that provide both support to victims as well as keeping a proactive watch for the signs of prejudice in their communities. A network of teens provides the same information to the HRC and to the Sheriff's Department, but at the juvenile level, which so often goes unnoticed by adult eyes.

Both the HRC and the Police Department work closely
with the Justice Department, and the District Attorney, in
order not only to prosecute perpetrators of hate violence, but
in the case of youth offenders, to help re-educate and
rehabilitate them, performs a kind of juvenile training school
so that they can rehabilitate the hate violence perpetrators
at a young age.

The HRC and the police also work closely with
community organizations to provide victim assistance and
educational programs promoting bias free behavior in specially
targeted communities.

There are many features which must be incorporated
into an effective hate violence program, and I have not
mentioned these for the sake of time. A strong legislative
underpinning executive support; the need to get the Mayor's
office behind this; the necessity of accurate and efficient
reporting systems; as well as analysis of those reports in
order to predict trends in bias related incidents. Dispute
resolution training, and most importantly, the recruitment of
the necessary monetary and personnel resources in order to
successfully implement a program. I think that Fred Persily
will speak to some of these in his presentation.

Lastly, I hope that San Francisco will consider some
of the aspects of the abovementioned models, and use this
information in order to immediately start building a hate
violence reduction program of its own. If something is not
done now, the City known as the Progressive City will in the
future become known as the racist, homophobic, sexist City.
San Francisco should avoid this at all costs.
CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Are there questions from the panel? Thank you so much, especially for the extensive nature of that study, very useful to us.

We would like now to hear from Ron Berman.

MR. BERMAN: My name is Ron Berman, and I am here as President of the Board of the Pacific Central Division of the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith. I had hoped that Richard Hershot, our Executive Director, could have been here tonight. But he's busy, all too busy these days, which is probably why we're all here.

I would like to thank the Commission for inviting us here to talk about one of the models that is really a nationwide model right now, as well as something that's being used in the Bay Area.

Several of the earlier speakers mentioned something that is all too obvious, but it's very important; it's the importance of programs aimed at our school kids. We all know that prejudice is a disease that must be treated early in an individual to be really effective. Better yet, we can prevent prejudice later in life, before it takes deep roots in an individual, when we get to these children and show them that there is a joy in diversity. It is nothing to be feared, but something to be appreciated.

That's what this program is all about. The program I am mentioning is called A World of Difference. A World of Difference. A World of Difference, by the way, started in Boston. We borrowed it, stole it, whatever you want to call it, for San Francisco, through the Anti-Defamation League, and
it's in, I think, about 18 cities throughout the United States right now.

Its centerpiece is a teacher/student study guide, which is used to teach and sensitize school children to appreciate and understand people of other races, religions and sexual preferences. This is the study guide; I won't read the whole thing now, because you'd go crazy ringing the bell, but it's quite an extensive study guide, covering an awful lot.

This study guide, by the way, has been well received by over 3,000 teachers right here in the Bay Area, and these teachers have been trained in special sessions to use this guide, not only in class, but to use it in handling prejudice in the classroom and schoolyard, as it comes up. So, it's more than a study guide; it really also sensitizes the teacher to handle special situations. In fact, I am very happy to say that it started out as a one or possibly two-year program, and right now it's in its second year and we have retained a part-time trainer who will insure a pretty good second year of teacher training in the teacher training component of this program.

The program here in the Bay Area has been sponsored by Safeway, the Koret Foundation, and Atari. I am not mentioning them to give them a plug, but these are expensive programs, and when you run a program like this it's terrific to get corporate sponsors. And what a wonderful thing for a corporation to get behind. It's been administered by the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, and it's been aided quite a bit by the Bay Area coalition.
The media has been a tremendous help in this also. KGO-TV has given A World of Difference over one million dollars worth of air time, in which they've had weekly public affairs programs, featuring A World of Difference segments. I would have to say the KGO News Department and their Publicity and their Public Affairs Departments has done an excellent job in celebrating of the ethnic diversity in the Bay Area.

A World of Difference has also been the theme of many local organizational dinners, featuring some innovative ethnic entertainment. We have had billboards that were donated to us by Gannett, outdoor, featuring the theme. We had wonderful Ethnic Images in the comics exhibit, which has now been seen by thousands of people at the Richmond Museum, a terrific kickoff. I was there with Morrie Turner - I don't know if you're familiar with him - from "Wee Pals". He kicked this whole thing off, and it was great, because here is man who really understands and appreciates our differences.

There was a school-based poster contest on A World of Difference, which has drawn entries throughout the Bay Area. It turned into this calendar, a fun calendar to have. When you go through a calendar and you see what the kids do and how they think, and we get them really involved with all of us being different and being together, you see that there is some hope in all of this, and there is a way of combatting this at an early age.

There has been various seminars and forums on prejudice featuring local personalities, and a very important spinoff on this program right here in San Francisco has been A
World of Difference training of the San Francisco Fire
Department on human relations issues.

    I believe it's a very good program. It's not
perfect; it won't halt hate crimes this week, but I think
programs like this in years to come will do a lot of good. I
hope something like A World of Difference spawns more programs
like it.

    Racial understanding is something that should be
taught at home at a very early age. Unfortunately, in many of
our homes the opposite is true. Programs like A World of
Difference just won't cure all the ills of bigotry, but
hopefully it will make a difference, maybe even a world of
difference. Thank you for letting me speak to you about this.

    CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much, Mr. Berman.
Are there questions from the panel? Commissioner Graff.

    COMMISSIONER GRAFF: Yes. I think that A World of
Difference Program is really an ambitious program. It seems
to be having a lot of success.

    I asked a question of another speaker last night,
about not including sexual orientation in the program, and
since that comment I have had conversations with other people
who have said other types of prejudice were not addressed
-- for example, gender and disabled, and not all types of
racial discrimination.

    I am wondering are there plans to be more inclusive,
specifically in the model educational curriculum?

    MR. BERMAN: I can't answer yes, that there are
absolute plans. There's been a lot of give-and-take on this;
an awful lot of give-and-take. As I say, this study guide is fairly inclusive; I wish I could say it's all inclusive. The bent of the Anti-Defamation League that created this is to fight racial prejudice. They are just getting, they, or we, being the ADL, in the past few years, have been pulled - and sometimes I will admit - kicking and screaming, into some new areas.

We have limited resources. I wish they were unlimited. We do the best we can, but if you see what's happening with the ADL and are following what's going on there, we've been very active in the Olympic Club affair. I think you'll see the ADL much more active in gay rights. I, for one, am somebody in the ADL who has addressed their national commission about gay rights, and even in specific cases. I haven't won yet, but we're gaining.

So, I would say that there is a good deal of hope that this will become more of an all inclusive program. I hope it will. It is not yet.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: How can we help you win? You have addressed the national board on the subject of its inclusion of other types of bias other than race bias, or other than particular kinds of race bias. Obviously, it is the essence of the charter of these two organizations working together to coalesce in dealing with the myriad, variegated mosaics kinds of hate based violence that this society faces.

What I want to know, and I would suspect the other panel members do as well, is how can we help you in the effort to become more inclusive in your program. Your program is a
model, and it is a model both in a positive and a negative sense, in this way. You know, as I do, that when one excludes a variable from treatment, the implication is that it's not a problem, the implication is that that type of violence is somehow less important. Consequently, it is in the best interest of everyone involved here to be of use to you in your battle, so you're not standing there by yourself arguing for a cause. What can we do?

MR. BERMAN: What we can do has already started to happen, at least in San Francisco, and I hope this becomes an Anti-Defamation League model, and I suspect it will. That is cross-pollenating, as far as boards and groups. Our Board actively sought and has obtained as a Board member someone who is very active in gay/lesbian rights. That's grassroots help right there.

There are those on our board who I think can easily be tapped the other way to get involved in this. Because how can you draw a line? We are talking about helping someone who is black; helping someone who is Hispanic; helping someone who is Jewish. Those same people are men and women of homosexual, heterosexual proclivities, and you can't draw a line. So, I think it has to come from the grassroots. If there are other ideas, I think we would be open to them.

I have already seen that the leadership of the ADL has become much more attentive in the past six months, and since this program started, because we were given some hell, and I think it was appropriate. I think they've become much more attentive to what's happening in the rest of the world,
beyond the racial problems.


COMMISSIONER CHINN: I was wondering what kind of attempts are made on a national level to tailor your program to different locales who have specific areas of concern, and if that's possible, how closely would you work with other community groups in order to develop the expertise you might need to tailor these programs?

MR. BERMAN: Let me take it from this point on, because we have already had a year and a half of history on that, although, first of all, there is some history to tailoring it to local communities, where there has seemed to be more problems, let's say, with the Hispanic area, there will be more emphasis on that, that kind of thing, that will happen. But I think it's a matter of monitoring what's happening, city-to-city. This was a national program. As I said, it started in Boston and was very well-organized. It hasn't solved all the problems of Boston yet. It won't solve all the problems, but it's going to help.

I think as we go forward, and we spend more time on this, we're going to get smarter on how to tailor it to local needs.

COMMISSIONER CHINN: I look forward to that.

MR. BERMAN: I look forward to it, too. This is a beginning.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Other questions for Mr. Berman?

Okay, thank you very much for your testimony, we appreciate it
very much.

We would now like to hear from Fred Persily, from Contra Costa County Human Relations Commission.

MR. PERSILY: Hi, my name is Fred Persily. I am Director of the Contra Costa County Human Relations Commission, and also the Coordinator for the Hate Violence Reduction Task Force in Contra Costa County. Before I start my remarks, I want to put them in context.

School is a place where kids learn to read, to write, add and multiply, where they can fantasize about being a doctor, firefighter or secretary. But it can also be a place where merciless taunts from others can lead them to hate themselves, their skin color, their religion, their gender.

The community is a place where people can have a small party, watch the 49ers, and make new friends, but it can also be a place where people are terrorized and afraid to leave their kids to play outside, or to sleep comfortably because they received threats from bigots.

The challenge facing us in this, the last decade of the second millenium, is to bring down the curtain on the bigotry that divides us and prepare our communities to foster an environment of peace and understanding. In other words, live the dream of the man whose birthday we celebrated earlier this week.

A description of the Contra Costa County Hate Violence Reduction Project formulated in response to recommendations made by the Attorney General's Commission on Racial, Ethnic, Religious and Minority Violence - we call that
the RERM Commission - should help you see how the core
elements of a program can be woven together to form an
integrated strategy for preventing and responding to hate
violence. I plan to summarize the features of what we're
doing in Contra Costa County and give you a little bit on how
they are being implemented.

First of all, we have a planning body called the
Hate Violence Reduction Task Force. That includes
representatives from criminal justice, schools, community
based organizations, religious institutions and other relevant
public agencies - Health and Human Services, local Human
Relations Commissions and Housing Authority, and we have
private groups involved, too.

The Task Force has three Committees - Criminal
Justice, Education and Community. Each Committee was
responsible for developing the policies and procedures in its
area of interest. So the Committees then came together once
they developed, once Criminal Justice decided what they wanted
to do, and Education decided what they wanted to do, and
Community Groups decided what they wanted to do, and then they
came together and said, okay, now, we all know what we have as
the important elements of ours, how are we going to put them
all together so that they work together?

The Criminal Justice Committee includes the District
Attorney, management level staff from the Sheriff's office,
from police departments, probation departments, victim witness
program, private (INAUDIBLE).

The Education Committee, and when I'm talking about
these Committees, now that a lot of them have accomplished what they set out to do, now they continue on as standing committees. The Education Committee includes representatives from School District offices, principals, California Teachers' Association, their local branch, the Parent Teachers' Association, and community organizations that are concerned with the schools.

The Community Committee includes representatives of churches, temples, community based organizations, particularly those that are ethnic based -- NAACP, Black Families Association, Hispanic Round Table, Japanese American Citizens League, Center for New Americans, etc., or those that are concerned with civil rights, and also the conflict resolution groups we have in the county. The Crisis Hotline is a part of it; the Housing Authority is part of it; Health Department; Human Relations Commissioners are part of it.

Their primary function, again, is to really create and then maintain. What they're doing now is beginning to maintain some of this cooperative effort for the whole community, the whole county to be involved in really dealing with bigotry and hopefully eliminating it.

So, what we have and what it has designed. The Hate Violence Reduction Task Force designed law enforcement policies, procedures and training for responding to hate crimes, so that now all the police departments and the Sheriff's Department use one single way of reporting these. They have one single type of response system, so that we can have a coordinated way for dealing with it. We have a little
more of a problem in Contra Costa County. I've got several police departments, 17 school districts, it's really a coordination problem that you wouldn't have here. You'd have other problems, but not that one.

We have specific District Attorney policies and procedures for the prosecution of hate crimes. Those include vertical prosecution - I was real pleased to hear that Arlo Smith created a Civil Rights Division, I hadn't heard of that in a local District Attorney's Office, but I didn't hear him say anything about vertical prosecution, I was wondering if he planned to include that.

We also have procedures for insuring that all public schools maintain curricula for promoting appreciation for diversity, and methods for resolving disputes without violence, so that every single school, primary, junior high and high school in Contra Costa County has a minimum standard of classwork that's involved in their English classes, dramatic arts, social studies and history, that deals with promoting appreciation for diversity.

I don't know any place else that has this - we have guidelines for how school staff can respond to hate incidents on the campus. In former lives, working with the State and places like that, I have come across hate incidents, gone and investigated them on school campuses, and doing what I do in Contra Costa. And pretty much very teacher is left to their own devices. Every school administrator, principal, is left to their own devices. If you are a custodian and you walk in and you see something happening in a restroom, what do you do
about it? Left to your own devices. Sometimes I've seen places where they're handled well; where after an incident there may be classes, some conflict resolution attempted, and things cool down.

But I've also seen times where administrators, trying to do the best thing, have tended really escalate incidents. And worse, and most often, I've seen attempts really just to put the lid on and pretend nothing's happening, to the extent that I know of one high school that was closed down because there was Klan activity outside, and when I talked to the Principal of the high school two days earlier, he said they had never racial problems in the school. You have a little bit of that, that denial.

One of the other things we have - that we have the plans for, we haven't implemented, we've got the training set up, but we haven't actually been able to do this, but we think it should be done - is training for religious institutions and community based organizations to provide assistance to victims of hate violence, just like CUAV.

Community United Against Violence provides support for people who might not normally call the police department; they'd feel more comfortable calling an organization where they feel they're going to find understanding and appreciation for their problem.

Well, in Contra Costa, I have had situations where I've had Vietnamese people and Laotian people who were really hesitant to come forward to the Police Department; a little less hesitant to come forward to me, but they'd really be
willing to make their complaints to the Laotian Church, to other community groups, that type of thing. We need to provide that kind of training. We have got curriculum developed, we haven't been able to provide the training yet.

We also have a plan for hosting get-togethers that we borrowed from Santa Ana, get-togethers in relaxed residential settings, to enable people to unlearn myths and stereotypes that provoke discrimination and bigotry. The idea of just having relaxed settings; having a place where ten or twelve people can come together who are different ethnic groups, different backgrounds, different lifestyles, and can just simply sit and talk, and begin to talk about those different lifestyles, so that the myths of this person being a terrible person, or this person being a God hater and all that type of thing can get thrown out the window.

Right now, in Contra Costa I am meeting with the youth that has been terrorizing a temple there, and he thinks they're devil worshipers and they're out to get them. We're getting into kinds of meetings where you can get past that type of thing.

Three projects we had on our wish list that we passed by because we're just not ready to deal with them. One was to really deal with the training of law enforcement officers and finding out what they felt they needed to work in multi-cultural communities where they felt they really had problems, and understanding, for example, how to work in a Southeast Asian community and getting people to come forward, or whatever it was, identifying what the needs were, and then
going and devising ways to provide that kind of training.

Another thing we wanted to, of course, and what we've been asked to do, it would be nice to do, is to provide school administrators and teachers with this assistance in understanding how to work with families and teach children who come from diverse backgrounds and cultures. If there is one thing I have heard from school superintendents, not only in Contra Costa County, but everywhere I go, it's "gee, we've got teachers who aren't used to teaching the students we have now. The demographics are changing. What we need is somebody to teach them how." A World of Difference Program is one of those kinds of methods, and I'm sure that we need to really work on other different kinds of strategies to do that.

The third thing that we wanted to do was to really get into the business of setting up programs designed to help perpetrators of hate violence realize that their actions not only destroy the lives of their targets, but themselves as well. I have done a lot of that on an individual basis. I am familiar with the program that Joan set up in Baltimore, the STOP program. I think there needs to be some way of adapting that kind of a program into a setting like San Francisco, I would hope, or maybe on a Bay Area regionwide basis.

Hate Violence Reduction Projects, such as the one in Contra Costa County and the one you can develop, can serve as laboratories for strategies to respond to and prevent hate crimes. If you have a uniform and efficient process for reporting incidents of hate violence, a central group, whether it be the Intergroup Clearinghouse or somebody else, can
assess what is happening and compliment the response of law enforcement.

The Hate Violence Reduction Project will be able to evaluate their own efforts and determine what works, what fails, what diverse communities need to counter violence motivated by bigotry. Regular reporting will reflect shifts in the nature and incidence of hate crimes, and provide information you need to design and implement anti-hate violence initiatives in a timely manner.

You know, some of the types of things that happen we don't pay attention to. I heard today some talk about Asians moving into housing projects under the Housing Authority that were primarily black, and the frictions. Well, somebody should have thought about that before it happened, and started working in developing programs to deal with it. A group that was actually sitting down and looking at the City and assessing what's going on could take a look at that and try to find programs. And there are programs. Richmond Housing Authority has a model program for dealing with those exact problems.

Let me finish my testimony by giving you an example of a real incident; first, how it actually happened, and then, how I hope it would be responded to now that our program in Contra Costa County is installed.

A number of years ago, a woman moved with her son and two daughters from a depressed ghetto area in Contra Costa County in the Richmond area, to a suburban area. The family was black. Her daughter was driven home from school by a
friend of hers, who was black, a boy. Two white teenagers got into a conversation with him, and the two white boys and the black kid wanted to trade beer for marijuana, that's what it was coming to. And the conversation ended in a fight. One of the white teenagers was beaten so badly that he was hospitalized.

This one incident wasn't motivated by prejudice, but what happened were these kids went to school, the white kids, and they talked about this black family that was coming around beating up their friends. Like wildfire, almost every black family became a target for white boys. The mother and her children were terrorized night and day.

Another home of a black family was shot at and bullets went through the front door. At another home, garbage was thrown into the swimming pool. At still another, a group of white youths filled the front yard and taunted a mother and a youth inside, daring them to come outside, and there were a number of those kinds of incidents that occurred.

Through the nightmare, the police responded as they would to incidents of malicious mischief and suspicious circumstances, because that's how they were called on the police report. The schools did nothing, despite calls from frantic parents. The incidents weren't even reported beyond the local Sheriff's office, and no note was taken until the families themselves called the newspapers and then held a press conference.

By this time, everyone in the country read about Tara Hills and the agencies were forced to go on the
defensive.

Now, how would it happen today? I hope today... I hope the fight would raise eyebrows of community leaders who were trained to prevent hate violence, and they would act to prevent the conflict from continuing right at the start. Or, if they weren't able to do that, by the time the rumors started spreading around school, the school staff would take quick action to dispel the rumors and get the truth out to the students.

I would hope the police would be there to disperse teams to canvas the neighborhood to find out if anything suspicious was occurring, give neighbors a number to report, and community groups would participate. And then, if incidents did occur, I would expect community organizations in the neighborhood, the police and the schools to meet together to draft plans for stopping any further activity.

Most of all, I hope that the mother that sought to raise her aspirations for her children by moving to another community wouldn't have had to sit there across from me at a table and say, "Would you still be here, Fred, if you were me? Would you still stay and listen to this kind of thing going on, and suffer from that?" She decided to move back, and I wish she wouldn't have. She decided to move back into the ghetto, where she felt protected.

I hope that wouldn't happen today, and I hope it never happens in San Francisco. Thank you. I am ready for questions.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Questions from the panel?
MR. WONG: The project in Contra Costa County kind of pulled together some very maybe uncommon partners in this Hate Violence Reduction Task Force. And my sense is a lot of the agencies did it voluntarily. I was wondering how you were able to do that. And for those who didn't do it voluntarily, what kind of stick did you use to get them to the table?

MR. PERSILY: Surprisingly enough, I didn't have to use a stick. The way I started that was I called a meeting. And I agree with you, it brings diverse people, and some people praise the work I'm doing, and it's kind of embarrassing to be praised by them, it kinds of bothers me a little bit.

But all I did, it was real simple. I publicized it all over the place, we're going to have a meeting to talk about stopping hate violence in Contra Costa County. I invited every County agency. I met with all the County department heads; I met with the Police Chiefs; I met with the County Superintendents and asked them to send people. Community groups I knew would come. We sat there and we talked about it, and we broke into the three committees, and it just went from that.

Now, it gained stature almost automatically because the people we had in there, some people would have viewed as safe. If you have a Sheriff's office or one Police Chief we had one Police Chief. Well then the other cops don't feel so bad about going in; well, it seems to be okay. It was a setting where that first meeting was real clear that we were going to work on doing something positive, and nobody was
going to take pot-shots. And so, I really didn't use a stick. I haven't had to use a stick in Contra Costa County.

CO-CHAIR DUNLAP: Other questions? Commissioner Bermudez.

COMMISSIONER BERMUDEZ: Earlier you stated that at one point you asked some of the officers what they felt they needed in terms of assistance, and I am wondering if you can elaborate on that.

MR. PERSILY: Yes, I said that's what we would like to do. Concord did that; the Concord Police Department actually created a survey.

If I have a few minutes, one of the problems you have working with police departments is what typically happens is you bring people in from the community to tell them - and I've gone through this myself, years ago - where you bring people in from the community to tell them how to work in your own community.

If you're going to work in the Chicano community, which I was working in East L.A. when I did this kind of thing, then you need Chicanos to train you how to work there and what Chicanos are about. So, we did that.

What happens is you end up sometimes with shouting matches, where people end up getting defensive, and 'you say we did this to you, we didn't do that, you got your facts wrong,' and then the cops go back and they talk to themselves about how you're screwing them, how you're bullshitting, and everything else, and then the people in the community go back and say, well, we really showed them, and you don't get real
training going on.

So, the other way you try and deal with it is you go to police academies, and we have in this State a thing called Peace Officer Standards and Training, that sets up the standards for all of the police academies. And you go in there, and you talk to them about community relations, or you talk to them about minority affairs, and it's four hours on there, and they have to pass 70% of the questions they have to answer, because they tell you beforehand how many percent you have to answer. You sit there and you go to sleep and you shut out that part.

The part where if you're a cop and you're going through that you're real excited about, is officer survival, you know, shootouts and that kind of stuff. And then the stuff they really make you do 100% is officer survival and also issues relating to liability, because they're worried about getting sued.

So, other things than that, when they say 70%, you can kick back and relax if you're going through the Academy. You kick back and you go through the three hours, nothing happens. You go to the police force, and the first thing that happens is you're assigned to an officer who is going to take you around; he's your field training officer. That field training officer says, 'forget everything you learned in the Academy, I'm here to tell you what it's really like on the streets,' and you pick up the attitudes of the cop that's on the street.

It is very difficult to break through that system
and get police departments who are ready to really work in the Chicano community, the black community, Latino community, Asian community, etc., either way, either model. What they did in Concord that seems to have had some effect is they sent out a survey and they said, 'what are the problems you face in the blah-blah-blah community?', and they listed the communities. 'What would you like to know about these communities?' Then what they did was they went to the community, then brought in the people, but directed them and helped them develop their presentation so that they were dealing with the specific issues that the police wanted to know about.

So, when they came in, it was no longer, "you did this to me, no I didn't" kind of thing, but, "look, you're interested in this kind of stuff, we're here to provide that kind of stuff for you," and develop that kind of understanding. That seems to be an easier way to get that kind of training going. At least it seemed to work fairly well in Concord. I was hoping that maybe we could do something like that on a countywide basis in Contra Costa County.

CO-CHAIR KAI: Actually, this isn't a question, but I think it's very warranted to take a minute out to give you special thanks. You've worked so hard with us, and I think both in terms of concrete guidance and inspiration. You've really been a model in terms of sharing, moving us along, prodding us, helping us, giving us your feedback and advice from your experience, and it has been invaluable.

I also want to thank you for your good humor during
all the enumerable meetings, as they are now referred to. One of the things that came out last night was how the regional incidents that happen affect people, and how we do have to move towards approaching things regionally, and I am very much looking forward to getting out program in place, and working with your program, and spreading this throughout the region. Thank you very much.

MR. PERSILY: Yes, I think it needs to be all over the place. And the payoff is really what happens in the community.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Lester Olmstead Rose.

MR. ROSE: I am the last one scheduled, I guess.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Take no implication from the timing list.

MR. ROSE: No, actually it feels kind of strange; it's been fun listening from out there. I'm glad I didn't have to sit up there with you all. What I'm here to present tonight is what we're calling a Coordination Proposal. And during the break, I slipped in front of all of you a typewritten two pages, which is essentially what I'm going to talk from. I thought it might make it easier for you all to see what we're doing. It's a little bit technical, in some ways, and hope you'll bear with me. We really wanted to put forward some proposals of how we're going to coordinate what we want on the other side of this hearing.

And as we're lavishing praise on Fred Persily, I'll add to that. He has a model, and what we're trying to do is adapt that to San Francisco. He certainly was an inspiration,
but it is different here. So what we're trying to do is put forward some ideas on what it could look like here; what that sort of program could look like in San Francisco.

It says that it's presented by the Forum Organizing Committee. I want to say that that is only partial true. A lot of the people who've been working hard to put this hearing together did in fact review this. Some of them only had five minutes to do it; and some of them never got a chance. So, think of this as a working document. It's not set in stone; we want to present it in the Public Hearing so that it becomes a part of what we're doing. But we assume that it's open to change.

The first section here is under Needs; just basically an outline of what we need to do here in San Francisco. First, we have Clear Reporting Procedures, and then following from that is Statistical Collection and Reporting. Right now, I think you've heard from Joan Weiss and you probably heard from five or ten other people who've testified -- there's no good statistics on Hate Violence. And there's very little uniformity among the statistics that do exist. So, at least within San Francisco, we need to address that. Collect good statistics as good as can be collected; make sure they're uniform and then make sure that reports are issued as to what's happening.

Secondly -- we need adequate training of direct service providers and adequate services for victims of hate violence. Right now, there are very, very, very few services available in San Francisco for individuals who are the victims
of hate violence.

CUAV is one organization that serves the lesbian and gay community; but there's very few organizations like that anywhere in the country, much less in San Francisco. The Anti-Defamation League, the NAACP has certain programs, but there's a lot more that could be done in literally every communities. And a lot of communities that have nothing being done are tailored for them.

Thirdly, we need aggressive programs both within and without the schools to promote appreciation for individuals and community diversity. It's almost cliqued, but I'll say it again because it's really the most important thing. Both in our schools and outside of our schools we need to do education, to tell people not to beat each other up. It seems so basic, but we need to do it. And I want to emphasize -- that's not just within the schools. I think we've been talking about that all along. But to really emphasize, I know my ideal is a MUNI ad campaign, billboards, PSAs on the radio and t.v., the whole sha-bang -- a long ongoing, intensive education campaign.

Fourthly, accountability to elected officials and to the community for creating an adequate response to prejudiced-based violence and part of that which I'm adding on here is, development of community-based programs to respond to hate violence. I addressed that a little bit before. We need accountability -- accountability to elected officials, accountability to the community so that these programs and issues are being taken care of, and ultimately communities and
elected officials are responsible for making sure that these kinds of issues are responded to in both groups, which is why we're doing a joint hearing: community and government. I say that lots of times; people are probably tired of hearing me say that.

The second area we outlined here is what a Flow Chart would look like. When Fred was testifying, he talked about the different steps you might go through in an incident. First, a report of hate violence comes in and the first question is "where does that come into?" Currently, that would normally come into the Police Department, occasionally it might come into a place lik CUAV or the NAACP, and those are really your two entry points -- community organizations or the Police Department.

When the Police Department receives one -- this is the second step -- when the Police Department receives a Hate Incident Report, they take their report, and when it's appropriate they need to refer it to a community organization for victim counseling or advocacy, etc. if that need exists. When a community organization takes in the incident, they encourage the victim to report it to the Police Department so that the Criminal Justice System can kick into the process also.

Then whoever takes it in, the statistics then that we're proposing, would go to the Human Rights Commission, and (although we haven't worked through the details) needs to make sure that there's not a duplication, so that community organizations and the Police Department are not duplicating
information that we only get to report once.

The third area is that community organizations, when needed, would need to provide the direct services and refer victims to professionals when needed for therapy, advocacy, legal and medical help, whatever the case may be. I've already said this, but I'll say it again -- most of these services do not currently exist in San Francisco nor very few places around the country.

Another part of that which is not on your sheet, is that also there needs to be some sort of follow-up, both with the Police Department and with the District Attorney; follow-up on the progress of the investigation, and what's happening with any prosecutions in various cases going on. That's a little sophisticated; I don't know if anybody goes that far in Victim Advocacy, but it's certainly what we want to attain.

Fourthly, the Human Rights Commission, in what we're proposing, would analyze the statistics in terms of what incidents have taken place, and release regular reports. The reports would ideally include information on where the incidents occur, against what groups, the demographics as they're available on both victims and assailants, whether weapons were used; what kind of weapons, and the rate of suspect apprehension and conviction. So, really good comprehensive statistics and information.

No. 5, that information would go to the Intergroup Clearinghouse which will analyze the HRC reports, draw on any other information available around the city from the community and so forth. The Intergroup Clearinghouse would also work
with appropriate community groups, appropriate government agencies in order to fill the gaps in services and to provide appropriate responses to the hate violence that's happening.

As we talked, there's a need for some type of coordinating community group that does hate violence; that takes responsibility for programs implemented; making sure that gaps are filled, making sure that new ideas come to fruition. In Contra Costa County, we have the Hate Reduction Task Force. That's essentially what this is. What we've found in San Francisco was that a number of people in the Intergroup Clearinghouse, like Robin Wu, who's the current director and has been working with us on this all along, that there was an organization that already existed; that it could fill this function; and that would be appropriate to fill this function. So that's why we're saying the Intergroup Clearinghouse. If they weren't there to do it, we'd have to create a group to do it. So, it's easier and nicer to have a group that's willing and interested in playing this role.

Finally, I'll emphasize again, that one of the things that the response would be is developing educational programs, programs to reduce prejudice and programs to promote what services are available so that people know what they can do.

On the third page I think I'll just read through this. I've just delineated some of the responsibility so it's kind of clear in peoples' heads -- whose doing what. Essentially, there's two components: the HRC as the government component, the Inner Group Clearinghouse as the
community component. The HRC would be responsible for the
general oversight and contracting with appropriate community
groups -- in this case the Inner Group Clearinghouse -- for
carrying out portions of the program. Data collection and
statistical reports would stay within the Human Rights
Commission, but the Human Rights Commission would go to
outside contracts for educational and training programs.
Through this model, the Human Rights Commission then
maintains, of course, direct accountability, both to the Mayor
and the Board of Supervisors.

The idea then is that the Human Rights Commission
would contract with the Inner Group Clearinghouse.
Incidentally, the Inner Group Clearinghouse would also be
searching for private financing, so it's just not government
funding this.

The Inner Group Clearinghouse would be responsible
for community education, surveying programs needs where
there's needs, where there's gaps; responding to gaps in
services and programs; coordinate training for the emergency
services organizations, Police Department, District Attorney,
community service organizations, the school districts, local
schools, other local schools and colleges.

The Clearinghouse would maintain accountability to
elected officials because they'd have a contract to the Human
Rights Commission. So as the dictate comes down from the
political side, that is translated into a contract with the
Inner Group Clearinghouse. The Inner Group Clearinghouse
maintains accountability to the community by developing a
board of directors or a task force, but I think probably board of directors. We've been talking about it. That would include a wide variety of community and government groups that are involved in the issue. So you'd have CUAV, you'd have the Human Rights Commission, the District Attorney, the Police Department, the NAACP, and Break the Silence -- all these groups would be represented there. Therefore, you'd get your direct community input.

And the Intergroup Clearinghouse's funding would come both from private fundraising and also through City contracts. Then on the very bottom there, you kind of have the structural chart of what we're proposing -- that the HRC would use existing staff or hire -- either way -- to hire a coordinator. That person would oversee the data intake within the HRC; the HRC and that coordinator would contract for the Intergroup Clearinghouse who would hire staff to interact with all the government and community organizations that need to work on this problem.

Okay, that's a mouthful; I know it's a little dry and technical. But are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER WONG: On the Response Flow Chart, you're talking about getting incident reports to the Police Department or to community organizations. I'm assuming that also covers schools?

MR. ROSE: The answer is yes. And actually, I don't think we ever specifically addressed that. We'd have to decide if schools take them in or if they need to be referred to somewhere through the schools. But, probably the schools
would take them in.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Further questions?

COMMISSIONER ROMERO: Yes. During (INAUDIBLE) testimony, there was a suggestion made that we needed to include the business sector and the labor unions. I think those are two critical components of our community. That needs to be addressed and we need to figure out where in this flow chart they fall, because part of the harassment and violence, etc. and attitudes are also in the wrong place. So I think we need to figure out where that fits in the structure.

MR. ROSE: Yes. Actually I appreciate that comment; I think that's very true. I keep thinking about gaps that we're going to find as we get going. And that's exactly -- in a sense, this is a gap from where we are now. So we need to somehow find a way to fill it. But absolutely; that's a good point.

COMMISSIONER PIVNICK: I'm thinking of two situations where, in one instance, I border the bus and a foreign-born person got on the bus and the sign did read: "give the transfer to the conductor", or whatever it says, and he did; and the bus driver turned to him and said: "can't you read? Put it in the can down there." And I thought that was a form of harassment. I don't know how we accommodate that in this chart here.

Secondly, when I went to the Department of Motor Vehicles, the lines were just going all over the place. A person who was accommodating the crowd said "next", and nobody
moved because they didn't know where the voice came from. They said "Can't you hear?" And by that time somebody pushed the next person in line, and I thought that was a form of intimidation also. I wondered how we can accommodate -- in one case it's a State agency over which we have no control; and the other, it's a city agency which we can do something about. And how are we to accommodate that through this kind of organization?

MR. ROSE: Let me answer the first one because, in a way, that's a bit easier. Ideally, we'd have reports coming in on that kind of harassment. So through the analysis, review and the reports you'd see, for example, that there might be a number of MUNI incidents of the type you described. And ideally, the Intergroup Clearinghouse would see that and would recognize that that is an area that needed special attention. Through that recognition they would work.... let's say it's against, as you said, somebody foreign-born or had limited English skills, ideally the Intergroup Clearinghouse would work with, for example, the Coalition For Immigrant Rights and Refuge Services on doing MUNI training to work with MUNI drivers on sensitivity to limited English and no-English passengers; and how they tend to be more sensitive.

It's actually a good example because, in fact, I can speak from personal experience at that exact situation, only it wasn't foreign language, but it was Lesbian-Gay concerns -- has happened on numerous occasions, and we now have an ongoing training program with MUNI because of that. In a sense, we're adding an extra step because when CUAV does it,
it's one little piece of what needs to happen. With the
Intergroup Clearinghouse involved, all that pulls together so
that they wouldn't need to have training just on one
community, but could perceive a more wholistic (if I might use
a Marin word) approach.

CHAIR DUNLAP: That's regional.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. ROSE: Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER PIVNICK: Except in this case. It
seems to me that the victim probably wouldn't report it, but a
passenger might. And I think we might have to encourage the
reporting of those kinds of incidents, not only to MUNI
itself, but to the organizations such as this that would be
looking at it.

MR. ROSE: And actually, that's absolutely true.
Lots of times victims don't, but once again, speaking from our
experience at CUAV, I'm sorry I keep doing that -- but it's
the model I know best. We have said about two times, I think,
into gay reporters that have been printed that we take verbal
reports. We've said that this last year which is a new thing
for us, and we had over seventy verbal reports reported to us
this year. And we didn't know campaigning because we couldn't
deal with anymore. It doesn't take much to get people to
report those things; it's a little bit of developing awareness
of the issue, and then people begin to recognize it where they
might not have seen it before. And people want to talk about
it; they want to tell somebody "this happened to me". And
you're not going to catch them all, of course. At best,
you're going to catch a very small percentage of incidents. But you'd be amazed at how many passengers, or witnesses, or victims will report as soon as they know there's somebody to talk to.

COMMISSIONER PIVNICK: In a case where we have no control over an agency, what do we do with the Department of Motor Vehicles? And I don't want to be critical of an agency, but I happened to be there to see this, and I was shocked at the treatment.

MR. ROSE: Well, we technically have no control over the school district, the Fair Employment & Housing Commission and I think there is a lot of persuasion that we can exercise. Usually you can find somebody in an organization who wants to do the right thing, and you can work through for training or awareness of some sort within an organization. That's been my experience. Sometimes you have to knock your head against the wall a lot.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Further questions? Thank you so much.

MR. ROSE: Thanks.

CHAIR DUNLAP: It goes, I think, almost without saying that you and the coordinating committee for the forum, Lester, have put us way ahead in terms of all the work that we have yet to do by making the presentation of this proposal. It is invaluable and I think we're going to be relying on you for the development of some of the detail. And at the same time, what you've done already is just really very, very valuable. We're most grateful.
At this juncture we will now have the final statement of public testimony on Hate Violence. I have nine cards, each of you will be restricted to two minutes. We're sorry that that's the case, but it's a function of the time limits in which we're working. I'm going to call your names in the order in which the cards were given to me. Let me ask first for Robert Williams. Is Robert Williams here?

Alright (hearing none), Hank Wilson. If Mr. Williams comes back in and someone knows him, let me know and we will call upon him.

MR. WILSON: My name is Hank Wilson, (spelled W-I-L-S-O-N), and I'm a member of the Gay-Lesbian Youth Advocacy Council. It's 1990, California Teachers Association is having a Human Rights Conference in March. Gay and lesbian issues are not included. The American Federation of Teachers was asked this year to give us a support on Youth Suicide -- a Gay-Lesbian Youth Suicide Report at the federal level. We got no support from the AFT when we requested it. I think the point I'm trying to make is that at the professional level in education we are not having our interests of young gays and lesbians looked after. One of the reasons is because people are ambitious, we are a controversial issue, and no one is taking up the cause for our young people.

The San Francisco State University's School of Education -- what are they doing? Are there any courses on homophobia? Are there any courses on homosexuality? Are there any courses preparing counselors or teachers to deal with young lesbians or gays? Or young homophobic people?
Your bodies would do justice for us by asking that question and let them respond. What are you doing? Can you do more? An official group like yourselves can raise those issues and put on burden on them to respond. In terms of the S.F. Unified School District, we hear about diversity workshops, we're not included. Within the last month, one of our gay teachers asked about gay and lesbian inclusion in the Diversity Workshops, which Amalia spoke about. Amalia didn't respond, but another district person said "you have to go and get included in the Science Staff Development Section."

Diversity is diversity. We're a part of this community when we're included, but very often we're not included. Again, let this body ask the S.F. School District "what are you doing to deal with homophobia?"

CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Any questions for Mr. Wilson from the panel? Okay. Thanks kindly for the clarity as well. There are a couple more speakers; I've also been reminded by Panetta Scott, and thank you. The audience should be reminded that you can submit written testimony which will become a part of the record of this forum, and we will keep the record open for three weeks, so that you may submit any such written testimony to the Human Rights Commission by February 8, 1990.

Now I will call for Raphael Chang. Forgive me if I mispronounced -- it's either Chang or Chaung, I couldn't read the card.

MR. CHANG: Good evening. My name is Rafael Chang (spelled C-H-A-N-G). I'm co-chair of the Gay Asian Pacific
and they are dying of AIDS just like everybody else. This community has also become a target for hate-motivated violence. I don't think I need to repeat to this commission the past acts of violence and discrimination against people with ARC or AIDS, or people perceived to be affected by HIV. My message is simple: to let this commission that there are Asian and Pacific Islander lesbians, bisexuals, and gay men, as there are gays, bisexuals, lesbians in the Latino, Afro-American and Native American communities. And we are directly affected by ethno-violence and gay bashing. These types of crimes must stop, perpetrators of gay bashings and racial attacks must be punished to the fullest extent of the law. Local agencies, such as Community United Against Violence, must be supported -- both financially and politically. Education programs in our schools, churches and general communities to combat homophobia and other forms of prejudice must take place. This education must be both culturally and linguistically appropriate.

As one of hundreds of thousands of gay Asian-Pacific men, we will work actively toward this issue where through local activism, or through the process of elections, we will take whatever steps are necessary to stop hate-motivated anti-gay violence. Thank you.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you, Mr. Chang. Questions from the panel? Thank you, very much. And thank you for your personal clarity as well. Our next witness is Kosmic Lady.

Association, the new clear vision division. As we lurch into the 90's and more people are understanding the much, much bigger picture, it is becoming more clear that oops, Mother Earth herself is a galactic reform school, and it's not surprising we're under the humongus troubles we're in. We've played cops and robbers. Damns unto us is through many ages, we're about to come to a new semester.

And we're in an emotional holocaust. There are no thems; more education on ancient ways. Why do you think there is so much interest in science-fiction? Our roots are not of this plane.

I've been doing Kozmick Ladye for twenty years, mostly have been mini-ander or mickey-moused. You folks know how it is being pioneers. I do gatherings called Planetary Whodunits, starring everybody; work with all religions, all governments, all genders -- look at what so-called normal mankind has wrecked and reeked upon our planet and to ourselves. And there are many definitions of the word "straight".

So, in closing, what I'm saying is if you expand the muscles of your imagination and our mind itself is a wondrous gift to expand, death as we know it will be dying soon. A whole new ballgame coming up folks. My own reputations are improving considerably and I'm getting ready to leave for other assignments. I wasn't committed forever to be a general planetary grouch. But in any event, I put out the reality maps. Work with universal metaphysical, ancient ways and I also have a few copies of our Conscious Public Opinion Survey
I'll leave in the back if anyone wants it. So hang on to your halos, we're shifting gears to alternative reality time. Peace. Good karma.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you, Kozmick Ladye. Our next witness will be Jesse Greenman, from the Gay-Lebanian Alliance Against Defamation.

MS. GREENMAN: That's (spelled) J-E-S-S-E-A G-R-E-E-M-A-N. Thank you. There are three things I want to say; I think they haven't really been said. Do you know the Hate Crime Statistics Act on the federal level has been stalled by Jesse Helms? Nobody said why. It's because it includes collecting statistics about hate crimes based on sexual orientation. To Mr. Helms this is promoting homosexuality. I say to oppose collecting statistics on violence committed against any member of this society is both hateful and criminal. It is a national disgrace that this Act has not been passed, and I think your role as well as our role, is to get it passed.

The Board of Supervisors should pass the resolution to that effect. The senior senator from the State of California is the Legislative Whip of the majority party in the Senate; and our junior senator has good ties with the Administration. There is no excuse for this not having passed. We have already lost too many lives.

The second point I'd like to make is educational strategies for change. I think it's never too late to unlearn hate and to start learning an appreciation of diversity. I work at U.C. Berkeley I'm ashamed to admit since there was a
terrible fight to get what started out as Ethnic Studies requirement to become an undergraduate requirement and it was renamed American Cultures. At first I had some issues with that, now I see it as a strategic move. The debate by this learned body of faculty -- the Faculty Senate -- which took the vote was such an appalling example of limited vision, of the breadth of the human experience that it would boggle your mind. And so I say, multicultural studies on every level -- undergraduate, graduate, professional schools, continuing education, and retroactive to some people who've already graduated from our institutions of higher learning but do not know these things.

My third point is visibility. The issue was raised last night about passing. Some communities, such as lesbian-gay and bisexual communities address this issue all the time. Individuals may choose to blend in and repress their differences for their own safety. They reduce their vulnerability by reducing their visibility. I understand this; and it's tragic because we all lose. They lose their cultural identify; we lose the richness of our society, and besides that, it doesn't work because as gay-lesbian people know, we're still attacked, we're still beaten up, we're still killed.

The other interesting side of those statistics is that while sixty-five to seventy percent of the people who think that they don't know someone lesbian, gay, or bisexual are against rights for sexual minorities. Sixty-five to to seventy percent of people who are aware that they know someone
who is lesbian, gay or bisexual are in favor of rights for sexual minorities. So that's where the education comes in and that's where the visibility comes in. Visibility is life.

Thank you.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Are there questions for Ms. Greenman? Okay, fine. Our next witness will be Hartley Frank.

MR. FRANK: Hello. Hello to the Commissioners, the general public. Thank you so much for being this involved in what could start out, and what I surmise to be a continuing effort. I applied to take this much of your time to point out that there are points being made all over the world and that the way I would suggest that we go about it, especially in a city of this magnitude, is that we stop being afraid of what will happen. And if we remain careful and exchange decency with dignity and courage, that we all will start to understand what part of it was honest, fair. And that's basically a courteous way of saying, yes, we all are guilty of these things that have been pointed out, that people here can see. Our natural urge as animals is to hide this. It's been hidden and history is fraught with examples of things that went on that were not really happy to talk about. And we keep separate histories.

If you ask one man of one race, you'll get a different answer. If you ask one other man of a different race, and these are being presented to our children and to our teenagers. They're open-minded adult population, and America is a leading force for information. These things are purveyed
Looking at it from what can we do about these, it hits us that it's us. We're standing here in the middle of it. And if we could just take the time out to understand that people don't need a pass to be here. We are all here, and it happens that prejudice travels down from father to son, mother to daughter, and it's our place to clean it out. And it's my way of putting it that some of the things, because I live in America, I take America for an example because I live in the San Francisco Bay Area, I can use this as an example. Have we done our part? This is not a finger-pointing session here that I'm trying to present to you. This is wheres do we stop our buck when it's passed to us? Do we hand it on?

This is a wonderful way for us to say "where to? where at?" These are basically our leaders. We have a very impersonal, almost disposable civilization. Things are still, and always will be, hell in personal (INAUDIBLE). And this is what we're fighting for, and they're arguing for us t deal with. It's a lackluster answer, but we can help ourselves. Thank you.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Are there questions? Thank you kindly. Our next speaker will be Gregory Wiggins of the Black Community of MUNI Operators.

MR. WIGGINS: First of all, I'd like to say good evening to the Commissioners. I would like to thank Deborah Carpenter for inviting me here tonight. I'd like everyone to know that I am a San Francisco MUNI operator that got brutally beaten by the San Francisco Police Department on
October 19, 1988 while I was driving the San Francisco bus which is property of the City. I got brutally beaten by the San Francisco police officers from the Potrero District Station. I am a resident of the Bayview Hunters Point area, a predominantly black community for the twelve years that I have been here from New Orleans, Lousiana

On the morning of October 19, 1988, as I approached the overpass near Bayshore and Arleta, there were policemen on the scene. There was a truck turned over that went into a ditch. So the officers set up a roadblock. One officer stopped me and told me that a truck had overturned ahead, and the MUNI inspectors were trying to get the buses to go through. At this point, I suggested to him that I would drive the bus up a little so that the other cars could get by. I could not make a U-turn with a sixty-foot articulated bus. I did not have enough space to do so because the bus was 60-feet. I did attempt to make an L-turn and in doing so I drove over one of the lighted flares. The move caused the officers to become impatient and call me racial names. He started yelling and calling me a "nigger" as he boarded the bus. I told him that I was not his "nigger" and he replied: "If you don't move the fucking bus, I'll move it for you. Don't you know by now that we do the fuck what we wanna do? All you "niggers" are alike."

I was called "niggers, punk." I feel that the type of conduct that the officers displayed should not have occurred. I feel that the action these officers took should not be tolerated on the police force. I feel that these
officers should not get away with the assault and battery that they committed upon me; and some kind of action should be taken.

After getting brutally beaten by the San Francisco police officers, I was taken down to 850 Bryant. I was released and went to St. Francis Memorial Hospital. One of the City's guys by the name of Bobby Long, the claims adjuster, told four doctors to deny me medical treatment. I got denied Workmen's Comp assault pay. I got a thirty-day suspension upon termination the next day, October 20, 1988.

This has been happening all over San Francisco with the Police Department. We are going forward to try to talk to the Chief of Police, talk to different organizations, nothing is getting accomplished. I have gone to the Officers of Citizens' Complaint to try to do the right thing. When the officers came into the courthouse, they had read the testimony, written and oral statement that I gave to OCC. And I thought this was confidential.

Many drivers attended the trial at my case. We were shocked at the guilty verdict on the charges of resisting arrest. It seemed a clear contradiction that the jury found me not guilty of a battery on three of the officers due to the excessive force of the police; and then found me guilty of resisting arrest. The instruction indicated that excessive force was a defense for resisting arrest, as well as for battery. In addition, many MUNI operators have had problems with the San Francisco Police Department.

Although we're both City departments, there is very
little cooperation with operators after operators have
reported different forms of harassment by the Police
Department.

    CHAIR DUNLAP: You will need to sum up, Mr. Wiggins,
just because of the time limit. I'm sorry about that.

    MR. WIGGINS: Okay. With all this happening and by
me living in the Bayview Hunters Point district, when we got a
cop on the Police force named Yoshi 1728, May 22, 1988, was
training a rookie female officer; took her to a house in
Foster City, raped her, choked her, forced her to have oral
sex. December 12, 1988 in Middle Point, a black community, he
stuck a gun in a guy's mouth who had the handcuffs on him, and
told him to suck on the pistol, the pistol goes off and puts a
hole in his jaw. The OCC asked the Police Department not to
put this guy as a street supervisor; they made him one anyway.

    Folks, if that was me as a Black person, a Black
guy, I would be history. I'm faced with -- you may have heard
me clearing my throat -- when they put the choke hold on me,
they messed up a nerve in my throat, a fractured hip, and
lower back damage.

    Why is San Francisco Mayor Art Agnos and the
politicians allowing a police(man) like this to be on the city
when he's dangerous to the public? I'm Black; I can't get
anything accomplished. If someone were to look at my twelve
years in San Francisco, a law-abiding citizen, a taxpayer, a
registered voter. I'm not a criminal, I'm not on drugs, I'm
not none of this. But if someone were to just look at my
twelve years' records they'd know that I'm not what these cops
are trying to do to me: turn me into a criminal.

   Folks, I need help. I'm coming to you and asking
you for help because I am not the only one. I just ask that
somebody give some type of justice. I had a biased judge
throughout the whole thing -- Paul Alvarado. There was a
Black young lady on the jury panel who got dismissed because
the D.A., John Farrell, said he couldn't believe that she
lived in the Bayview Hunters Point area and being black, that
she never had dealings with the Police Department.

   CHAIR DUNLAP: Mr. Wiggins, your time is up.

   MR. WIGGINS: So, folks, please get this guy off the
street. Thank you very much.

   CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Your time has
expired. Are there questions of the witness? Okay, thank you
kindly. Our next witness is Michael O'Toole from the North of
Market Planning Association for the Homeless Task Force and
also for Americans For Nonviolent Independent Living. Mr.
O'Toole? Alright. David Cooper.

   MR. COOPER: Good evening. My name is David Cooper.
There are many things I want to talk about, but due to limited
time, I'll have to sum it up. Mainly what I'd like to say,
it's almost comical that this panel here is discussing some of
the things and the groups that are bringing this up have their
own groups that intimidate other people who do not go along
with their policies. They keep you from working, you can't
get a job. I haven't been at work since '84; I'm a registered
nurse and a very good nurse. But if you're not politically
correct in this city, you don't work, you can't buy a home
even if you had the money. As I was told, they didn't care how much money I had, they were not selling to me. So, I think you should know that.

And attempts to reach this group and others, have to go by phone by various other people and you can't get through to those group. If I'm not articulate right now it's because I have much suppressed anger. It's been suppressed for a long time.

People intimidate you by following you around, going in, and if you say anything, then they try to imply that you're mentally ill, homophobic, anti-women, anti-immigrant. And all kinds of friends that you had don't want to lose their jobs. As they say: "well, I can't afford to lose my job so I can't be seen with you." This kind of stuff -- by being political incorrect, as they call it.

As I've said, there needs to be a way for people to reach groups like this. I tried to reach a Supervisor and was prevented from talking with that Supervisor by her administrative assistant. I kept waiting and waiting until the Supervisor departed. It's the same way with other groups, the NAACP and other types of things. When you describe what goes on, you intimidate -- with noises and all other kinds of noises going on at your home, and you're told to simply move. "Why don't you move?"

And I've been in San Francisco since 1967 when I got out of the service. And I feel that I have earned the right to live here. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you, Mr. Cooper. Our next
witness will be Chris Tafe of the John Brown Anti-Klan Committee.

MR. TAFE: My name is Chris Tafe; I'm in the John Brown Anti-Klan Committee. We want to thank the Human Rights Commission and all other groups who made these hearings possible.

Our group is an organization and it's been in existence over ten years, whose main purpose is to educate and mobilize people about the reality of Klan and Nazi, and other white supremacist groups. We are here at the hearings tonight because we want to be a resource for identifying racist groups, their tactics, their national strategies, their leaders, the relationship with local groups and their approach to organizing a movement in San Francisco and the Bay Area. The Klan and Nazis are active in the area.

I missed a lot of the hearings, so I'm sorry for repeating what other people have already stated. My main point is I believe, and we believe, that racism is not just an individual attitude of prejudice, but that it's a political and social movement that's growing in this country. Although I agree largely with Joann Weiss, I think that I'll take issue with one thing she said. I believe that if we ignore the role of racist groups and their activities in San Francisco, we will actually not be able to understand why racist incidents are growing, why some of our young people are moving in this direction toward sympathy with white supremacist groups, and toward anti-gay violence.

So, racism is more than an individual attitude, we
need to take not only a personal but a political approach. And many of the approaches people have talked about sound very valuable. We want to be connected with this and supportive of it.

The problem is even more complex than I've stated so far, and other people have stated though. We live in a thoroughly racist and anti-gay system. This country was built on racism. It's today thinly disguised as public policy in many ways. Locally and nationally minority people are equated with criminals as being criminals. There is a great deal of police violence against minority groups -- good point to the shootings of Larry Lumpkin and Nelson Yip.

So to sum up, we think that people have a right to be safe from racist violence. We think that people have the right to defend themselves, build community organizations, take many of the approaches described here, and the John Brown Anti-Klan Committee wants to help. Thank you.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you very much. Are there questions of the witness? Alright. Our final witness will be Mark Miller of the American Friends Service Committee.

MR. MILLER: My name is Mark Miller (spelled M-I-L-L-E-R). I want to express my thanks to everyone who made these hearings possible; I think they're very important.

I wanted to speak primarily to the issue of the homeless. I would say, first of all, the American Friends Service Committee has been active in the Bay Area for many decades and was founded in 1917 by Quakers as a social service organization that works primarily on peace and justice issues.
One of the issues we've become more and more concerned with of late is the issue of the homeless. And I would like to point out that they are the victims of hate crime and hate-inspired violence. There are some characteristics, I think, that we need to keep in mind when we're talking about homeless people. First of all, they're very vulnerable, of course. Because they're in the streets, they're very visible. And they are subject not only to acts of individual violence, but also as we know institutional violence. This is often manifested both by individuals and by local governments in the attitudes expressed by toward the property of homeless people.

We've seen again and again that the property of homeless people is regarded both by institutions, governments, and individuals as trash which translates, I think, into a communication to the homeless people that they are trash. I'm just using that as one example of the many ways in which they're victimized.

I've read estimates, as I'm sure you have, that we may expect 30 million homeless Americans over the next few years, perhaps more, as current economic and housing conditions persist and get worse. And so the problem is one that's going to grow.

I think that this commission and all of us need to pay very close attention to the homeless, and to acts of violence against them, very often only because they are homeless.

We plan to submit further written testimony on other
issues as well, but I felt compelled to talk about this particular issue because I didn't think it was getting quite the level of attention deserved. Thank you.

CHAIR DUNLAP: Thank you, Mr. Miller. Are there questions of Mr. Miller? Has Robert Williams returned? Okay. I believe we've heard then from all the people who signed up to give public testimony, and these hearings now are formally closed. Any written testimony can be submitted by February 8th to the Human Rights Commission. It will be included in the record.

Thank you all for your patience, your participation, and you will be hearing from us.

(OFF THE RECORD)

(Thereupon the Public Hearing of the San Francisco the Human Rights Commission and the Coalition For Civil Rights was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.)
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