

HATE CRIME IN AMERICA

Recommendations from the 1998 IACP Summit



181775

C.3

January 1999

This project was supported by Cooperative Agreement No. 98-MU-MU-K006 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice.

FROM THE SUMMIT:

- ▶ *Though hate and its consequences have always been part of the human condition, we are not born with prejudices or intolerance. These attitudes are learned, as are the behaviors that constitute hate crime. Social change, particularly as rapid and pervasive as witnessed in 20th century America, can engender fear of being displaced, and in turn, bias-motivated attitudes and behavior. Most perpetrators of hate crime are steeped in the fear and anger that fuel prejudice.*

- ▶ *Communities become victims when hate crime erodes mutual respect and civility, and undermines the citizens' sense of well-being and safety.*

- ▶ *Summit participants were hopeful that communities, schools, and justice system agencies can work together to create and maintain conditions in which prejudice gives way to tolerance and bias-motivated violence is replaced with peaceful problem-solving.*

- ▶ *To be leaders in preventing hate crimes, law enforcement professionals must ensure that they exemplify the values of tolerance and peaceful conflict resolution, and that any bias-related behavior by police officers is dealt with swiftly, equitably, and severely.*

- ▶ *Law enforcement leaders and officers will continue to contribute significantly to stopping violence and preventing hate crime. However, the work outlined in this report cannot be accomplished solely through the efforts of law enforcement agencies. Implementing summit recommendations requires the continuing collaboration and commitment of community leaders, parents and families, schools, and other public agencies in the ongoing enterprise to create a society of peacemakers.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The IACP *Hate Crime in America Summit* was supported through grants from the Department of Justice (DOJ): Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA); Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS); Office for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP); and the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC). The IACP is grateful for the inspiration and guidance provided by Assistant Attorney General Laurie Robinson, OJP, and the directors of the funding agencies: Nancy Gist, BJA; Joe Brann, COPS; Shay Bilchik, OJJDP; and Reggie Robinson, OVC.

We are indebted most to the summit participants who worked so diligently and productively to fashion the recommendations that appear in this report. We hope we have synthesized and conveyed their contributions faithfully and accurately. Each participant is acknowledged individually later in this report.

Throughout the project, but particularly during the conceptualization and planning stages, the summit benefited from the contribution and collaboration of the Advisory Board, composed of the directors of the funding agencies and:

- ◆ Jennifer Knobe, Bureau of Justice Assistance
- ◆ Charles Kindermann, Bureau of Justice Statistics
- ◆ David Walchak, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
- ◆ Barbara Wallace, Federal Bureau of Investigation
- ◆ Doug Dodge, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
- ◆ Tim Johnson, Office for Victims of Crime

Compelling critiques of a draft of this report were provided by:

- ◆ James Castello, United States Department of Justice
- ◆ Michael Lieberman, Anti-Defamation League
- ◆ Karen K. Narasaki, National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Overview	1
Hate Crime in America: Origins and Nature	8
Summit Background and Purpose	17
Strategies to Prevent and Respond to Hate Crimes: Summit Recommendations	23
Law Enforcement Action Agenda	40
Endnotes	44
Summit Participants	45
Resources	57



EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

Though hate and its consequences have always been part of the human condition, we are not born with prejudices or intolerance. These attitudes are learned, as are the behaviors that constitute hate crime. Social change, particularly as rapid and pervasive as witnessed in 20th century America, can engender fear of being displaced, and, in turn, bias-motivated attitudes and behavior. Most perpetrators of hate crime are steeped in the fear and anger that fuel prejudice.

The concept of hate crime is often misunderstood. In many cases, there is confusion between hate incidents and hate crimes. Legally, a hate crime is any crime enumerated in a hate crime statute in which a perpetrator is subject to an enhanced penalty if the crime was motivated by bias, as defined by the statute. Arson, aggravated assault, and vandalism exemplify such crimes. Hate incidents are those actions by an individual that, while motivated by bias, do not rise to the level of a criminal offense. Both hate crimes and hate incidents are the focus of this report.

Legislation to prohibit racially motivated violence dates back to the Ku Klux Klan Act passed by Congress in 1871. Since that time, federal and state legislators have recognized hate crime as dangerous to our society and have passed numerous pieces of legislation to address it.¹ The federal acts we regard today as hate crime legislation emerge from the Civil Rights Act of 1968, the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990, and section 280003 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1995.

Federal, state, and local agencies, as well as public-interest organizations, have initiated a wide array of approaches to prevent and respond to hate crimes. Although a great deal has been accomplished, much work remains to be done.

In June 1998, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) convened the *Hate Crime in America Summit*, a gathering of over 100 police executives, community leaders, citizen activists, justice system decisionmakers, and scholars with hate crime expertise and experience. At this summit, participants explored the nature of hate crime and discussed

ways to address it. This report summarizes 58 recommendations affirmed as the most promising for communities, justice agencies, schools, social service agencies, and police to help them prevent and respond to hate crime.

The summit produced 46 policy and program recommendations to

- ***Prevent Hate Crime,***
- ***Respond to Hate Crime,***
- ***Measure the Effectiveness of Prevention and Response Efforts.***

The summit also produced a Law Enforcement Action Agenda – 12 vital actions to help police address hate crimes. Collectively, these recommendations constitute a comprehensive agenda to advance understanding of hate crime, prevent hate crime, and improve the effectiveness of our response to this complex and challenging social problem. The agenda sets forth roles and responsibilities for a coordinated, community-wide response by citizens, schools and colleges, police, justice system agencies, social service agencies, and victims. Recommendations are summarized here and detailed later in this report.

HOW CAN WE PREVENT HATE CRIME?

The summit produced 18 recommendations to prevent hate crime.

- **Increase Public Awareness**
 - **Create multidisciplinary planning processes to develop coordinated approaches to prevent and respond to hate crime.**
 - **Create local Human Rights Commissions or other forums to promote community harmony and stability.**
 - **Focus public attention on issues of prejudice, intolerance, and the ways that hate crime affects community vitality and safety.**
 - **Develop public information to promote values of tolerance and social equality.**
 - **Raise awareness of the goals and activities of organized hate groups.**

- Develop national, regional, and/or state task forces to understand and counter the influence of organized hate groups.

■ Educate Children and Young Adults

- Involve parents in efforts to prevent and intervene against bias-motivated behavior of their children.
- Foster a “zero-tolerance” atmosphere in schools and colleges.
- Provide every student and teacher the opportunity to participate in hate crime prevention courses and activities.
- Incorporate hate crime education into existing curricula.
- Reinforce diversity training and multicultural education at early ages.
- Provide conflict resolution training to all children.
- Intervene with students who express discriminatory beliefs before their behavior escalates.

■ Educate Community Groups and Leaders

- Inform vulnerable groups and individuals about ways to protect themselves from bias-motivated incidents and crime.
- Provide knowledge and impart skills to recognize and defuse high-risk situations.

■ Encourage Strategic Planning and Collaborative Problem-Solving

- Develop mechanisms for ongoing problem-solving within local communities.
- Encourage responsible and accurate media coverage.
- Improve accuracy and completeness of information about the incidence of and response to hate crime.

HOW SHOULD WE RESPOND TO HATE CRIME?

The summit produced 22 recommendations to respond to hate crimes.

■ **Develop Shared Definitions of Hate Incidents and Hate Crimes**

- **Broaden statutory definitions of hate crimes to eliminate disparities between laws.**
- **Clarify the difference between hate incidents and hate crimes.**

■ **Eliminate Barriers to Hate Crime Reporting**

- **Encourage reporting of all hate incidents and crimes.**
- **Make it safe and easy to report bias-related incidents and crimes.**
- **Develop and disseminate hate crime reporting protocols.**

■ **Provide Adequate Support to Victims of Hate Incidents and Hate Crimes**

- **Ensure that responses to hate incidents and crimes are swift, thorough, and sensitive to the feelings of victims.**
- **Develop coordinated community plans to respond to and manage public demonstrations by organized hate groups.**
- **Assign organizational responsibility for coordinating and monitoring hate crime response.**
- **Accord community recognition to “Good Samaritans” who protect victims of hate incidents or crimes, or who report incidents to appropriate authorities.**
- **Provide specialized support to hate crime victims through existing victim assistance programs.**

■ **Establish Mechanisms for Repairing Harms to Communities**

- **Support, console, and assist targeted communities.**
- **Develop coordinated community incident response plans.**
- **Ensure that schools and colleges establish processes to respond to bias-related incidents.**

- Engage the media as partners to restore communities to wholeness.

■ Develop More Effective Sanctions for Hate Crime Perpetrators

- Impose enhanced sentences for violent or repetitive hate crime offenders.
- Use restorative justice options for first-time nonviolent hate crime offenders.
- Involve parents of juvenile hate crime offenders in post-adjudication sanctions and interventions.
- Develop strategies to counter the influence of organized hate groups in correctional institutions.

■ Enhance Professional Training

- Train first responders, investigators, and leaders.
- Train victim assistance providers.
- Train judges and prosecutors.
- Provide cross-disciplinary training for all those who respond to hate incidents and crimes.

HOW WILL WE KNOW WE ARE SUCCEEDING?

The summit produced six recommendations to improve research and evaluation.

■ Conduct Basic Research

- Clearly define expected outcomes of hate crime prevention and response efforts.
- Define valid measures of expected outcomes.

■ Evaluate Outcomes of Prevention and Response Efforts

- Ensure that all hate incidents and crimes are documented thoroughly and consistently.
- Collect data on expected outcomes where particular prevention and intervention efforts are being implemented, over time, across jurisdictions, and in a variety of settings.

- ▶ **Share quantitative and qualitative information about the elements of successful prevention and response programs.**
- ▶ **Systematically record characteristics and activities of organized hate groups.**

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTION AGENDA

The summit produced 12 recommendations to encourage and enable police agencies to assume a leadership role in community-wide efforts to address hate crime issues effectively.

- ▶ **Establish a “zero-tolerance” atmosphere in every law enforcement agency.**
- ▶ **Encourage local jurisdictions to conduct hate crime summits.**
- ▶ **Participate in collaborative development of coordinated approaches to prevent and respond to hate crimes.**
- ▶ **Sponsor and participate actively in community events, forums, and activities concerning diversity tolerance, bias reduction, conflict resolution, and hate crime prevention.**
- ▶ **Respond to and support the individual victims of hate crimes and their communities.**
- ▶ **Employ community policing strategies to prevent and respond to hate crimes.**
- ▶ **Continuously investigate, track, and deal appropriately with the activities of organized hate groups.**
- ▶ **Identify and report all bias-related incidents and hate crimes completely and accurately.**
- ▶ **Ensure that all law enforcement professionals are trained to recognize and respond appropriately to hate crimes.**
- ▶ **Assist schools and colleges to design and deliver hate crime prevention curricula and to develop response protocols.**
- ▶ **Engage the media as partners in preventing hate crimes and restoring victimized communities.**
- ▶ **Collaborate in defining measurable outcomes of efforts to prevent and respond to hate crimes.**

Law enforcement leaders and officers will continue to contribute significantly to stopping violence and preventing hate crime. However, the work outlined in this report cannot be accomplished solely through the efforts of law enforcement agencies. Implementing summit recommendations requires the continuing collaboration and commitment of community leaders, parents and families, schools, and other public agencies in the ongoing enterprise to create a society of peacemakers.

IMPLEMENTATION

Several actions are necessary to implement summit recommendations. First, local agencies and organizations should read this report and identify areas of hate crime policy that are most important to their local jurisdiction. Second, agencies should select a set of specific recommendations most relevant to their current hate crime issues. Finally, agencies interested in taking action on the selected recommendations should contact the IACP or OJP to discuss strategies for implementation.

HATE CRIME IN AMERICA: ORIGINS AND NATURE

ORIGINS OF HATE

Though hate and its consequences have always been part of the human condition, we are not born with prejudice or intolerance. These attitudes are learned, as are the behaviors that constitute hate crime. In a review of evidence suggesting that we are not innately hostile, Ashley Montagu notes that “throughout the two million years of [human] evolution the highest premium has been placed on cooperation, not merely intragroup cooperation, but also intergroup cooperation, or else there would be no human beings today.”² It is also unfortunately true that many, even most, human groups, tribes, and nations “create a sense of social solidarity and membership in part by systematically creating enemies...The hostile imagination begins with a simple but crippling assumption: what is strange or unknown is dangerous and intends us evil.”³

Twentieth-century Americans have witnessed profound and far-reaching shifts in social structures, some of which may be perceived by certain groups (those with limited employment options or restricted social mobility, for example) as threats to economic or personal security. To the extent that fear of being displaced leads to bias-motivated attitudes and behavior, social change can create a climate conducive to increased prejudice and hate crime. Societal changes that may currently be seen as particularly threatening include:

- Formerly disenfranchised groups (e.g., racial and ethnic minorities, women, gays and lesbians, and people with disabilities) are claiming increasing political and economic power.
- The growing emphasis on technological and service work, and a corresponding decline in the availability of high-wage manufacturing jobs, is undermining the economic security of many.

- New waves of immigrants continue to transform the racial, ethnic, and religious composition of our nation.
- Increased mobility is destabilizing.
- Incidents of violence, aggression, and terrorism are regularly conveyed by the news media and increasingly portrayed in the entertainment media.

A group which perceives its security or identity to be threatened may react by consolidating and reinforcing a “consensual paranoia,” described by psychologist Sam Keen as “a complex of mental, emotional, and social mechanisms by which a person or a people claim righteousness and purity, and attribute hostility and evil to the enemy.”⁴ “Enemy” can be defined as anyone different from the threatened group. Organized hate groups and “mission offenders”⁵ provide the clearest example of this “othering” process at work, but all perpetrators of hate crimes, including both “thrill-seeking” and “reactive” offenders, as defined by Levin and McDevitt, are steeped in the fear and anger that fuel prejudice.⁶

HATE CRIME DEFINED

The following definition, a consensus opinion of participants, was used for summit deliberations:

A hate crime is a criminal offense committed against persons, property, or society that is motivated, in whole or in part, by an offender’s bias against an individual’s or a group’s race, religion, ethnic/national origin, gender, age, disability, or sexual orientation.

Prejudicial behavior exists along a continuum, including negative speech, discriminatory practices, property damage, physical assault, and murder.⁷ Organized hate groups are the most visible manifestations of bias, fueling fear and anger that may motivate individual perpetrators of hate crimes. It is these individuals who commit the majority of hate crimes.

Hate incidents and crimes victimize not only the individuals or institutions targeted, but the entire community or group they represent. "By making members of minority communities fearful, angry and suspicious of other groups - and of the power structure that is supposed to protect them - these incidents can damage the fabric of our society and fragment communities."⁸ Violent hate crimes may lead to cycles of retaliation and vigilantism that can engulf communities and perpetuate hatred and prejudice.

RECENT HATE CRIME LEGISLATION

In 1990, Congress passed the **Hate Crime Statistics Act** (P.L. 101-275) amending section 524 of Title 28 of the United States Code. The current language reads in part "the Attorney General shall acquire data, for each calendar year, about crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity, including where appropriate the crimes of murder; non-negligent manslaughter; forcible rape; aggravated assault; simple assault; intimidation; arson; and destruction, damage or vandalism of property." The Attorney General shall establish guidelines for the collection of such data and shall publish an annual summary of the data. (28 USC § 534)

The 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (P.L. 103-322):

- Amended the definition of "hate crime" to include disability for purposes of statistical reporting (P.L. 103-322, Title XXXII, Subtitle I, 320926, 108 Stat. 2131). See also 28 USC § 534 (1998).
- Directed the United States Sentencing Commission to "promulgate guidelines or amend existing guidelines to provide sentencing enhancements of not less than 3 offense levels for offenses that the finder of fact at trial determines beyond a reasonable doubt are hate crimes." (P.L. 103-322, Title XXVIII, 280003, 108 Stat. 2096) See also 18 USC § 994 Appx § 3A1.1 (1998). (Application note: hate crime penalties are not to be applied on the basis of gender in the case of a sexual offense.)
- Defined hate crime for purposes of sentencing as a "crime in which the defendant intentionally selects a victim, or in the case of a property crime, the

property that is the object of the crime, because of the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation or any person.” (P.L. 103-322, Title XXVIII, 280003, 108 Stat. 2096) See also 18 USC § 994 Appx § 3A1.1 (1998).

The **1994 Violence Against Women Act** (P.L. 102-322) created a civil cause of action for crimes motivated by gender. “A person (including a person who acts under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State) who commits a crime of violence motivated by gender and thus deprives another of the right declared in subsection (b) shall be liable to the party injured, in an action for the recovery of compensatory and punitive damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, and such other relief as a court may deem appropriate.” (P.L. 102-322, Title IV, Subtitle C, § 40302, 108 Stat. 1941) See also 42 USC § 13981.

Congress unanimously passed the **Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996** (P.L. 104-155), which makes the following actions federal crimes:

- Intentional defacing, damage or destruction of religious real property because of the religious character of that property or attempts to do so when the offense is in or affects interstate or foreign commerce. (18 USCS § 247)
- Intentional obstruction, by force or threat of force, of any person in the enjoyment of that person’s free exercise of religious beliefs or attempts to do so when the offense is in or affects interstate or foreign commerce. (18 USCS § 247)
- Intentional defacing, damage or destruction of religious real property because of the race, color, or ethnic characteristics of any individual associated with that religious property or attempts to do. (18 USCS § 247)

By 1998, 40 states and the District of Columbia had enacted statutes that require enhanced criminal penalties for crimes in which victims are selected because of perpetrators’ perceptions of race, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender.

Of those jurisdictions:

- All criminalize violence and intimidation motivated by race, religion, or ethnicity.
- 37 have passed some form of institutional (particularly church) vandalism legislation.
- 21 criminalize interference with religious worship.
- 20 criminalize violence motivated by gender.
- 21 criminalize violence motivated by sexual orientation.
- 23 criminalize violence motivated by other factors, such as disability, political affiliation, and/or age.⁹

In 1997, Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) introduced **S. 1529** and Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) introduced **H.R. 3081**. Both bills would:

- Amend the Federal criminal code to set penalties for persons who, whether or not acting under color of law, willfully cause bodily injury to any person or, through the use of fire, firearm, or explosive device, attempt to cause bodily injury to any person or, through the use of firearm, or explosive device, attempt to cause such injury, because of the actual or perceived: (1) race, color, religion, or national origin of any person; and (2) religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability of any person, where in connection with the offense, the defendant or the victim travels in interstate or foreign commerce, use a facility or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, or engages in any activity affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or where the offense is in or affects interstate or foreign commerce.
- Direct the United States Sentencing Commission to study the issue of adult recruitment of juveniles to commit hate crimes and, if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide sentencing enhancements for adult defendants who recruit juveniles to assist in the commission of hate crimes.

- Require the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice (DOJ) to make grants to State and local programs designed to combat hate crimes committed by juveniles. [Authorizes appropriations. Authorizes appropriations to the Department of the Treasury and to DOJ to increase the number of personnel to prevent and respond to alleged violations of provisions regarding interference with specified federally protected activities, such as voting.]

These bills are currently under committee review. IACP has passed resolution number EXC0017.A98, *Recommending Support for Hate Crime Laws*, in support of these bills.

INCIDENCE AND NATURE OF HATE CRIMES

Like all Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) reporting, it is not mandatory for state and local law enforcement agencies to report hate crimes to the FBI. Nevertheless, since passage of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act in 1990, progress has been made in documenting the incidence and nature of hate crimes.

- In 1991, the first year that UCR included hate crime data, 4,755 bias-motivated crimes were reported by 2,771 law enforcement agencies in 32 states.
- In 1997, 11,211 agencies reported a total of 9,861 hate crime offenses.
- By 1997, 21 states and the District of Columbia had passed statutes requiring collection of data on hate crimes, though their definitions and reporting requirements vary.¹⁰

Progress notwithstanding, measurement and reporting challenges make it impossible to determine from UCR data either the actual magnitude of hate crime or whether the rate of hate crime has been rising or falling.

A central challenge to accurate reporting of hate crime is the need to determine offender motivation. Hate crimes traditionally are motivated by bias. Many law enforcement

agencies may be reluctant to ascribe bias motivation until incidents can be thoroughly investigated or offenders apprehended. The FBI suggests a protocol that law enforcement agencies can follow to determine whether bias motivation exists.¹¹

In addition to the FBI, private advocacy organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League, the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force compile hate crime data. Some of these public-interest groups record all incidents, including bias-motivated speech, as hate crimes, and accept reports from community-based organizations and/or anonymous sources.¹² These organizations may use different definitions of hate crimes than law enforcement agencies. These differences may account for hate crime counts that diverge from UCR statistics.

It is likely that many victims do not report hate crimes to the police. Reasons may include the following:

- fear of revictimization or retaliation by offenders
- feelings of humiliation and shame about being victimized
- uncertainty about the responsiveness of law enforcement and justice system agencies
- cultural and language barriers
- for undocumented aliens, fear of being deported
- for gays and lesbians, fear of being “outed”

Considering these factors, UCR hate crime statistics most likely underrepresent actual incidence. Even if the actual number of hate crimes is small in comparison to other crime types, their impact is broad and powerful. “A single hate crime has the power to send a broad ripple of fear and discomfiture across a community.”¹³

The UCR data do provide a profile of hate crimes, victims, and offenders, which can assist policymakers. Of the 9,861 hate crime offenses reported in 1997,

- 71% of all reported hate crimes were motivated by racial or ethnic bias,
- 39% of all reported hate crimes were motivated by bias against blacks,
- 15% of all reported hate crimes were motivated by religious bias,
- 14% of all reported hate crimes were motivated by sexual orientation,
- 0.1% of all reported hate crimes were motivated by disability,
- 63% of known offenders of hate crimes were white,
- 19% of known offenders of hate crimes were black,
- 70% of the 9,861 reported offenses were crimes against persons,
- 30% of reported offenses were crimes against property.¹⁴

The 1996 UCR statistics do not indicate age or gender of suspected hate crime offenders. An Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention study estimated that 17 to 26 percent of hate crimes recorded by law enforcement agencies are committed by juveniles under 18.¹⁵ A 1988 study estimated that half of those arrested for hate crimes are adolescents and young adults between 16 and 25 years of age.¹⁶ The Bureau of Justice Assistance reports that “the UCR for 1994 illustrates that the majority of hate crimes are committed by young white males against persons of other races”.¹⁷

Federal, state, and local agencies, as well as public-interest organizations, have initiated a wide array of approaches to combat hate crimes during the past decade. These approaches include the following:

- Increasing community awareness of hate crime and its impact, and promoting a “zero tolerance” atmosphere;
- Encouraging community organizations to collaborate with law enforcement and other justice agencies to prevent and respond to hate crime more effectively;

- Implementing diversity and tolerance education, as well as conflict resolution training, in schools;
- Drafting model hate crime legislation;
- Developing mechanisms to enable systematic state and national reporting of hate crime incidents by law enforcement agencies;
- Increasing efforts to deal with the impact of hate incidents and crimes and to assist and support victims;
- Expanding training options and opportunities for law enforcement, victim assistance and other justice system professionals who respond to hate crimes and their victims;
- Allocating resources to support specialized sentencing options for youthful hate crime offenders that can prevent their recidivism “through education, community service, and exposure to previous targets of their bigotry.”¹⁸

Although a great deal has been accomplished, much work remains to be done. The *Hate Crime in America Summit* provided an opportunity to consolidate and build on the achievements of the many community groups, public agencies, and private organizations concerned with this issue.

SUMMIT BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Since 1994, the IACP has held annual summits on critical issues facing law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve. Each has brought together approximately 100 police and community leaders, justice system decisionmakers, scholars, and others with expertise in an area to share information, deliberate on issues, and craft recommendations and action plans.

■ **1994: *Violence in the United States***

Focusing on all types of violent crime, this summit produced a report to the president and Congress that recommended policies to reduce violence in U.S. communities. The report principally focused on law enforcement strategies at the federal, state, county, and local levels.

■ **1995: *Murder in America***

This summit examined various aspects of homicide, including murders committed in the context of domestic violence, gang activities, robbery, and fights that escalate to murder. Participants developed four classes of strategies to reduce homicide: prevention, intervention, enforcement, and prosecution components. The strategies set forth a leadership position for the police.

■ **1996: *Youth Violence in America***

Youthful victims and perpetrators of violent crime were the central concern of this summit. Participants called for strong relationships among schools, police, religious institutions, and community leaders to fight youth crime and keep youth out of trouble through early and consistent prevention and intervention strategies.

■ **1997: *Family Violence in America: Breaking the Cycle for Children Who Witness***

Children who witness domestic violence were the focal point of this summit. Participants developed policies and protocols to respond effectively to these

children, who are themselves at great risk of becoming abusers or victims if they are not successfully protected and supported.

SUMMIT OBJECTIVES

In November 1997, President Clinton convened the *White House Conference on Hate Crimes* to focus national attention on prejudice and its destructive consequences. More than 200 persons representing groups that have historically been targets of hate crimes gathered to define the scope of the problem and outline innovative solutions. The IACP continued and expanded this dialogue at its *Hate Crime In America Summit*.

Using the findings of the White House Conference as a foundation, the *1998 IACP Hate Crime in America Summit* brought together over 100 individuals to accomplish six objectives:

- **Prioritize This Critical Problem.** Motivate law enforcement agencies and communities to devote increased attention and resources to the problem of hate crime and its destructive personal, social, and criminal consequences.
- **Illuminate the Issues.** Through presentations, discussions, and debate crystallize knowledge, surface new information, and transform perspectives on hate crime.
- **Achieve Consensus on Effective Approaches.** Forge a consensus on the most promising strategies to prevent, respond to and control hate crimes.
- **Strengthen Capacity to Advocate and Implement the Consensus.** Return participants to their communities better prepared to devise and implement policies and programs to enhance quality of life—with support from a powerful nationwide network of colleagues.
- **Motivate Communities Across the Nation to Take Action.** Produce an action plan to alert communities to the dangers of hate crime and to enable them to build consensus around critical issues, and implement recommended prevention and response strategies.

- **Highlight Law Enforcement's Pivotal Role in Preventing and Responding to Hate Crime.** Build upon the unique capacities and responsibilities of law enforcement agencies to prevent and respond to hate crime.

SUMMIT FRAMEWORK

To illuminate issues, generate action recommendations, and forge consensus on promising strategies, eight issue-specific breakout groups were formed. Groups were encouraged to consider a range of tailored questions.

■ **COMMUNITY**

- How can awareness of the hate crime problem be increased?
- How can unhealthy community norms be changed?
- How can the community prevent hate crime? What obstacles might a community encounter and what could be done to surmount them?
- How can communities develop strategies to address hate crime against different victimized groups (e.g., sexual orientation, religion, race, gender)? What should be different for each group? Similar?
- What measurable outcomes should be defined for community hate crime prevention and intervention efforts?

■ **SCHOOLS (K - 12)**

- How can schools increase awareness of hate crime? What strategies can be used?
- What policies and programs could be enacted to create a tolerant and peaceful atmosphere in schools?
- What policies and strategies can schools employ to identify students at risk of committing hate crimes?
- How can schools intervene with students who are involved in hate crimes?
- What can schools do to respond effectively to crime victims in the school setting?
- What measurable outcomes should be defined for school hate crime prevention and intervention efforts?

■ **SCHOOLS (COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES)**

- How should colleges/universities educate students regarding hate crime? What about those studying to be teachers, health care providers, or justice system practitioners?
- How can the college/university community engage in hate crime prevention on campus?
- Under what circumstances are non-justice responses (e.g., disciplinary or review boards) to hate crime on campus appropriate? Under what circumstances are justice system responses appropriate?
- What aspects of campus culture contribute to hate crime (e.g., exclusive groups, student isolation from the broader community) and how can they be transformed?
- What criteria should be used to assess effectiveness of the campus response? What differences and similarities in outcome measures might there be across types of campuses?

■ **FIRST RESPONDERS**

- What is the best definition of hate crime? Do we share a common understanding? How should differences in legal, philosophical, and record-keeping definitions be reconciled?
- How can offender motivation/intent be assessed?
- How can first responders be trained to recognize hate crime and deal with victims and witnesses effectively and sensitively?
- How can first providers be trained to recognize, document, and control crime scene evidence to prove a hate crime was committed?
- What criteria should be used to assess first responder effectiveness? What similarities and differences in outcome measures might there be across types of first responders?

■ **JUSTICE**

- What is the best definition of hate crime? Do we share a common understanding? How should differences in legal, philosophical, and record-keeping definitions be reconciled?
- What justice system policies, procedures, or protocols can help to heal the harms caused by hate crime?

- What is the appropriate correctional response to hate crime offenders? What can be done to rehabilitate them? Should responses to youthful and adult offenders differ? What about members of organized hate groups?
- How can the responses to hate crimes by various justice system agencies be coordinated within a jurisdiction?
- How can justice agencies develop and sustain a partnership with community organizations, schools, and first responders to prevent and respond to hate crimes? What would these partnerships look like?
- What criteria should be used to assess justice system effectiveness? What differences and similarities in outcome measures might there be across different agencies of the justice system?

■ LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERSHIP

- What role can law enforcement leadership play to reduce hate and hate crimes in the community?
- What is the role of the chief/administrator in response to community concerns?
- What is the role of the chief/administrator when a hate incident occurs?
- How can police leadership respond effectively when a hate crime has been committed?
- How can law enforcement agencies develop and sustain partnerships with community organizations, schools, other justice agencies, and other first responders to prevent and respond to hate crimes? What would these partnerships look like?
- What criteria should be used to assess law enforcement effectiveness in responding to hate crime? What differences and similarities in outcome measures might there be across law enforcement agencies (e.g., rural vs. urban)?

■ VICTIM RESPONSE

- What are the primary concerns of hate crime victims regarding response from professionals? What changes should be made?
- How can the community and justice system agencies improve chances that victims will report hate crime?
- How can victims and their communities be restored after a hate crime incident?

- What programs and services should be offered by justice and non-justice agencies to victims, and in what ways should they differ among victim groups?
- How should justice system agencies assist and support victims when a hate incident is not being prosecuted as a hate crime, but the victim/community perceives it as such?
- What criteria should be used to assess the effectiveness of response to victims? What differences and similarities in outcome measures might there be for responding to victims?

■ ORGANIZED HATE

- How should communities be involved in recognizing and monitoring organized hate groups?
- How can the justice system better track, understand, and respond effectively to the activities of organized hate groups?
- How can communities and criminal justice agencies balance free speech and assembly rights of organized hate groups with community and individual rights to safety? What role can justice agency leadership play?
- How can communities become aware of emerging hate groups and newly targeted victim groups?

STRATEGIES TO PREVENT AND RESPOND TO HATE CRIMES: SUMMIT RECOMMENDATIONS

The summit produced 46 recommendations to

- ***Prevent Hate Crime,***
- ***Respond to Hate Crime,***
- ***Measure the Effectiveness of Prevention and Response Efforts.***

Collectively, the recommendations constitute an action agenda to advance understanding of hate crime, prevent hate crime, and improve the effectiveness of our response to this complex and challenging social problem. The agenda sets forth roles and responsibilities for a coordinated, community-wide response by citizens, schools and colleges, police, justice system agencies, social service agencies, and victims.

The summit also produced a Law Enforcement Action Agenda—12 essential actions to help police address hate crime.

HOW CAN WE PREVENT HATE CRIME?

Investing in prejudice reduction and violence prevention is vital to reducing the incidence of hate crime. Summit participants were hopeful that communities, schools, and justice system agencies can work together to create and maintain conditions in which prejudice gives way to tolerance and bias-motivated violence is replaced with peaceful problem-solving. Summit participants recommended 18 proactive initiatives to help communities prevent bias-motivated incidents and hate crime.

■ **Increase Public Awareness**

An informed citizenry is the cornerstone of our democratic society. Citizen involvement is essential to the success of any program to reduce prejudice and prevent bias-related crimes.

1. Create multidisciplinary planning processes to develop coordinated approaches to prevent and respond to hate crime.

Some communities already engage in crime prevention planning processes that include representatives of business, religious institutions, advocacy groups, public and private schools and colleges, and the full spectrum of justice agencies. Every community should maintain or develop a strategic crime prevention planning process that includes a focus on hate crime, and view planning as an ongoing responsibility, not just a one-time project.

2. Create local Human Rights Commissions or other forums to promote community harmony and stability.

All citizens should be encouraged to talk about their differences and commonalities and to share their visions of safe and healthy communities. HRCs or other organized forums can sponsor community events that bring people together to learn about and celebrate one another and provide multicultural training in many facets of community life.

3. Focus public attention on issues of prejudice, intolerance, and the ways that hate crime affects community vitality and safety.

Community and justice system leaders, particularly police chiefs, must continue to speak out forcefully against intolerance, bigotry, and hate crime, not only in the aftermath of high-profile incidents, but at all times. Citizens must recognize that hate crimes, and even bias-motivated behaviors that are not criminal, victimize not only the targeted individuals or groups, but the entire community. Communities become victims when hate crime erodes mutual respect and civility, and undermines the citizens' sense of well-being and safety.

4. Develop public information to promote values of tolerance and social equality.

Justice agencies, private foundations, and community groups should collaborate to develop hard-hitting, culturally relevant endorsements of the value of tolerance and

understanding that can be disseminated through print and electronic means to diverse audiences.

5. Raise awareness of the goals and activities of organized hate groups.

Hate groups are less effective in sowing seeds of social unrest and conflict when their activities (including Internet hate sites) are brought to light. Continuous monitoring of hate group activity is vital for contravening their influence on children, youth, and other groups vulnerable to their toxic diatribe. Their messages of bigotry and intolerance can be countered by community leaders, schools, and justice agencies with truthful information that promotes mutual understanding and honors diversity.

6. Develop national, regional, and/or state task forces to understand and counter the influence of organized hate groups.

Because the influence of many organized hate groups is national or regional, strategies to counter their hate-producing efforts must also be national or regional, and be developed by broad-based coalitions of political, business, religious, community, and justice system leaders. Strategies to contain and counteract the negative influences of hate groups, while respecting their First Amendment rights, require creativity, persistence, and constant vigilance. The United States Department of Justice/United States Attorney Hate Crime Task Force Initiative can serve as a model and a vehicle for coordinated efforts.

Educate Children and Young Adults

Teaching our children to respect differences and celebrate diversity is essential to prevent development of prejudiced attitudes that can lead to hate crime. Because conflict is a fact of human life, children must also be given tools to deal with conflict constructively, to become “peacemakers.”¹⁹

7. Involve parents in efforts to prevent and intervene against bias-motivated behavior of their children.

Parents should be engaged in hate crime prevention in a variety of ways, from helping to design and deliver conflict-resolution and hate crime prevention curricula, to participating in mediation and conflict resolution activities in their children's schools. Schools should consider involving parents of children expressing prejudicial beliefs or behaving in discriminatory ways in interventions to prevent the speech or behavior from escalating into more harmful criminal acts.

8. Foster a "zero-tolerance" atmosphere in schools and colleges.

Written codes of conduct for students, teachers, and other employees should express support for peaceful conflict resolution and clearly delineate the consequences for engaging in bias-motivated behavior. Codes of conduct should be readily available to students, parents of students, faculty, and other employees.

9. Provide every student and teacher the opportunity to participate in hate crime prevention courses and activities.

Hate crime prevention curricula can be used in general and alternative classroom settings, schools experiencing bias crime problems, with student government leaders, in after-school programs, and in teacher training. The Education Development Center, with support of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, has prepared a model curriculum for middle and high school students designed to reduce prejudice and prevent crimes based on intolerance.²⁰ The U.S. Departments of Education and Justice collaborated to produce a manual that provides guidance to schools and communities to develop school-based hate crime prevention programs.²¹

10. Incorporate hate crime education into existing curricula.

Schools and colleges should encourage faculty to incorporate hate crime education into existing curricula in subject areas such as health, geography, social studies, history, and civics. Studies in these and other areas offer many opportunities to

promote tolerance and to illustrate the negative individual and societal impacts of prejudice and bigotry.

11. Reinforce diversity training and multicultural education at early ages.

Multicultural education diminishes reliance on stereotyping, and reduces the chances of miscommunication between members of cultural groups. To develop an appreciation of similarities and differences among groups of people, children and young adults should learn about the many cultures that make up American society.

12. Provide conflict resolution training to all children.

Children should be taught skills essential to peaceful conflict resolution, including active listening, appropriate expression of feelings, negotiation, and interruption of expressions of bias. There are model curricula and approaches appropriate for various age levels and contexts, including New York City's Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP),²² peer mediation initiatives, the "peaceable school" approach, as well as parent-led and community-based efforts.²³

13. Intervene with students who express discriminatory beliefs before their behavior escalates.

Standards for recognizing and responding appropriately to discriminatory expressions and behavior should be clearly articulated and widely disseminated to students, teachers, and parents. Faculty and other staff should be trained to identify early warning signs of risk of hate incidents and crimes. Schools and colleges should offer counseling, mentoring, and educational opportunities for all students who exhibit prejudicial beliefs and behaviors. Efforts of organized hate groups to disseminate information to students or recruit them as members should be carefully monitored.

■ **Educate Community Groups and Leaders**

Community leaders and citizen groups should have the skills and knowledge to recognize and actively resist intolerance and hate-motivated actions in their neighborhoods and jurisdictions.

14. Inform vulnerable groups and individuals about ways to protect themselves from bias-motivated incidents and crime.

Individuals or groups that could be a target of hate crime because of race, religion, ethnic/national origin, gender, age, disability, or sexual orientation should be informed about ways to prevent being victimized. Justice system and other professionals should train and counsel potential victims to help them recognize threatening situations and to provide conflict resolution and other coping skills to enable them to deal effectively with bias-motivated behaviors. Vulnerable individuals should be informed about the importance of reporting bias-related incidents and the support that is available for seeking redress of discriminatory actions. Training materials should be published in different languages to reduce language and cultural barriers to reporting.

15. Provide knowledge and impart skills to recognize and defuse high-risk situations.

Community groups and leaders should seek training and support from a coalition of justice system agencies, teachers, social service professionals, and victim advocacy groups to identify patterns of prejudice and discrimination before they escalate into hate incidents or crimes. Coalitions should also train community leaders in techniques for defusing and addressing identified high-risk situations. Professional mediation and conflict resolution services should also be available to support the ongoing prevention efforts of community leaders and neighborhood groups. The Department of Justice Community Relations Service can provide support in this area.

■ **Encourage Strategic Planning and Collaborative Problem-Solving**

Ongoing collaboration of citizens, elected officials, and public employees to develop strategic hate crime prevention enhances chances for success. Citizens who participate in governmental decisionmaking processes are more likely to assume their share of responsibility for specific outcomes and the overall quality of life in their communities.

16. Develop mechanisms for ongoing problem-solving within local communities.

To prevent unresolved racial, ethnic, or other tensions from erupting into hate incidents or crimes, communities should establish coalitions of political, business, religious, and justice system leaders to encourage ongoing dialogue about current problems and recommend collaborative approaches for resolving them. These coalitions could be the same groups that are involved in long-range strategic planning to prevent hate crime.

17. Encourage responsible and accurate media coverage.

The media should be urged to report on hate crimes accurately, to treat victims with dignity and sensitivity, to provide balanced coverage of organized hate group activities, and to highlight community partners' successes in preventing and responding to hate crimes.

18. Improve accuracy and completeness of information about the incidence of and response to hate crime.

Citizens need to know the facts about hate crimes and current responses to them, so they can more effectively prevent hate crime and deal with its impact on communities. Achieving greater accuracy in documenting hate crimes depends to a large extent on developing shared definitions and reducing barriers to comprehensive reporting, as discussed in several recommendations that follow.

HOW SHOULD WE RESPOND TO HATE CRIME?

Summit participants reached consensus that the following are effective responses to hate crime:

- The definition of hate crime must be clear and commonly understood.
- Offenders must understand that hate crime will not be tolerated and those who commit it will be apprehended and appropriately sanctioned.
- Victims must be taken seriously and supported in dealing with the social, emotional, physical, and financial impacts of hate crime.
- Justice system practitioners and their community partners must hold hate crime offenders accountable for their actions and provide opportunities for them to broaden their perspectives and change their values.

These general principles helped summit work groups craft 22 policy and program recommendations to guide communities and public agencies toward more effective responses to hate crime.

■ **Develop Shared Definitions of Hate Incidents and Hate Crimes**

Prejudicial behavior exists along a continuum including negative speech, discriminatory practices, property damage, physical assault, and murder. Legally, a hate crime is any crime enumerated in a hate crime statute in which a perpetrator is subject to an enhanced penalty if the crime was motivated by bias, as defined by the statute. Hate incidents involve behaviors that, though motivated by bias against a victim's race, religion, ethnic/national origin, gender, age, disability, or sexual orientation, are not criminal acts. Communities and justice agencies should develop a common language for these attitudes and behaviors so that their responses can be consistent, equitable, and effective.

1. Broaden statutory definitions of hate crimes to eliminate disparities between laws.

Disparities between federal and state hate crime laws should be eliminated by supporting new laws, which encompass criminal offenses committed against persons, property, or society, which are motivated in whole or in part by offenders' bias against an individual's or a group's actual or perceived race, religion, ethnicity/national origin, disability, sexual orientation, or, where legally permissible, gender. For example, federal law includes sexual orientation, while some state laws do not.

2. Clarify the difference between hate incidents and hate crimes.

Definitions of reportable incidents (hate crimes) should distinguish hate crimes from hate incidents. Hate incidents, in which an individual or group is subjected to negative or offensive speech or behavior that is not a criminal offense, still harm the sense of safety of victims and communities.

■ **Eliminate Barriers to Hate Crime Reporting**

3. Encourage reporting of all hate incidents and crimes.

Citizens should be informed through a variety of sources that reporting crimes as bias-related can result in enhanced penalties for perpetrators and specialized support for victims. Schools and colleges should report all hate crimes occurring on campuses to local police. Law enforcement agencies, school administrators, and other first responders should encourage citizens to report all bias-related incidents to the police, even if these incidents do not constitute hate crimes, so high-risk situations can be tracked and appropriate problem-solving actions can be taken.

4. Make it safe and easy to report bias-related incidents and crimes.

To ensure comprehensive reporting of hate incidents and crimes, victims and witnesses must feel safe from retaliation or stigmatization. Telephone hotlines are one way to encourage community members, including students, to report incidents.

Crimes reported on hotlines must be reported to a law enforcement agency to be effectively investigated and prosecuted. Police must ensure that both victims and witnesses feel safe.

5. Develop and disseminate hate crime reporting protocols.

Law enforcement agencies, schools and colleges, medical professionals, and community organizations should collaboratively develop and issue standard operating procedures (SOPs) and memoranda of understanding (MOUs) that detail how and to whom individuals should report hate incidents and crimes.²⁴ SOPs should include criteria to identify incidents as bias-related and determine whether a crime has occurred. They should include specific procedures for reporting both crimes and incidents. These SOPs should be communicated to citizens and community groups in user-friendly, culturally relevant and language-sensitive formats. Hate crimes should always be reported to the police; other hate incidents may be reported to community organizations and kept in some central repository or database.

■ **Provide Adequate Support to Victims of Hate Incidents and Hate Crimes**

6. Ensure that responses to hate incidents and crimes are swift, thorough and sensitive to the feelings of victims.

First responders must obtain accurate information about an incident; conduct a preliminary assessment of physical, emotional, and financial injury to a victim; and reassure victims that their concerns and needs will be addressed. First responders must be prepared to assist victims whose initial emotional reactions to an incident may include rage, terror, and grief. Victims and their families should be immediately referred to victim assistance agencies and other community services when needed.

7. Develop coordinated community plans to respond to and manage public demonstrations by organized hate groups.

Plans should specify the responsibilities of law enforcement agencies, including protection of First Amendment rights, techniques to prevent violence through separation of demonstrators and counter groups, and notification and communications responsibilities. Community groups should partner with justice agencies to develop constructive ways to counter the potential negative impacts of such events and to use demonstrations as opportunities to educate citizens, students, and justice system professionals regarding precipitating factors and effective responses. The Department of Justice Community Relations Service can be an excellent resource for help in designing a peaceful response to hate group marches and gatherings.

8. Assign organizational responsibility for coordinating and monitoring hate crime response.

Every law enforcement agency should fix responsibility for coordinating and monitoring responses to hate crime in a specific individual/operating unit. Other first responder organizations, particularly schools and colleges, should also designate individuals who will ensure that responses to hate incidents and crimes are timely and appropriate.

9. Accord community recognition to “Good Samaritans” who protect victims of hate incidents or crimes, or who report incidents to appropriate authorities.

Individuals who risk their own safety to assist victims of bias crime, as well as those who take the time to report threatening or harmful hate incidents, should be publicly recognized for their efforts.

10. Provide specialized support to hate crime victims through existing victim assistance programs.

Victim assistance programs should individualize support for victims of hate incidents and crimes in recognition of the unique and severe impacts they may suffer.

Programs should recognize that hate crimes that involve “only” minor property damage or assaults still may have serious long-term impacts on victims. Programs should partner with schools and community groups to provide ongoing support for all hate crime victims, so victims’ alienation from their communities can be ameliorated. Agencies and groups providing ongoing services to hate crime victims should be co-located to permit better coordination.

■ **Establish Mechanisms for Repairing Harms to Communities**

11. Support, console, and assist targeted communities.

Hate crimes harm not only individual victims but also the groups and communities of which they are a part. Justice and victim assistance agencies should convene and facilitate community meetings in the aftermath of hate crimes to provide opportunities to express feelings and begin the process of restoring a sense of safety and well-being to community members.

12. Develop coordinated community incident response plans.

Communities should create hate crime response teams that comprise representatives of law enforcement, other justice agencies, schools, health care providers, victim assistance programs, and cultural diversity advocacy groups. These teams should develop policies and procedures to respond to bias-motivated incidents or hate crimes. Communities can turn to the United States Department of Justice/United States Attorney Hate Crime Task Force for guidance.

13. Ensure that schools and colleges establish processes to respond to bias-related incidents.

Schools and colleges are self-contained communities that should support students victimized by hate incidents and crimes, and provide for appropriate school-based disciplinary actions and remedial interventions for student perpetrators.

14. Engage the media as partners to restore communities to wholeness.

Through responsible reporting, the media can play a critical role in defusing community tensions, preventing further bias-motivated incidents in the wake of identified hate crimes, and educating the public to understand and prevent hate crime. Justice agencies and community groups should establish a single point of contact to provide media representatives with accurate information about the nature and impact of hate incidents and crimes while respecting individual victims' rights to privacy and security.

■ **Develop More Effective Sanctions for Hate Crime Perpetrators**

15. Impose enhanced sentences for violent or repetitive hate crime offenders.

Most hate crime statutes provide enhanced penalties, usually longer sentences, for crimes determined to be bias-related. These enhancements are particularly appropriate for chronic, violent hate crime offenders who pose a significant and continuing risk to community safety.

16. Use restorative justice options for first-time nonviolent hate crime offenders.

Restorative justice options can promote healing of victims and change offender attitudes, while restoring the trust of the community. They are appropriate whenever victims and communities are willing to hold hate crime offenders accountable for repairing the physical and emotional harm caused by their actions.

17. Involve parents of juvenile hate crime offenders in post-adjudication sanctions and interventions.

Families can have a powerful influence, for better or worse, on the outcomes of correctional interventions for youthful offenders. Involving parents and their children in treatment and education opportunities can teach whole families to practice peaceful conflict resolution and exercise tolerance of individual differences.

18. Develop strategies to counter the influence of organized hate groups in correctional institutions.

Efforts to change attitudes and behavior patterns of hate crime offenders sentenced to prison may be thwarted by the influence of organized hate groups operating within prisons and jails. Corrections administrators must develop strategies to contain or counter the bias-motivated activities and expressions of these inmate groups.

■ **Enhance Professional Training**

Professionals who must respond to hate crimes, assist victims and communities, and impose sanctions and interventions on convicted offenders require ongoing training and technical support. In 1995, a model curriculum for training law enforcement and victim assistance professionals was fashioned by the Education Development Center, with funding from the Office for Victims of Crime and the Bureau of Justice Assistance.²⁵ A few years before, the FBI published a guide to assist law enforcement agencies with hate crime data collection and training program design.²⁶ Many other resources can be tapped to help design and implement essential training. Summit participants recommend four types of training:

19. Train first responders, investigators, and leaders.

Topics should include the following: recognizing bias-related incidents, utilizing standard criteria to determine bias and assess perpetrator intent, interviewing victims and witnesses, collecting and preserving evidence, referring victims to appropriate community agencies, providing information to prosecutors and the courts, and standardizing documentation of hate incidents/crimes. The U.S. Department of Justice has available four hate crime curriculums that are excellent training resources: Patrol and Responding Officers; Detectives and Investigators; Core Curriculum for Patrol Officers, Detectives, and Command Officers; and Command Officers.²⁷

20. Train victim assistance providers.

Topics should include assessing impacts of hate incidents and crimes on victims, reviewing hate crime reporting protocols, exploring the continuum of support options, and engaging community groups in the healing process.

21. Train judges and prosecutors.

Topics should include creative alternative sentencing approaches, outcomes and impacts of all types of sanctions, and treatments for perpetrators. Prosecutors and judges must be fully apprised of community and law enforcement strategies for hate crimes, so subsequent charging and adjudication decisions are consistent.

22. Provide cross-disciplinary training for all those who respond to hate incidents and crimes.

Cross-disciplinary training that involves educators, law enforcement officers, victim assistance providers, court personnel, and correctional officers should promote closer collaboration for response to hate crime.

HOW WILL WE KNOW WE ARE SUCCEEDING?

Summit participants cited three types of research that are needed to better understand hate crime, its consequences, and promising responses:

- Conduct basic research to shed light on the causes of hate crime and to provide insight into promising ways to deal with the causes.
- Evaluate research to identify the most effective prevention efforts.
- Evaluate research to identify the most effective strategies to heal community harm and reform offenders.

Six recommendations were developed.

■ **Conduct Basic Research**

1. **Clearly define expected outcomes of hate crime prevention and response efforts.**

Useful program evaluation relies on clear and measurable definitions of outcomes. In addition to reducing the incidence of hate crime (all hate crime or particular offense types targeted by a prevention strategy), positive outcomes could include changes in attitudes of children or community members who participate in hate crime prevention training, improved conflict resolution skills, increased victim satisfaction, enhanced perceptions of safety and well-being, reduced recidivism rates, and positive changes in the behavior or attitudes of offenders.

2. **Define valid measures of expected outcomes.**

To assess the impact of prevention and response efforts, outcome measures must be carefully specified and the results interpreted validly. For example, in communities with growing populations, the *number* of hate crime incidents may increase over time even though prevention and response efforts may be contributing to an overall reduction in the *rate* of hate crimes. Quantifying changes in other outcomes involving attitudes, values, or perceptions is a challenging evaluation task, but can be accomplished through careful design of survey formats, data collection protocols, and methods of “counting” that ensure uniformity and objectivity.

■ **Evaluate Outcomes of Prevention and Response Efforts**

3. **Ensure that all hate incidents and crimes are documented thoroughly and consistently.**

To assess correlations among characteristics of victims, perpetrators, and the situations in which hate crimes occur, detailed information about these variables

should be routinely collected by first responders and stored in central data repositories accessible to researchers.

4. Collect data on expected outcomes where particular prevention and intervention efforts are being implemented, over time, across jurisdictions, and in a variety of settings.

By documenting trends in such outcome measures as the rate of reported hate crimes or the recidivism of convicted perpetrators, the long-range impact of prevention and response strategies can be demonstrated. However, in jurisdictions where the rate of hate crime reporting has been low, a desirable short-term or interim outcome may well be to increase the rate of reported hate incidents or crimes. Analyzing differences in trends across jurisdictions and settings may also yield insights about the impacts of contextual factors on outcomes.

5. Share quantitative and qualitative information about the elements of successful prevention and response programs.

Researchers and program evaluators should collaborate with justice professionals and those who implement prevention and response strategies to design evaluations that will generate information useful for program design, public information campaigns, and professional training efforts. Evaluators must document the qualitative case studies of successful efforts to prevent and respond to bias-motivated incidents. Human-scale stories can enrich the pictures painted by quantitative data, and encourage others to invest in similar efforts in their own communities.

6. Systematically record characteristics and activities of organized hate groups.

Documenting the extent to which organized hate group activities are linked to hate incidents and crimes is important. Through study of hate group goals, tactics, and impacts, researchers may be able to pinpoint promising ways to counter their influence, both with their members and on the larger society.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTION AGENDA

Law enforcement agencies must assume a central role in implementing the hate crime prevention, response, and performance measurement strategies outlined above. To encourage and enable law enforcement agencies to lead community-wide endeavors, summit participants recommended 12 actions:

1. Establish a “zero-tolerance” atmosphere in every law enforcement agency.

Police leaders and officers must be positive examples for their communities by actively discouraging bias-related behavior or speech in their own organizations. To be leaders in preventing hate crimes, law enforcement professionals must ensure that they exemplify the values of tolerance and peaceful conflict resolution, and that any bias-related behavior by police officers is dealt with swiftly, equitably, and severely.

2. Encourage local jurisdictions to conduct hate crime summits.

Local hate crime summits or focus groups can elicit community views on pressing issues, educate community leaders, and galvanize public support for investing in hate crime prevention and response. Law enforcement agencies can use the IACP summit model to engage community organizations, first responders, schools, and justice system agencies to collaborate closely with police to address hate crimes.

3. Participate in collaborative development of coordinated approaches to prevent and respond to hate crimes.

Law enforcement agencies must be architects of and active participants in ongoing planning processes to enable communities to assess hate crime issues, inventory current policies and practices, and devise strategies to improve prevention and intervention efforts.

4. Sponsor and participate actively in community events, forums, and activities concerning diversity tolerance, bias reduction, conflict resolution, and hate crime prevention.

Police leaders and officers should be an influential presence at public events that encourage community members to talk about differences and commonalities and share visions of safe and healthy communities. Law enforcement leaders must continue to speak out forcefully against intolerance, bigotry, and hate crimes, not only in the aftermath of particular incidents, but at all times.

5. Respond to and support the individual victims of hate crimes and their communities.

Police officers must obtain accurate information about a hate crime or incident; conduct a preliminary assessment of victims' physical, emotional and financial injuries; and reassure victims that their concerns and needs will be addressed comprehensively. Police should encourage members of the community at large to express their feelings and should take action to restore a sense of safety and well being in the community.

6. Employ community policing strategies to prevent and respond to hate crimes.

Community policing principles encourage law enforcement agencies to foster close connections with the communities they serve, and to support officers in creative problem-solving that will prevent or discourage criminal behavior. These principles can readily be applied to the work of preventing hate-motivated incidents and crimes.

7. Continuously investigate, track, and deal appropriately with the activities of organized hate groups.

Continuous intelligence-gathering about hate group activities is a primary responsibility of law enforcement agencies that requires cross-jurisdictional collaboration and significant investment in information systems technology and training. Law enforcement agencies must protect the First Amendment rights of hate groups while simultaneously ensuring the safety and well-being of communities that hate groups attack verbally or in other non-criminal ways.

8. Identify and report all bias-related incidents and hate crimes completely and accurately.

Law enforcement agencies should collaborate with other first responders to specify how and to whom citizens should report bias-related incidents and hate crimes. Detailed information about characteristics of victims, of perpetrators, and the situations in which hate incidents and crimes occur should be routinely collected by police.

9. Ensure that all law enforcement professionals are trained to recognize and respond appropriately to hate crimes.

Police officers must be trained to recognize potential bias-related incidents, use standard criteria for determining bias and assessing perpetrators' intent, interview victims and witnesses, collect and preserve evidence, refer victims to appropriate community agencies, provide information to prosecutors and the courts, and standardize documentation of all hate incidents/crimes.

10. Assist schools and colleges to design and deliver hate crime prevention curricula and to develop response protocols.

Hate crime prevention curricula can be used in general and alternative classrooms, in schools experiencing bias crime problems, with student government leaders, in after-school programs, and in teacher training. The Education Development Center, with support of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, has prepared a model curriculum for middle and high school students designed to reduce prejudice and prevent crimes based on intolerance. The U.S. Departments of Education and Justice collaborated to produce a manual that provides guidance to schools and communities to develop school-based hate crime prevention programs. Police leaders and officers should be involved in planning and delivering such curricula in a wide variety of school and college/university settings. Law enforcement agencies can also assist schools and colleges in developing protocols for recognizing and responding appropriately to hate incidents and crimes.

11. Engage the media as partners in preventing hate crimes and restoring victimized communities.

Law enforcement leaders and their public information officers should encourage the media to report on hate crimes accurately, to treat victims with dignity and sensitivity, to provide balanced coverage of organized hate group activities, and to highlight community successes in preventing and responding to hate crimes.

12. Collaborate in defining measurable outcomes of efforts to prevent and respond to hate crimes.

Police leaders and officers should work with community members and researchers to define standards for success in preventing and responding to hate crimes. Performance measures should focus not only on reducing negative behaviors, but also on enhancing the quality of life in communities. Law enforcement participation in evaluation efforts can help to ensure that research results will be used to continuously improve the effectiveness of prevention and response strategies.

Law enforcement leaders and officers will continue to contribute significantly to stopping violence and preventing hate crimes. However, the work outlined in this report cannot be accomplished solely through the efforts of law enforcement agencies. Implementing summit recommendations requires the continuing collaboration and commitment of community leaders, parents and families, schools, and other public agencies in the ongoing enterprise to create a society of peacemakers.

ENDNOTES

-
- ¹ David Rosenberg and Michael Lieberman. Hate Crimes Laws. Washington, D.C.: Anti-Defamation League, 1999.
- ² Ashley Montagu. "The New Litany of Innate Depravity," in Montagu, A., ed., Man and Aggression. London: Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 15.
- ³ Sam Keen. Faces of the Enemy: Reflections of the Hostile Imagination. New York: Harper Collins, 1986, p. 17-18.
- ⁴ Ibid., p. 19.
- ⁵ Jack Levin and Jack McDevitt. Hate Crimes: The Rising Tide of Bigotry and Bloodshed. New York: Plenum Press, 1993.
- ⁶ K. A. McLaughlin, K. Brilliant, and C. Lang. National Bias Crimes Training for Law Enforcement and Victims Assistance Professionals. Newton, MA.: Education Development Center, Inc., and Office for Victims of Crime, 1995.
- ⁷ Ibid, p. 176.
- ⁸ Supra n. 1, p. 1.
- ⁹ Ibid., p. 18-19.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹ U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division. Training Guide for Hate Crime Data Collection. Washington, DC: 1997.
- ¹² Supra n. 5, p. 201.
- ¹³ Bureau of Justice Assistance. A Policymaker's Guide to Hate Crimes. Washington, D.C.: March 1997, p. 21.
- ¹⁴ U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Hate Crime Statistics 1996. Washington, D.C.: 1997.
- ¹⁵ Eric Bishop and Jeff Slowikowski. Hate Crime: Fact Sheet # 29. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), August 1995.
- ¹⁶ P. Finn and T. McNeil. Bias Crime and Criminal Justice Response: A Summary Report Prepared for the National Criminal Justice Association. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., 1988.
- ¹⁷ Supra n. 13, p. 13.
- ¹⁸ Anti-Defamation League. Hate Crimes: ADL Blueprint for Action. Washington, D.C., 1997.
- ¹⁹ Nancy Lee Cecil. Raising Peaceful Children in a Violent World. San Diego, CA: LuraMedia, Inc., 1995, p.16.
- ²⁰ K.A. McLaughlin & K. J. Brilliant. Healing the Hate: A National Bias Crime Prevention Curriculum for Middle Schools. Washington, D.C.: Education Development Center, Inc., and OJJDP, January 1997.
- ²¹ U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice. Preventing Youth Hate Crime: A Manual for Schools and Communities. Washington, D.C.: 1997.
- ²² William DeJong. "Building the Peace: The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 199_.
- ²³ Donna Crawford and Richard Bodine. Conflict Resolution Education: A Guide to Implementing Programs in Schools, Youth-Serving Organizations, and Community and Juvenile Justice Settings. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, and Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, October 1996.
- ²⁴ The IACP's Hate Crimes Model Policy and Concepts & Issues Paper (1991) can serve as a model in developing SOPs and MOUs.
- ²⁵ Supra, n. 6.
- ²⁶ Supra, n. 11.
- ²⁷ The curriculums were developed jointly by the U.S. Department of Justice, the National Association of Attorneys General, the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training, and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center of the U.S. Department of Treasury. For information on how to obtain the curricula, contact Tim Johnson, Program Specialist for the Office for Victims of Crime, at (202) 305-4548.

SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

IACP SUMMIT STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

Executive

Bobby Moody	1997-98 IACP President, Chair
Daniel Rosenblatt	Executive Director
Eugene Cromartie	Deputy Executive Director
Jerome Needle	Director, Programs and Research

Summit Coordination

John Firman	Summit Coordinator
Natalie Ivanovs	Assistant Summit Coordinator
Jim Culp	Summit Planning and Support
Jennifer Gerberick	Summit Planning and Support
Casey Lear	Summit Planning and Support
Sandy Prabhu	Summit Planning and Support
Mark Pappaioanou	Summit Planning and Support
Kay Hampton	Summit Planning and Support
Renee Cobb	Summit Planning and Support
Jeanine Burchard	Summit Support
Stephanie Howard	Summit Support
Sara Johnson	Summit Support
Stephanie Sloan	Editorial Support
Katherine Spivey	Editorial Support and Summit Photographer

Consultants

Teri Martin, Ph.D.	Author, Draft Report
Marcia Morgan, Ph.D.	Facilitator Training

Volunteers

Michael Lieberman	Facilitator: Community
Mary Li	Co-Facilitator
Jennifer Gerberick	Recorder
Charles Thomason	Facilitator: Schools K-12
Karen McLaughlin	Co-Facilitator
Sandy Prabhu	Recorder
John Wilson	Facilitator: Schools Colleges and Universities
Lee Coleman	Co-Facilitator
Mark Pappaioanou	Recorder
Albert Najera	Facilitator: First Responders
Larry Turner	Co-Facilitator
Casey Lear	Recorder
Mary Ann Viverette	Facilitator: Law Enforcement Leadership
Gina Wood	Co-Facilitator
Michael Martin	Recorder
James Castello	Facilitator: Justice Response
Elaine Deck	Co-Facilitator
Renee Cobb	Recorder

Barbara Wallace	Facilitator: Response to Victims
Susan Herman	Co-Facilitator
Marci Wilding	Recorder
Brian Levin	Facilitator: Organized Hate Groups
Joe Rodriguez	Co-Facilitator
Nancy Turner	Recorder

Advisory Board

Laurie Robinson Assistant Attorney General	Office of Justice Programs
Nancy Gist Director	Bureau of Justice Assistance
Joe Brann Director	Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
Shay Bilchik Director	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Reggie Robinson Director	Office for Victims of Crime
Jennifer Knobe Program Manager	Bureau of Justice Assistance
Charles Kindermann Senior Statistician	Bureau of Justice Statistics
David Walchak Senior Policy Advisor	Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
Barbara Wallace Victim-Witness Community Outreach	Federal Bureau of Investigation

Doug Dodge
Director, Special Emphasis Division

Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

Tim Johnson
Program Specialist

Office for Victims of Crime

SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

1. Mr. Elie Fayez Abboud
President
National Arab American Business
Association
25480 Aurora Road
Bedford Heights, OH 44146
2. Mr. Francis Amoroso
Conciliator
Community Relations Service
99 Summer Street, #1820
Boston, MA 02110
3. Dr. Deirdre Anglin
Department of Emergency Medicine
Room 1011, USC Medical Center
1200 N. State Street
Los Angeles, CA 90033
4. Honorable Carla Arranaga
Deputy District Attorney
Los Angeles County
18000 Criminal Courts Building
210 W. Temple St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012
5. Ms. Suzanne Bailliere
Chief, Hate Crimes Unit
Federal Bureau of Investigation
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20535
6. Dave Baker
Montgomery County Police
Department
9125 Gaither Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20877
7. Sheriff Jacquelyn Barrett
Sheriff
Fulton County
185 Central Ave., 9th Floor
Atlanta, GA 30303
8. Mr. Dan Bell
United States Attorney's Office
Eastern District of Virginia
2100 Jamieson Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22314
9. Chief William B. Berger
Chief of Police
North Miami Police Department
16901 NE 19th Street
North Miami Beach, FL 33162
10. Mr. Keith Bergman
Town Manager
260 Commercial Street
Provincetown, MA 02657
11. Ms. Maya M. Berry
Director of Government Relations
Arab American Institute
918 16th Street, NW
Suite 601
Washington, DC 20006
12. Ms. Teri Black
Chief of Staff
Office of Community Oriented
Policing Services
1100 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530
13. Mr. Joe Brann
Director
Office of Community Oriented
Policing Services
1100 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
14. Ms. Stephanie Brown
Student
Roberto Clemente High School
1424 N. Artesian
Chicago, IL 60647

15. Chief Joseph C. Carter
Chief of Police
Oak Bluffs Police Department
P.O. Box 1504, Ocean Avenue
Oak Bluffs, MA 02557
16. Mr. Zachary W. Carter
U.S. Attorney Chair, Civil Rights
Subcommittee
Attorney General's Advisory Committee
Eastern District of New York
US Courthouse, 147 Pierrepont Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201
17. Ms. Kelly Cassidy
Deputy Director of Intergovernmental
Affairs
Cook County State's Attorney Office
500 Richard Daley Center
Chicago, IL 60602
18. Mr. James Castello
Associate Deputy Attorney General
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room #4217
Washington, DC 20530
19. Ms. Jessica Castro
Student
Roberto Clemente High School
2424 N. Western Ave.
Chicago, IL 60647
20. Mr. Morris Casuto
Regional Director
San Diego ADL
7851 Mission Center Court
Suite 320
San Diego, CA 92108
21. Mr. Jan Chaiken
Bureau of Justice Statistics
810 7th Street, NW Room #2413
Washington, DC 20531
22. Ms. Diane Chin
Executive Director
Chinese for Affirmative Action
17 Walter U. Lum Place
San Francisco, CA 94108
23. Lee Coleman
By Mutual Agreement Mediation
Services
7815 SW 161st Drive
Beaverton, OR 97007
24. Ms. Miosoty Colon
Student
Roberto Clemente High School
1854 N. Albany
Chicago, IL 60647
25. Ms. Pamela Coukos
Public Policy Director
National Coalition Against Domestic
Violence
119 Constitution Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
26. Mr. Jim Cox
Vice President, Urban Services
Boys & Girls Clubs of America
1230 West Peachtree Street
Atlanta, GA 30309
27. Mr. Lou DaFalaize
Office of US Attorneys
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room #1619
Washington, DC 20530
28. Ms. Elaine Deck
Director
Adult Probation Department
880 Bryant Street
Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94103

29. Mr. Doug Dodge
Office of Juvenile Justice
& Delinquency Prevention
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
30. Lieutenant Mark A. Eisenman
Houston Police Department
61 Reisner Street
Houston, TX 77002
31. Mr. Luis Garcia
Director, Research and Evaluation
Boston Police Department
1 Schroeder Plaza
Boston, MA 02120
32. Ms. Nancy Gist
Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
33. Chief Bruce D. Glasscock
Chief of Police
Plano Police Department
PO Box 860358
Plano, TX 75086-0358
34. Ms. Krystal Glenn
Student
Roberto Clemente High School
2649 W Portland
Chicago, IL 60647
35. Ms. Tara Good
Student
El Molino High School
8080 Mirabel Avenue
Forestville, CA 95436
36. Ms. Vernita Gray
State's Attorney
Cook County
500 Richard Daley Center
Chicago, IL 60602
37. Mr. Jeff Hall
Bureau of Justice Assistance
810 7th Street, NW Room 4138
Washington, DC 20531
38. Chief Fred Hayes
Chief of Police
Milledgeville Police Department
125 West McIntosh Street
Milledgeville, GA 31061
39. Lieutenant Trae Heath
Crime Prevention Commander
Alexandria Police Department
2003 Mill Road
Alexandria, VA 22314
40. Ms. Susan Herman
National Victims Center
2111 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22201
41. Mr. Robert Honecker
Second Assistant Prosecutor
Monmouth County Prosecutor's
Office
County Courthouse
Freehold, NJ 07728
42. Superintendent LeRon Howland
Superintendent
Oregon State Police
400 Public Service Building
Salem, OR 97310-2011
43. Dr. H. Range Hutson
Brigham Women's Hospital/Harvard
75 Francis Street
Boston, MA 02115
44. Ms. Rebecca Isaacs
Political Director
National Gay and Lesbian Task Force
2320 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

45. Mr. Tim Johnson
Office for Victims of Crime
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
46. Mr. Ryan Johnson
Program Specialist
National Crime Prevention Council
1700 K Street, NW 2nd Floor
Washington, DC 20006-3817
47. Mr. Thomas Jurkanin
Executive Director
Illinois Local Governmental Law
Enforcement Officers Training Board
600 South Second Street 3rd Floor
Springfield, IL 62704
48. Lieutenant Terry Katz
Maryland State Police
1201 Reisterstown RD
Pikesville, MD 21208
49. Chief Philip Keith
Chief of Police
Knoxville Police Department
P.O. Box 3610
Knoxville, TN 37927
50. Mr. Charles Kindermann
Senior Statistician
Bureau of Justice Statistics
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
51. Ms. Aisha Knight
Student
Roberto Clemente High School
4030 W Ramerling
Chicago, IL 60647
52. Ms. Jennifer Knobe
Program Manager
Bureau of Justice
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
53. Mr. Barry Kowalski
Department of Justice
601 D Street, NW
Room 5142
Washington, DC 20530
54. Ms. June Kress
Senior Policy Analyst
Office of Community Oriented Policing
Services
1100 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530
55. Mr. Joe Kuhns
Social Service Analyst
Office of Community Oriented Policing
Services
1100 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530
56. Mr. Bill Lann Lee
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room #5643
Washington, DC 20530
57. Dr. Jack Levin
Professor
Northeastern University
500 Holmes Hall
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115-5096
58. Mr. Brian Levin
Director, Center on Hate & Extremism
Richard Stockton College
Jim Leeds Road
Pomona, NJ 08240
59. Ms. Mary Li
Multnomah County Community and
Family Services
421 SW 6th Avenue, 5th Floor
Portland, OR 97204

60. Mr. Michael Lieberman
Anti-Defamation League
1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1020
Washington, DC 20005
61. Mr. Chad Lord
Human Rights Campaign
1101 14th Street, NW Suite #200
Washington, DC 20005
62. Mr. Gene Marlin
Illinois State Police
State Armory Building
Springfield, IL 62794
63. Assistant Chief Ray Martinez
Assistant Chief
Miami Police Department
400 Northwest 2nd Avenue
Miami, FL 33128
64. Dr. Jack McDevitt
Co-Director
Northeastern University
400 Cushing Hall
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115-5096
65. Ms. Kathy McGinley
Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities
1730 K Street, NW Suite 1212
Washington, DC 20006
66. Ms. Karen McLaughlin
Senior Policy Analyst
Center for Violence & Injury Prevention
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02158
67. Chief Bobby D. Moody
Chief of Police
Marietta Police Department
150 Haynes Street
Marietta, GA 30060
68. Mr. Albert Najera
Deputy Chief
Sacramento Police Department
900 8th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-2506
69. Ms. Karen K. Narasaki
Executive Director
National Asian Pacific American Legal
Consortium
1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
70. Chief Ronald S. Neubauer
Chief of Police
St. Peters Police Department
PO Box 9
St. Peters, MO 63376-0009
71. Mr. David Owens
Director of Corrections
Camden County Correctional Facility
300 Federal Street
Camden, NJ 08103
72. Major Kathleen T. Patek
Commanding Officer
Baltimore Police Department
Crimes Against Persons
601 E. Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
73. Mr. Israel Perez
Student
Roberto Clemente High School
1754 N Washtenaw
Chicago, IL 60647
74. Sergeant Alexander Peterson III
Sergeant
Delaware State Police Troop 1
603 Philadelphia Pike
Wilmington, DE 19809

75. Chief Don Pierce
Chief of Police
Bellingham Police Department
505 Grand Avenue
Bellingham, WA 98225
76. Jody Rabhan
National Council of Jewish Women
1707 L Street, NW
Suite 950
Washington, DC 20036
77. Mr. Mujahid Ramadan
President, Board of Directors
American Muslim Council
Nevada Partners, Inc.
710 W. Lake Mead Blvd.
N. Las Vegas, NV 89030
78. Ms. Lisa Rivera
Student
Roberto Clemente High School
2522 N. Western
Chicago, IL 60647
79. Mr. Richard Roberts
Chief, Civil Rights Criminal Section
Department of Justice
601 D Street, NW
P.O. Box 66018
Washington, DC 20035-6018
80. Ms. Laurie Robinson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Justice Programs
810 7th Street, NW, Suite #6400
Washington, DC 20531
81. Mr. Reginald Robinson
Director (Acting)
Office for Victims of Crime
810 7th Street, NW
Room #8332
Washington, DC 20531
82. Mr. Joe Rodriguez
Community Relations Services
Department of Justice
1100 Main Street, Suite 1320
Kansas City, MO 64405-2112
83. Mr. Steve Schenk
Assistant Director
INS
425 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20035
84. Mr. Arne Schoeller
National Council of Juvenile & Family
Court Judges
University of Nevada
P.O. Box 8970
Reno, NV 89507
85. Ms. Ellen Scrivner
Assistant Director
Office of Community Oriented Policing
Services
1100 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530
86. Ms. Belle Shalom
Whatcom County Human Rights Task
Force
816 20th St., #201
Bellingham, WA 98225
87. Ms. Jane Nady-Sigmon
Director of Research
APRI
99 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22312
88. Colonel George Smith
United States Army Criminal
Investigation Division
6010 6th Street
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060

39. Mr. John Stein
Deputy Director
National Organization of Victim Assistance
1757 Park Road, NW
Washington, DC 20010
30. Mr. Robert Stewart
Executive Director
National Organization of Black Law Enforcement
4609 Pinecrest Office Park Drive
Alexandria, VA 22312-1442
31. Ms. Allyson Stollenwerck
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Room 4116
Washington, DC 20530
32. Mr. Jonathan Strong
Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Fair Housing Litigation and Legal Opinion
Office of General Counsel, HUD
451 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
33. Ms. Lisa Swafford
Resident Practitioner
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Department of Justice
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
34. Mr. Charles Thomason
Roberto Clemente High School
1147 N. Western Street
Chicago, IL 60622
35. Ms. Susan Tucker
Director of Policy and Research Development
Victim Services
2 Lafayette Street
New York, NY 10007
96. Mr. Ben Tucker
Deputy Director for Operations
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
1100 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530
97. Mr. Larry Turner
Community Relations Services
Department of Justice
99 Summer Street, Suite 1820
Boston, MA 02110
98. Ms. Maritza Villanueva
Student
Roberto Clemente High School
1626 N. Kedzie
Chicago, IL 60647
99. Chief Mary Ann Viverette
Chief of Police
Gaithersburg Police Department
7 E. Cedar Avenue
Gaithersburg, MD 20877
100. Mr. David C. Walchak
Senior Policy Advisor
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
1100 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
101. Ms. Barbara Wallace
Victim-Witness Community Outreach Unit, Criminal Investigative Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20535
102. Ms. Joan Weiss
Executive Director
Justice Research & Statistics Association
777 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite #801
Washington, DC 20002

103. Mr. Steve Wessler
State of Maine
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
104. Mr. Leon West
Director
Congress of National Black Churches
Drug, Violence, and Hate Crime
Division
1225 Eye Street, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20005
105. Mr. John Wilson
Deputy Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice &
Delinquency Prevention
810 7th Street, NW, Room 8411
Washington, DC 20531
106. Mr. Marvin Wingfield
Director of Education and Outreach
American Arab Anti-Discrimination
Committee
4201 Connecticut Ave., NW, #300
Washington, DC 20008
107. Mr. Byron Wong
Special Advisor to the Director
Community Relations Service
Bicentennial Building, Suite #2000
600 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530
108. Ms. Gina Wood
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
810 7th Street, NW, Suite 8407
Washington, DC 20531
109. Chief William A. Young
Chief of Police
Tyler Police Department
711 W. Ferguson
Tyler, TX 75702-5696
110. Dr. Jim Zogby
President
Arab-American Institute
918 16th Street, NW
Suite #601
Washington, DC 20006

RESOURCES

The following list has been reproduced from BJA's 1997 *Monograph A Policymaker's Guide to Hate Crimes*. Please note that the list is not comprehensive, but is meant to serve as a starting point for individuals who need additional information on the topic of hate crime.

Anti-Defamation League
823 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
Phone: 212-490-2525

Arab American Institute
918 16th Street, NW
Suite 601
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-429-9210
Fax: 202-429-9214

Bureau of Justice Assistance Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000
Phone: 1-800-688-4252
Fax: 301-579-5212
E-mail: askncjirs@ncjirs.org

Bureau of Justice Statistics
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: 202-307-0765
Fax: 202-307-5846

Community Relations Service
U.S. Department of Justice
600 E Street, NW, Suite 2000
Washington, DC 20530
Phone: 202-305-2935
Fax: 202-305-3009

Disability Law Center
11 Beacon Street, Suite 925
Boston, MA 02108
Phone: 617-723-8455
Fax: 617-723-9125

Facing History and Ourselves National
Foundation
16 Hurd Road
Brookline, MA 02146
Phone: 617-232-1595
Fax: 617-232-0281

Federal Bureau of Investigation
J. Edgar Hoover Building
10th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20535
Phone: 202-324-1143

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Criminal Justice Information Services Division
Attn: Uniform Crime Reports
1000 Custer Hollow Road
Clarksburg, WV 26306
Phone: 304-625-4995
Fax: 304-625-5394

Human Rights Campaign
1101 14th Street, NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-628-4160
Fax: 202-347-5323

International Association of Chiefs of Police
515 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-2357
Phone: 800-THE-IACP
Fax: 703-836-4543

**The National Conference of Christians and
Jews**

71 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1100
New York, NY 10003
Phone: 212-206-0006
Fax: 212-255-6177

National Congress of American Indians

2010 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Second Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-466-7767
Fax: 202-466-7797

National Council of La Raza

1111 19th Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-785-1670
Fax: 202-776-1792

National Criminal Justice Association

444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 618
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: 202-624-1440
Fax: 202-508-3859

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force

2320 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009-2702
Phone: 202-332-6483
Fax: 202-332-0207

National Network of Violence Prevention

55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02158
Phone: 617-969-7100
Fax: 617-244-3436

National Women's Law Center

11 Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-588-5180
Fax: 202-588-5185

**Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
Prevention**

810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: 202-307-5911
Fax: 202-307-2093

Office of Victims of Crime

810 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: 202-307-5983
Fax: 202-514-6383

**The President's Initiative on Race
The New Executive Office Building**

Washington, DC 20503
Phone: 202-395-1010
Fax: 202-395-1020

Simon Wiesenthal Center

9760 West Pico Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90035
Phone: 310-553-9036
Fax: 310-553-8007

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

624 9th Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20425
Phone: 202-337-0382
Fax: 202-376-7558

U.S. Department of Education

600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202
Phone: 202-205-5557
Fax: 202-205-5381

**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development**

451 7th Street, NW
Room 10000
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: 202-708-0417
Fax: 202-708-2476

Violence Against Women Office
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room 5302
Washington, DC 20530
Phone: 202-616-8894
Fax: 202-307-3911

Women's Legal Defense Fund
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 710 Washington, DC 20009
Phone: 202-986-2600
Fax: 202-986-2539

