COMMISSION MEETING

FRIDAY

UNEDITED

JULY 19, 2002

DETROIT, MICHIGAN

+ + + + +

The Commission convened at 9:15 a.m., in the OMNI Detroit River Place Hotel, 1000 River Place, Detroit, Michigan, Chairperson Mary Frances Berry, Presiding.

Present:

MARY FRANCES BERRY, CHAIRPERSON
CRUZ REYNOSO, VICE CHAIRPERSON
JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, COMMISSIONER
CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR., COMMISSIONER
ELSIE M. MEEKS, COMMISSIONER
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, COMMISSIONER

LESLIE R. JIN, STAFF DIRECTOR

Staff Present:

KIMBERLEY ALTON

DEBRA CARR, Deputy General Counsel

IVY DAVIS

TERRI DICKERSON (Via Telephone)

BETTY EDMISTON

SHELDON FULLER

GEORGE M. HARBISON (Via Telephone)

JENNY PARK

PETER REILLY, Parliamentarian

JOYCE SMITH (Via Telephone)

AUDREY WRIGHT

NEAL R. GROSS

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

Commissioner Assistants Present:

LAURA BATIE PATRICK DUFFY KIMBERLY SCHULD

I-N-D-E-X

I.	Approval of Agenda 4
II.	Approval of Minutes of June 21, 2002 Meeting9
III.	Announcements
IV.	Staff Director's Report
v.	State Advisory Committee Appointments for Florida and Kentucky
VI.	Discussion of the statutory report, "Ten-Year Check-Up: Have Federal Agencies Responded to Civil Rights Directives?", 34
VII.	Discussion of staff report and recommendations on the civil rights implications of welfare reauthorization
VIII.	Presentations from Midwest Regional SAC members on post-9/11 and other civil rights issues in their states, and by individuals and organizational representatives on post-9/11 issues affect Arab and Muslim Americans in Michigan and the midwestern region
TX.	Adjournment 200

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1 9:15 a.m. 2 I. Approval of Agenda 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The first item on the 4 agenda is the approval of the agenda. Could I get a 5 motion to approve the agenda? 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So moved. 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second? 8 DICKERSON: Excuse , we for MS. 9 This is Washington, D.C. and we are 10 interrupting. having a lot of trouble hearing. 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could you hear me? 12 MS. DICKERSON: Just faintly. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can you hear me now? 14 MS. DICKERSON: A little better and we 15 couldn't hear the other speaker at all. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can you hear me now? 17 MS. DICKERSON: We can hear. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So that means that I 19 don't put it right up to my mouth, I just sort of --20 okay. So you can hear me now? 21 MS. DICKERSON: Yes. 22 So maybe Commissioner CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 23 Kirsanow, can try like to putting it about where mine 24

25

is and see what happens.

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Can you hear me?
2	This is like a Verizon commercial.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go ahead.
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair, I'd
6	like to move that we include in the agenda discussion
7	or reports from the Staff Director on the current
8	status of the Monroij litigation or administrative
9	proceedings.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You have heard the
11	suggestion. Is there any discussion of it?
12	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I seconded it, by the
13	way.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Commissioner
15	Berry, this is Jennifer, can you hear me?
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: yes.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Could you all turn
18	it up on your end a little bit? We can't hear the
19	person in the background that's speaking now.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, but you hear me?
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's weird. Why do
23	you hear me?
24	Boost the volume in D.C. Each person say
25	something in turn and let's see what happens.

1	Commissioner Braceras?
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Testing 1, 2, 3.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can you hear
4	Commissioner Braceras?
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, not at all.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Wait a minute.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Testing 1, 2, 3.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you hear?
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Try one more time,
11	please, Commissioner.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Testing 1, 2, 3.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's a lot
14	better.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Commissioner
16	Thernstrom?
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No.
18	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Testing 1, 2, 3.
19	There's a terrible noise in the mike on top of
20	everything else.
21	Can you hear me?
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We can hear you,
23	there's just a lot of noise in your mike.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. What we're
25	going to do is we are going to go ahead with the
	1

1	7
1	meeting and we're going to let you listen as best you
٠2	can while they figure out the technical difficulties.
3	We have enough staff here to go ahead and do it anyway
4	and let's see if it works out as we go along in the
5	interest of time, so we'll just go ahead and proceed
6	any.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The suggestion is made
9	by Commissioner Kirsanow, seconded by Commissioner
10	Thernstrom that we add a discussion of the Monroij
11	case to the agenda. Someone was seeking recognition.
12	I think it was the Vice Chair.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I had just
14	suggested, Madam Chair, that that can come under the
15	Staff Director's Report. He can give us an update on
1.6	what's happening with that matter.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's right. It
18	would, it could come appropriately under the Staff
19	Director's Report. And so if you have no objection to
20	having it come under the Staff Director's Report, we
21	can do that?
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No, I don't, Madam
23	Chair,
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Commissioner
25	Braceras?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: My only question 1 is whether the staff would also at that juncture be 2 able to discuss the proposed CFRs and their relation 3 to the Monroij case. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The staff can discuss anything that is on-going at the Commission under the 6 Staff Director's Report. So any issue, that as well 7 as any others that are on-going issues and are not new 8 issues, you may ask about when we get to the Staff 9 10 Director's Report. Commissioner Thernstrom? 11 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, it's not 12 13 clear to me that that's an on-going issue and that the letter to the Federal Registrar for an emergency 14 15 inclusion of changes to the CFR went out. So it that an on-going issue that we can 16 discuss? 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 18 Yes. 19 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, so what we'll do then is if there's no objection is proceed 21 with the agenda and any of these administrative issues 22 23 that Commissioners want to discuss, we will discuss 24 under the Staff Director's Report.

Yes, Commissioner Edley?

1	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I'm sorry, I do have
2	a concern about the extent to which the Commission
3	ought to be involving itself in the administrative
4	matters.
5	I don't know what the general practice is,
6	but I do worry about you don't think that there's
7	any issue of our becoming overly intrusive in the
8	administrative what are the natural limits on this
9	kind of discussion when we get to the Staff Director's
10	Report?
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think that there are
12	natural limits and when we get to the Staff Director's
13	Report, you should raise that point again.
14	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Okay.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So without any
16	further objection, could we approve the agenda? Call
17	for the question.
18	All those in favor, indicate by saying
19	aye.
20	(Ayes.)
21	Opposed?
22	(No response.)
.23	II. Approval of Minutes of June 21, 2002 Meeting
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now the second item is
25	approval of the minutes of June 21st meeting.

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

	10
1	Could I get a motion to approve the
2	minutes?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?
5	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have any
7	changes to the minutes or corrections that they see
8	need to be made to the minutes?
9	(No response.)
10	Okay, all those in favor indicate by
11	saying aye.
12	(Ayes.)
13	Opposed?
14	(No response.)
15	So ordered.
16	III. Announcements
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The announcements, the
18	first thing I just wanted to point out that we lost,
19	since our last meeting, two very important persons in
20	the struggle for our civil rights in this country, the
21	first was Justin Dart, Jr., who had come before us
22	many times and who was an advocate primarily known in
23	the area of disability, but other civil rights too and
24	over four decades in the United States and through the

In fact, he was one of the people who led the

world.

fight to get the Americans With Disabilities Act passed, traveled throughout the United States visiting every state at least four times, and the whole struggle to get that law passed. He was the recipient of many, many awards from all of the people who supported and loved what he did, including the Hubert Humphrey Award of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and the American Legion's National Commander's Award for Distinguished Public Service, and was, of course, elected to the Disability Hall of Fame. So I just wanted to acknowledge the passing of Dart. Mr. Justin was a champion in the cause of civil rights.

And the second is to announce another landmark which is the passing of General Benjamin O. Davis, Jr. who was a graduate of West Point, became a Commander of the Tuskeegee Airmen in World War II and was the first black General in the Air Force and got his Fourth Star in 1998 by President Clinton and his squadron during World War II, their performance, the Tuskeegee Airmen was a crucial factor in President Truman's decision to integrate the armed forces in 1948. So I just wanted to mark the passing of those two champions in the cause since the last meeting.

Does anyone else have any announcements about anything at all?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IV. Staff Director's Report

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, now we'll go to the Staff Director's Report. And people may ask whatever they please.

Do you have anything you wish to tell us, Staff Director?

MR. JIN: Madam Chair, I do have one item that I'd like to report on and I could do it now or later, but if there's no preference I'd just as soon announce it now, if that's all right.

As you know, the Commissioners are aware a couple of weeks ago there was an incident Englewood, California where again on videotape was caught a situation which many felt was an example of I've excessive police force and so been in conversation and contact with our Regional Office, in particular, about that situation to keep apprised. From my conversations with our office, they report that although there is calm there, there is also a high interest in what happened, quite a bit of anger and a lot of resolve to fix what many in the community see as a persistent problem of police practices in Englewood. For now, there's a willingness in the community to wait to see how various investigations play out.

2

3

5

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Englewood Police Department and the L.A. Sheriff's Department are conducting internal investigations of the officers. An attorney for the youth has filed a lawsuit in Federal District Court and the L.A. District Attorney quickly convened a Grand Jury to consider evidence of possible legal action against the officers and late Wednesday, returned two indictments.

civil The F.B.I. has begun rights investigation and will forward its report back to Also, Assistant Attorney General for Headquarters. Civil Rights, Ralph Boyd, was in L.A. last weekend. He apparently met with Englewood officials, officials, but I don't believe he met with anyone from the community. When Mr. Boyd returned to Washington, D.C., he issued a statement indicating that the local to be comfortable with their community appeared leadership and with the process being formulated. our understanding is that he is now waiting for the FBI report.

Over last weekend, the local community also formed a local committee of community leaders was formed in Englewood, and based on conversations our regional staff had with various people, as well as informal information gathering, it appears that a good

relationship has been established between the local government leaders and community leaders. Our sense is that as long as there is optimism, that this process will develop a strong likelihood that effective change will occur. This will be the primary focus for the community.

Among the things being examined are plans for the city to establish a civilian panel to oversee police action, review the current complaint process, and remove police from the street when complaints are filed. The <u>L.A. Times</u> has done a number of stories showing that the Police Department has had more than its share of complaints. However, none of these complaints filed with the Department involving excess force has ever been raised to the L.A. District Attorney.

Our Western Regional Office says that the Englewood Police Department is relatively poorly trained compared to the L.A. Police Department since there appears to be a significant turnover. The Department has about 200 officers, about a third who are pretty new. The force is about 43 percent white, 27 percent Latino and 24 percent African American. And in contrast to that, the city's 110,000 residents is about 46 percent African American and 47 percent

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Latino. Both the Mayor, a retired Judge, and the Police Chief, formerly a high ranking officer with the L.A. Department, Police Department are African Americans.

Englewood has not utilized community policing or a civilian review board. Our Western Regional Office has sent to the city some of our reports of police practices and highlighted our work and recommendation on those issues.

As the Commissioners may remember, our police practice is to highlight the value of tools such as training, community policing and civilian review boards. And one interesting note is that the L.A. County Board of Supervisors responded to what happened in Englewood by adopting a proposal to provide assistance to cities within the county that may want to implement civilian review boards.

If the Western Regional Office had not written the Mayor and the City Council in Englewood and provided them with our reports of police practices, I would definitely suggest that we should However, at this time, I think it may be do that. best to wait to see how things develop in Englewood in terms of how the broader issues of police practices are handled, since the community appears to believe it

has a viable process it plays. However, there may be an opportunity to offer assistance to the broader L.A. County by offering to have Western Regional office staff with support from Headquarters to brief the L.A. Board of Supervisors, as well as other L.A. entities and some of the other 88 cities in L.A. County on our findings and recommendations of police practices.

Additionally, the L.A. Sheriff's Office is responsible for about half of the cities and L.A. County and offering to work with it is another option. This will allow us to take advantage of the high interest and concern in L.A. County about police practices and our Western Regional Office does have significant experience working on these issues, technical providing assistance with various communities. In recent years, they worked with Sonoma County and parts of Nevada and Huntington Park, And so, unless Commissioners feel that I California. should take a different course, I will proceed with that.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, thank you. I was out of the country when this happened and got a call from a reporter who chased me down to ask if I wanted to comment on the latest incident perpetrated by the LAPD. I said the LAPD, where was it? And he

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

said Englewood. And so I asked somebody else who was on the trip with me from California whether it was the So I said no. LAPD and they said no. turned on the television later and saw the story and the story led with "latest incident of the LAPD", so I But in any case, and when I got back a thought gee. couple of people called to see if I wanted to go out there to -- there were some folks going out there to have meetings with people and from what I could read and what you tell me confirms this, that folks out there seem to be on top of it and the Justice Department and everybody and so it doesn't seem to me at this time beyond what you've suggested that we need to do anything in particular.

Yes, Vice --

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair,
I've been impressed by the approach of the officials
to this incident with one exception and that is that
most officials have taken the view that this is a bad
apple incident and there are some indication that may
be true because the reports were that another officer
stepped in between the young African American youth
who was being manhandled and the officer who was doing
the manhandling.

On the other hand, I'm convinced that

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

these incidents will continue to happen so long as we pay more attention to the motivation what motivates them, have, respect to them within the Department and I think that the oversight that we have and other efforts that will continue be with been involved unsuccessful without a deeper understanding of what motivates an officer, what makes an officer feel that he or she is doing a good job and then trying to change that motivation.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Unless someone thinks there's something else we should be doing about this, we will leave the Staff Director and thank him for his report and you can keep us informed if there's anything else we should be doing on this subject.

The other thing I wanted to point out to you is that I've asked the Staff Director to have drafted a letter to go to the Agriculture Department, to the Secretary over there, concerning the issue of the black farmers who recently mounted a protest at one of the Farm Agency offices over the issue of loans and land loss of black farmers. The Commission has a position on this issue which we have had since the early 1980s. We did the first report on the decline of black farming in America. And we have followed up

1	on it with several different reports and we have met
2	with the Secretary over time, various Secretaries, to
3	discuss this issue and have followed it and asked for
4	recommendations for improvements over there including
5	civil rights offices and activities which I thought
6	had already taken place, since the last Secretary
7	promised that they would take place. So we just
8	thought that we would send a letter over and remind
9	them of our longstanding interest in this question and
10	repeat the recommendations that we have made. And if
11	the issue is not resolved, it may require a meeting at
12	some point, but for now just a letter reminding them.
13	Now others had questions, yes.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Would the letter
15	be sent on behalf of he entire body?
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, the letter will
17	say for the Commission, yes.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Will we have an
19	opportunity to review the letter?
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's not the policy
21	of the Commission as it's stated
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm just asking
23	for the opportunity to review the letter.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could someone remind
25	me what the Commission passed as its policy on the

1	matter of letters?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, Madam
3	Chair, once the Commission has taken, it's certainly
4	been the practice, I don't know if it's in the
5	regulations, that the Chair well, I guess the
6	statute says the Chair speaks for the Commission and
7	the practice has been therefore when we've taken the
8	position, the Chair is authorized to send its letter.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no. I'm talking
10	about the last discussion we had at the meeting when
11	this issue was raised and we passed a resolution
12	reaffirming our policy on such letters.
13	The last letter was a letter, I think,
14	concerning the Haitians, but I've forgotten what the
15	letter was about.
16	But in any case, I'd be happy to send you
17	a copy as a matter of courtesy, if you wish to
18	comment?
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That would be
20	wonderful. I'd appreciate it. Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm not required to do
22	that, but I'd be happy to do that.
23	Yes?
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair, as I
25	understand it, you send a letter and if any of us

don't like it we can send a letter too? 1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can send your own 2 3 letter, yes. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I appreciate the 4 Chair's offer as a matter of courtesy to let us look 5 at it before it goes out. It is a matter of courtesy 6 7 and it's appreciated. Okav. Commissioner 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 9 Thernstrom? the COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Ι mean 10 trouble with we can send a letter too is that we don't 11 necessarily see all letters that go out under our name 12 and it does put us in a position that some of us are 13 14 not comfortable with, that letters are going out in our names that we haven't even seen and don't have 15 therefore, an opportunity to write independently in 16 17 response to. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, all right, thank 19 Now someone had other questions for the Staff you. 20 Director that you wish to raise, please could you ask 21 whatever questions you wish to raise? 22 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'd like to ask 23 the Staff Director what is the current status of the 24 Monroij Administrative Proceedings. 25 MR. Certainly, Commissioner JIN:

Kirsanow.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Have you written to them on this question?

MR. JIN: Yes, Madam Chair, I was just going to say that Commissioner Kirsanow wrote a letter to a me a little while back and then it was followed up with a -- well, on Ms. Monroij, I guess it was Commissioner Kirsanow wrote to me and asked me about the situation and I believe I indicated that the -with Ms. Monroij we had gotten a decision of course from the EEOC a couple of months ago and the decision basically reaffirmed a hearing official the Commission did not discriminate stating that Monroij the allegations of against Ms. on discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender age.

did find and reaffirm Ιt that the Commission inappropriately her certain gave assignments a number of years back and that because Ms. Monroi; had filed a complaint against us in the intervening period that that was a retaliation against her. And so what we did was we decided to accept part of that decision, but we challenged in the Motion to Reconsider the finding that we had -- that we needed to reinstate her to the Solicitor position. However.

consistent with that opinion we have implemented the part on reinstating her to the Solicitor position. I've had three conversations with Ms. Monroij myself in the last couple or three weeks and including one with Deputy General Counsel and one with our head of personnel to make sure that we've done everything right to make sure that she will be giving assignments in accordance with that ruling. So that is the status.

We have a Motion to Reconsider because we do believe that we should not be required to reinstate her to the Solicitor position. We've always maintained that those duties did not entail an entire position and that we should have some leeway, General Counsel's Office should have some leeway in terms of giving staff assignments to making sure we're fully covered with all of these various duties. We have a small staff, there are departures and things like that so we wish to make that case with the EEOC, but that is the status. We believe we're in full compliance with the order at this time.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley?

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I guess I feel a little uncomfortable discussing the particulars of individual personnel matters for litigation. And I'm

wondering whether it would not be appropriate 1 interested Commissioners to have a meeting with the 2 Staff Director to talk about all of this in detail and 3 then if on the basis of that full conversation with 4 the Staff Director and the Deputy General Counsel, 5 whomever that's appropriate, if then there's 6 policy action that's required of the Commission that 7 can be brought back to the Commission, at the next 8 meeting or if there's a motion that we need to do by 9 poll vote or something of that sort, but I'm prepared 10 to make that a motion. 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, please do. 12 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I quess my motion 13 would be that the Staff Director is instructed to meet 14 with interested Commissioners to have 15 discussion of this administrative matter, including 16 17 litigation related to it. further, that if Commissioners And 18 following that full staff discussion wish to put a 19 20 matter for discussion or action before the Commission, that we do it at the next meeting. 21 22 So that's my motion. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second? 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Second. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Discussion? 25

Yes, Commissioner Braceras.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I'm not
going to speak directly to the motion, but I do have
something I'd like to say about this matter and that
is I feel and I think I speak for Commissioner
Kirsanow, as well, both being employment lawyers, that
there are certain things that need to be said on the
record about this, not necessarily with respect to
prior dealings in this case, but with respect to the
actions of the Commission going forward. And it is my
concern, quite frankly, that the proposed regulations
and the proposed elimination of the position would be
interpreted by the EEOC as further retaliation and I
certainly would not want to see the United States
Commission on Civil Rights helped by the EEOC to have
further retaliated against an employee. And so were
the Commission to be my client, I would strongly
advise the Commission to reconsider that. And what I
wanted to ask the Staff Director about specifically
was

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, could we dispose of the motion first?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. I want to finish what I'm saying.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are you speaking to

NEAL R. GROSS

the motion? 1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm asking the 2 Staff Director a question which is --3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But there's a motion 4 5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me, excuse 6 7 me. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- on the floor. 8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right, that's why 9 10 I asked you before the question was called, before he That's why I asked you if I could made the motion. 11 first be heard. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can be heard as 13 soon as the motion is passed. 14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, if I could 15 just finish it would make it much more efficient, I 16 17 think. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go right ahead. 18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And then I'll be 19 20 I wonder exactly what Ms. Monroij's title is quiet. 21 and exactly what the duties are. Because as I read 22 the EEOC opinion, she is to be reinstated to her prior position with the same duties and the elimination of 23 24 those duties would, in my view, constitute further

retaliation, so I'd like the Staff Director to explain

1	precisely the nature of Ms. Monroij's duties and what
2	his intentions are for her and her position in light
3	of the CFR. I think it's important that we be
4	apprised of that so that we're not complicit in any
5	illegal actions.
6	MR. JIN: Madam Chair, I'd like to defer
7	to the Deputy General Counsel who has been working on
8	this case to answer this.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Please.
LO	MS. CARR: Thank you. I just have a
L1	general concern that by discussing the internal
L2	personnel matters of the Commission in an open session
L3	that we may be in violation of Privacy Act provisions
L4	and we may want to do this in a closed meeting or
L5	closed session.
16	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I renew my motion. I
L7	think the Commissioner's concern is questions can be
18	handled in that staff discussion and if anything
19	emerges from that we could take action at the next
20	meeting or in between.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I simply then in
23	. that regard
24	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I think she raises an
25	important substantive question. I don't think any of

want the Staff Director to pursue a course action that opens us up to further liability or even cuts corners with respect to what requires of us. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I suppose just a get that doesn't into procedural question any particular personnel matters would be what is the status of the proposed CFRs? Is that something this Commission will be asked to vote on or just where are we in that process and what happens next? CARR: Right. The CFRs are still MS. They've not been submitted as a final rule. I don't envision that here would be a need for the Commissioners to vote on the proposed revisions to the The Commission voted on that in 1998. submit revisions that we would propose to are consistent with the Commission's vote in 1998. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right, but in light οf changed circumstances, including might it not be appropriate to bring litigation, certain sections back to the Commission for discussion, perhaps in Executive Session if that's more appropriate?

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

MS. CARR:

inconsistent with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the

The revisions in the CFRs are

EEOC's order that

employee be provided the duties and functions of the 1 position as it existed in 1990. So we don't envision 2 that the CFRs would have an adverse impact on that 3 employee. 4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thank you for the 5 6 update. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Does anyone 7 else want to speak to the motion before the question 8 is called, to this motion? We can talk about other 9 things, but if it's related to this. 10 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I've 11 question related to --12 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone want to speak to the motion about this particular motion? 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I do, Madam 15 I have found it helpful when I had a question 16 pertaining to administrative matters to call or sit 17 down with the Staff Director to see if I had any 18 19 qualms and particularly whether those qualms would 20 lead to a suggested policy change. I must say that most of the concerns that I've had have been resolved 21 22 without the necessity of a policy change, so I never 23 brought anything to the Commission, but I have found that a very valuable step in answering, particularly 24 25 administrative questions that I have.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So can we call for the 1 All all those in favor question? right, 2 Commissioner Edley's motion indicate by saying aye. 3 (Ayes.) 4 Those opposed to Commissioner's Edley's 5 6 motion. (No response.) 7 further Now 8 The motion carries. discussion on the Staff Director's Report? 9 Commissioner Thernstrom? 10 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I'm still back 11 the same issue. I did pose, in writing, 12 When were these proposed rules, the CFR 13 question. rules, adopted by the Commission? If the last vote of 14 the proposal was in 1998, why did it take five years 15 16 to publish the rules in the Federal Register? Why 17 weren't the proposed rules presented before this Commission this year relying on a 5-year vote? 18 19 And I don't -this whole procedure 20 Five years ago there was a vote that bewilders me. 21 don't need a vote on changes somehow now we I don't understand this whole scene, 22 safequards? 23 frankly. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think the motion

covers the discussion and therefore after you had this

1	discussion with the Staff Director, if it's
2	unsatisfying, you can bring it back again. That's
3	what the motion says.
4	Could we move the agenda, unless someone
5	has
6	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Move the agenda.
7	V. State Advisory Committee Appointments for
8	Florida and Kentucky
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The SAC appointments
10	for Florida and Kentucky are the next item on the
11	agenda.
12	Could I get a motion to approve the SAC
13	appointments for Florida?
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?
16	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second.
17	.CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I was particularly
18	impressed with the statement of the Chair of the
19	Florida SAC. I thought it was illuminating. You
20	might share it with some of your other SAC Chairs
21	because we now have this procedure and the SAC Chair
22	is submitting statements and I thought hers was
2.3	particularly interesting.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair,
25	two comments. One, I've been pleased that the many

proposals we've had for the state SACs have continued 1 to include young people, i.e., under 40. So I 2 want to commend the staff for that and the SACs. 3 a while we had lost young people under 40. 4 Secondly, I must have that I had serious 5 qualms about asking the Chairs for their comments on 6 7 what they hope to do in the next couple of years. Fellow Commissioner Edley was the one who made that 8 9 suggestion, but I must say that it's worked out well. I think it's been illuminating to get a 10 11 statement from the Chair telling us what the Chair hopes she or he and the local SAC will accomplish. 12 Maybe that and with CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 13 that enterprise of going around meeting with people 14 and listening to them, maybe this will help us in the 15 absence of greater resources to at least show people 16 that we appreciate what they're doing and try to 17 18 support what they're doing. Ι notice Willie And 19 Gonzalez who used to be a Staff Director on the Florida SAC. 20 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Oh ves. 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I didn't know he was 23 in Florida. Okay. If there's no further discussion, 24 could we -- all those in favor of the appointments to 25 the Florida SAC indicate by saying aye?

1	(Ayes.)
2	Opposed?
3	(No response.)
4	So ordered.
5	The Kentucky SAC, could we get a motion on
6	the Kentucky SAC?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second, please?
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Discussion? Okay. All
11	those in favor indicate by saying aye.
12	(Ayes.)
13	Opposed?
14	(No response.)
15	So ordered.
16	VI. Discussion of the statutory report, "Ten-Year
17	Check-Up: Have Federal Agencies Responded to Civil
18	Rights Directives?"
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Then the next item is
20	discussion of the statutory report, "Ten-Year Check-
21	Up: Have Federal Agencies Responded to Civil Rights
22	Directives?"
23	Kim, do you have something on that? What's
24	the story on that?
25	Do we just want to have discussions?

Is she able to do that? Okay. 1 MS. DICKERSON: Hello? 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Hi, Terri. 3 MS. DICKERSON: Hi, we're still straining 4 a little bit to hear. So --5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We can hear you very 6 well, so don't worry. 7 And I will take it on MS. DICKERSON: 8 faith that when we discuss the report I'll be able to 9 hear what you say. 10 I'll go ahead and proceed and I hope 11 you're looking at a screen that says --12 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We are looking at it. We're looking at it. 14 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: It's gorgeous. 15 MS. DICKERSON: Thanks for the opportunity 16 to briefly discuss this report. OCRE has worked on 17 this report for the past year, along with other 18 19 assignments. The 10-year review or Volumes 1 and 2, the teams consisted of Eileen Rudert who was team 20 leader; Manual Alba, Softul McDougal, Margaret Butler, 21 Wanda Johnson, Monique Dennis-Elmore, Latrice Veaushay 22 and Marie Zisnus were on the team as well as our 23

Michael Wolf, Daniel Head and Carolyn Fallon.

interns over the past year, Tammy Chu, Victoria Tomb,

24

25

I also

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to thank Barbara Delavise, Curt Perry, Smith and Bernard Quarterman for reviewing the report for legal sufficiency and Ivy Davis and Al Jenkins, David Aaronson, Barbara Fontana, Angus St. Helair, and Arthur Palacio who reviewed and commented on report and helped us to get the draft together, as Sweet for all of her editorial well Dawn as A lot of people had read it before you got it.

The Commission decided to do this report, I'm on Slide 2, Kim, in 1999 and last year, in 2001, decided it should be a multi-year series. This is different because what we were looking at this time around was not really going to agencies and getting We were cataloging and documenting new information. Commission already had said its what the in enforcement reports, all reports, not but in enforcement reports between 1992 and 2002.

And secondly, the objective of the report was to determine the extent to which agencies had responded to those and were following the Commission recommendations.

Years ago, long before my time, the Agency did more regular monitoring of agencies because the staff was bigger and there were more resources to do

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

that and so this was a good time, an opportune time to go back and really assess how these agencies had responded to what the Commission has been saying over the past 10 years.

I'm going to talk about Volume 1 first. For Volume 1, no new data was collected from agencies. It simply served to establish an overview of what the Commission has issued to agencies over the past 10 years. So for Volume 1, we didn't conduct interviews of staff. We catalogued recommendations and reviewed them and documented what was said in past enforcement reports.

On Slide 3, these are the methodology that followed. For Volume 1, we reviewed and we categorized those recommendations from the past reports and thus, this volume is an overview of the emerged from themes that that 10 vears of recommendations and it's also an analysis of which agencies are enforcing civil rights well or poorly when the Commission last studied them.

Slide 4 addresses the scope of the review.

Volume 1 looked at 16 Commission enforcement reports

and that covered 11 federal agencies which covered

most of the major civil rights statutes and

represented more than 1100 recommendations that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Commission had made in both enforcement reports.

Slide 5, these nine bullets represent the 16 reports that we catalogued in this review. So they really ran the range from housing to employment to transportation.

Slide 6, again, these are the 11 federal agencies that were studied and represented in the 16 reports. We didn't study them this year, but again, they were the ones that were represented in the reports that resulted in the study.

slide 7 shows or kind of summarizes by category the civil rights statutes that were covered and again, they ran the gamut of the Civil Rights Act, education statutes, disability statutes, housing statutes and other statutes. All of those were represented in the 10 years of enforcement reports.

Slide 8 shows a breakdown of what the Commission spoke about in those 10 of years recommendations and you will see the biggest category is policy dissemination and that refers to issuing quidance and policy statements in terms of agencies needing to provide guidance for how enforcement works, followed by the priority of civil rights enforcement within the Agency. That has to do with where the Agency is situated -- where the Office of Civil Rights

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is situated within the Agency and how civil rights is a priority or not within the Agency. Those were the largest category and I won't go over the other ones.

Slide We detected overall 9. an patterning what the Commission had said in the 16 Taken together, the reports reports over 10 years. key elements about which said that there are enforcement responsibilities really can't be carried So what are those elements that we identified out. Commission when all the that the we put recommendations on reams of paper, this is what jumped out.

Slide 10. They are number one, a high priority within the Agency for civil rights enforcement expressed in part by an organizational structure that makes civil rights a priority; planning goals and evaluating outcomes and fourth, pertinent policy and quidance, regulations, technical assistance and outreach. These are continues on the next slide, 11.

An effective complaints processing system, systems that ensure a review of all funding recipients and their compliance before and after awards are made and regular staff training on civil rights statutes and emerging issues. So as the Agency's authority may

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

change that the staff gets trained appropriately.

Slide 12 is our other chief finding. There were agencies that have the elements that I mentioned, but those agencies that were most get around resource able to successful were constraints, were the ones that found ways to maximize those elements and put them together. Some did so in order to compensate for shrinking budgets and some did so just as matter of course and good management and we noted this in the end of report.

The next slide talks about those ways to overcome the limited resources that agencies had found or that agencies, that irrespective of resources found ways to maximize those elements. And those are integrating civil rights enforcement throughout every the Agency, delegating activities of appropriate, implementing oversight and quality assurance procedures, coordinating civil rights enforcement activities with other agencies, streamlining procedures and truly involving advocacy groups, not just putting them on a mailing list, but having a two-way conversation with the community and people in the public.

Slide 14, we also found that there was great, wide variation in how successful the Commission

NEAL R. GROSS

found agencies over the 10 years. The Commission said that agencies needed to be cognizant of all those elements and furthermore that they need to organize and utilize all the elements in a very effective way.

Slide 15, some agencies seem to have the structure in place in most of the elements. They were focused on or were able to focus on how to utilize those elements in a widespread fashion. For example, the Commission found over the last 10 years of study that the Department of Education and the EEOC were probably in that category, all those elements that I mentioned before are in place and now they are focusing on how to utilize them.

Slide 16, some had elements in place, but they weren't widespread. For example, the Department of Labor, the Department of Transportation has some elements in place, but needed to work on comprehensively having them in place for all of their civil rights functions.

Slide 17 showed that we found the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Department and the Department of Justice, they had many, but not all elements in place and in some cases really decent and laudable programs, but very inconsistent across the board and this is why

we placed them in this category.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Slide 18, the Commission seemed to find in its report that there were agencies, overall the Interior, the of the Department notably Environmental Protection Agency and the Small Business Administration that really didn't even have a lot of the elements in place, let alone in a widespread ability to utilize them having the manner oreffectively.

slide 19. We received responses from -we sent out the report to be reviewed by all the
affected agencies and we received responses from the
EEOC and from the Departments of Justice, Labor and
Transportation. Most of the comment we received were
editorial and there was a change made as a result, a
minor change. We had categorized the Department of
Education as having one model of authority and they
really are considered in another model of authority.
So that is a table that will change. And if there are
questions about that I can go into greater detail. I
won't take the time now.

On Slide 20 and the following slides, I just have in case anyone wants to discuss any of the tables and figures, but I'm not planning to discuss them here, so I want to ask that we just move, skip

NEAL R. GROSS

ahead to Slide 29 which is Volume 2 of the report.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Just a minute. Do you have 29 up?

Okay, it's up now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. DICKERSON: Thanks. Volume 2 is the beginning of our look at agencies specifically. And if you skip to Slide 30, our purpose of Volume 2 was to study the extent to which three agencies, the Departments of Justice, Labor and Transportation had implemented specifically past recommendations.

And to the extent that this report reviews three agencies, the next year's report is going to look at another three. So that's how we plan to cover all of the 16 reports.

On 31, this is methodology for this Volume We did contact the three agencies and we did ask for responses to interrogatories and new documents that help us to determine whether or not they had followed past Commission recommendations. So policy, specifically, requested reviewed we. and planning, budget documents, annual reports, rights implementation plans. We prepared and reviewed their responses to our interrogatories. We interviewed civil rights staff at all three agencies and we reviewed documents from the internet and other

places, GAO reports, a number of sources that we went to for our study.

What we determined from the Department of Justice, that's page 32, so if you skip to 33, within the Department of Justice, we looked at the Civil Rights Division, specifically two sections, the Coordination and Review Section, the Disability Rights Section, and we also looked at two other offices, the Office of Justice Programs and the FBI because these were the entities to which the Commission has directed past recommendations.

On 34, I'm only going to give some example findings, obviously. I know you've seen the report and read it so there are many more findings and recommendations. One of the recommendations with respect to Justice is that they need a central source of information for its functions that don't fall under CRD, for example, the FBI. The FBI has hate crimes reporting responsibilities and it's very hard to get civil rights reports out of offices that don't fall under CRD. So this is difficult and we recommended that they address that.

On Slide 35, we studied two sections and found that they had improved, particularly in their coordination and planning, in fact, the Disability

Rights Section is -- especially in its use of mediation for the enforcement of the ADA, is really a model program that should be replicated in other areas of the Department and that was our recommendation.

To do that, we also recommended that they need more resources, more money.

Justice Program, we found they're not doing as good a job as they could. One of the reasons is that a reorganization has been up in the air for a very long time and the office itself is not situation to have enough authority and we recommended that they finalize that reorganization and that it give the office enough authority, enough -- a line of reporting that would help it to exercise its authority.

In Slide 37, we found only lukewarm support and elements in place to support the Hate Crimes Statistics Act and we recommended that this be addressed by Congress as well as the Department.

Okay, 38 really skips us to the Department of Labor. And 39 shows the two offices that we looked at that were addressed in past reports, the Civil Rights Center and in previous reports it may have been referred to as the Directorate of Civil Rights, as well as the Office of Federal Contract Compliance

Programs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and findings 40, among Slide recommendations directed at Labor this time, they have instituted Title 6 functions for their main programs, but they really haven't put enough effort into Title 6 enforcement in other areas and I think our report noted and went into more detail about their regional They monitor Title 6 compliance mainly offices. through data collection and they need to establish a Title 6 program, enforcement comprehensive program.

Slide 41, Labor still hasn't gotten around to developing a publication we recommended in an earlier report and that publication would help the Department to explain how civil rights applies to other Labor programs. They need to interpret their regulations in relation to all of what the Department does, so everyone can understand what manifestations of discrimination exist and are possible.

Slide 42, we found that the Center hasn't strategically planned and designed an outreach program targeted to groups that may be victims of discrimination. And we gave them ideas for how they should do that and materials that they should develop in order to respond to that finding.

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

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On Slide 43, we found that their compliance review program was spotty. They do some one year, maybe none the next year and it really is inconsistent. As a result, they haven't reviewed all of their recipients and they're not doing as good a job as they could in terms of compliance review.

With respect also to staff training, on Slide 44, they need to conduct training on Title 6. They do effective training in other areas, but not on this and this is a big part of their responsibility. They really need to shore up their Title 6 training program.

Slide 45, if they got more involved in --I'm talking particularly about the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, OFCCP, we found that if they got more involved with the community and outside groups they would be a lot more effective. They are one of the organizations of that sort had communication with groups and their effectiveness would be greatly enhanced if they were to more maximize that resource.

Slide 46 switches us to the Department of Transportation.

Slide 47 shows that when we reviewed the Department of Transportation, it was a very large

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

review because in addition to recommendations that were directed to the Secretary, there were seven operating divisions that had been addressed in previous Commission reports and they're listed on Slide 47.

On Slide 48, we Okay, what did we find? found the Federal Highway Administration, these are examples of some of the recommendations and findings, that it needs to have -- I'm sorry, there needs to be a more direct line of reporting in order to be more effective. They also need to strengthen their civil functions that affect the public. Their emphasis tends to be on internal complaints, you know, employee complaints, and they need to shore up their with respect their public programs to responsibilities.

On Slide 49, this was something that was resonant throughout the report that in order to carry out their -- all of their authority; they really need to get additional resources and so there were some recommendations directed to Congress, as well as to the Secretary for how they might improve their funding picture.

On Slide 50, some of Transportation's operating divisions don't develop civil rights

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

implementation plans and these are required to -every agency is required to develop these by DOJ and
they don't develop them, so the -- well, there were
four divisions that should prepare those and they
should conform to the DOJ requirements.

In 51, we found that the Coast Guard really is not doing enough post-award reviews, recipients. They are relying on self-certification and information from state recipients to determine their Title 6 compliance and we felt that this should be stronger.

52 gets to the conclusion and the last two slides. First, I think it should be said that the majority of Commission recommendations were implemented by the agencies and we found that the Department of Justice has improved in civil rights enforcement, but the Office of Justice Programs still is inadequate and needs a lot more and we were very concerned about the somewhat casual implementation for the Hate Crimes Statistics Act which results in a serious under reporting of such crimes.

Slide 53, the Department of Labor Center for Civil Rights still hasn't addressed many of the Commission's 96 recommendations and cited a lack of resources for that and we concur with that after

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

looking at their budgets. They still have a lot to do in order to follow many of the -- some recommendations that were made to them before.

The Department of Transportation is strong in some places and weak in others, so they have a lot of work to do and we directed a lot of recommendations to their staff and how that could be done and how they could overcome or compensate in the meantime for some staff and resource limitations.

54 gets at the effective agency review. Once again, all three agencies replied to us and the majority of the comments that received we editorial in nature.

55, I won't spend time going over unless someone really has a question about specifically what the agencies said in their affected agency review. The Department of Justice though did provide additional information on the FBI's enforcement of the Crimes Statistics Act because we had noted in a footnote that they hadn't provided that, so they want that footnote to be deleted and the Department of Transportation gave us some clarification on their organizational structure and staffing. And we made the Federal Railroad some statements about Administration and their enforcement responsibilities

and they qualified those as well. Those were some of 1 the more substantive changes that we made. 2 That's really this year. Next year, we're 3 going to review the Departments of Agriculture, the 4 EPA, the SBA and the Department of the Interior in 5 this same way and in 2004, there will be four other 6 agencies to kind of put this in context. That's all I 7 had planned. 8 Terri, that 9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: was wonderful. 10 MS. DICKERSON: Thank you. 11 Magisterial. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: so Terri-like. And Dickersonian, we'll say. 13 14 (Laughter.) In any case, I think it's -- and I don't 15 remember whether you outlined the overall summary of 16 the report this way in the beginning of the actual 17 report, but I think that it would be great if you did 18 that with these same kinds of bullets in the final 19 20 report. **Ž**1 MS. DICKERSON: Okay. 22 And the other thing CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 23 is, unless somebody objects, the other thing is that I 24 pleased to see that most of the Commission 25 recommendations have been implemented. I read that in

report and you reiterated that because the 1 Commission has prided itself on that over time. 2 MS. DICKERSON: Yes. 3 That this, all this CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 4 work is worthwhile and is useable from the agencies. 5 And then my only quibble with the entire report and 6 then I'll turn it over to others is the title of the 7 report, where you talk about directives. 8 MS. DICKERSON: Yes. 9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If we could direct 10 people to do things that would be great. 11 Okay. MS. DICKERSON: 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: then Because 13 could implement all of our reports so we could club 14 them over the head if they couldn't. 15 16 MS. DICKERSON: Okay. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But I think we need to 17 find some other word other than "directives." 18 19 you probably didn't want to say recommendations over and over again, but do you understand what I mean? 20 21 MS. DICKERSON: Yes, I do. We were trying 22 to get away from that word because it's so much in the 23 report that we were -- we will revisit that. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. And let me .25 for Commissioners. comments from other

	11
1	Commissioner Edley, and if you don't hear people, I'll
2	repeat what they said.
3	MS. DICKERSON: Thank you.
4	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: First, I want to say
5	to Terri and the battalion that worked on this, I
6	think it's just a fabulous piece of work and it is
7	extremely heartening in its results. My only comment,
8	Madam Chair, is that I think there will be an
9	important market for this report on Capitol Hill and
10	that it's worth investing, the staff, I think,
11	investing some thought into how to effectively get
12	interested folks on a whole range of committees,
13	interested staff on a whole range of committees to pay
14	some attention to these findings.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you hear that,
16	Terri? Terri, can you hear me?
17	MS. DICKERSON: Oh, yes. I do.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you hear
19	Commissioner Edley?
20	MS. DICKERSON: I believe I heard most of
21	what he said.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Other
23	Commissioners, anyone have a comment on this before we
24	we need a motion, I guess.
ا ہے۔	MATCH CITY IN DEPOSIT DESCRIPTION OF THE CLASS TO

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO:

25

Madam Chair, I

just want to comment on the value of having a third 1 party like the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights look at 2 what the federal agencies are doing and whether or not 3 4 they are complying with their statutory and regulatory duties, so I think this is particularly important role 5 the Commission has been able to fill. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can we get a motion? 7 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I'll make the motion, 8 9 but I do want to say that Terri, this has been a very 10 good report. MR. JIN: Second. 11 BERRY: The motion is CHAIRPERSON 12 13 seconded. Any further discussion? 14 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm not sure that agencies 15 input from the three we had any departments that were identified as not having fully 16 17 implemented the Commission's reports. There was 18 Interior, SBA and EPA and I'm wondering if Terri can 19 tell us whether we expect any kind of response from 20 them or have we requested a response and they've 21 neglected to reply? 22 MS. DICKERSON: Yes. Along with the other 23 agencies, they were sent the report and given a 24 deadline for responding and we didn't receive any 25 responses from them.

the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON . BERRY:

Would

Commissioners wish to formally reiterate the request to them to respond before we actually publish this or should we just note that they didn't respond?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: My preference would be that we give them another chance to get some type of response back, give them a firm deadline and if they fail to do so and also give them notice that this report is going to be issued at some point or maybe vote upon or consider by the Commission at some point absent their opportunity to have some input.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now, we have to vote on it today because the statutory report is due before the beginning of the fiscal year. We don't actually have to -- we could wait and give them some time to include what they say as the staff revises it before it actually be issued, while we're not meeting in August. We can do that, which would satisfy, I think, your concern that they have yet another opportunity.

MS. DICKERSON: Ι wanted to clarify something that maybe isn't apparent from the report. In Volume 1, we really didn't -- those particular agencies that Commissioner Kirsanow just mentioned, those only reports summaries of what the were Commission has said previously. Those findings

weren't new and the only new findings were with 1 respect to Volume 2 and the Departments of Labor, 2 Transportation and Justice. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So this means that you 4 will be doing the same kind of study you did of 5 Justice, Labor and Transportation of those departments 6 in a later volume? 7 MS. DICKERSON: Yes. 8 And we'll then get CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 9 another further opportunity. 10 So all they really didn't comment on was 11 your summary of all the things we recommended before, 12 is that what you're saying, Terri? 13 MS. DICKERSON: They are only mentioned in 14 Volume 1 which is really just a summary of past 15 16 Commission reports. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So does that satisfy 17 18 you, Commissioner? 19 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Not quite. Ι 20 think still would prefer that they have 21 opportunity to respond. Give them notice of this and give them an opportunity to respond. 22 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, so now they've 24 had one opportunity. We will give them, if this goes 25 forward, if we vote to approve the report, you can

inform them again, Terri, that in fact, we have voted
on it, We're going to go forward with it. If they've
got any comments, please get them in by the time you
have to go to print this.
MS. DICKERSON: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any further
discussion? Yes, Commissioner Braceras?
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I do have some
concerns about some of the recommendations,
particularly the recommendations that special interest
groups be brought into the process of making policy on
a consistent and regular basis. And I know that a lot
of this is just reiterating recommendations that we
made in the past, but I certainly wasn't here to make
those recommendations, nor would I have agreed to such
recommendations, so that is a substantive concern I
have.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anyone else have any
comments on the report?
Okay, all right, then I call for the
question on the motion.
VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Motion.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor
indicate by saying aye.
(Ayes.)

Ī	57
1	Opposed.
2	(Nos.)
3	Give me a roll, somebody.
4	Thank you, Audrey. This is on the
5	statutory report.
6	Commissioner Braceras?
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Vice
9	Chair Reynoso?
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Kirsanow?
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
14	Thernstrom?
15	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: No.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Berry, yes. The
17	motion passes by a vote of 4 to 3.
18	So ordered.
19	VII. Discussion of staff report and recommendations
20	on the civil rights implications of welfare
21	reauthorization
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item on the
23	agenda is the discussion of staff report and
24	recommendations on the civil rights implications of
25	welfare reauthorization. You received a memo and some
j	

In

the

other

recommendations. We can proceed with the discussion, but my own view -- the Staff Director -- since the memo was for our information and there were a lot of in the memo that either people agree or things disagree with or that are social policy concerns that are subject to debate, that we simply focus on the recommendations concerning civil rights issues decide whether or not we support the recommendations. That's my suggestion. And then see if there are any other recommendation that people want to include. other words, we're not asking -- not being asked to adopt the briefing memo. What we're being asked to do is decide whether we agree with the recommendations and to add any others that we would like to add. Could I get a motion to do that? COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I'll move. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So the motion that's the floor is on that we agree recommendations and then there may recommendations that people will want to add in a subsequent motion. So the first motion would be to agree with

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

the recommendations that are there and then after

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be

1	that, if there are others that people want to add, we
2	would move those.
3	Commissioner Meeks?
4	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: So how would we do
5	that, one recommendation at a time?
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we do all
7	the recommendations that are there. Let's try first
8	saying all the recommendations that are there. And if
9	that doesn't work, then we'll do one by one. There
10	might be others added.
11	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Does somebody
12	have an extra copy of these recommendations?
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Just a minute.
14	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, actually, what
15	I meant was I think we should agree wholly on them or
16	not agree, but vote on the recommendations here, but
17	I'm just talking about amendments to them or
18	additions.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right.
20	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: How would we do that?
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, here's what
22	we'll do. We'll vote on the recommendations and in
23	when we have the discussion, you can propose
24	amendments to specific ones and then the motion at the
25	end can be the approval can be with the

1	understanding that they are amended by what you say in
2	the discussion. How's that?
3	Yes, Commissioner Edley?
4	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I'm a little confused
5	as to what we should be thinking as of the list of
6	recommendations. Because in the documents I have
7	there's an executive summary that has some things in
8	boxes.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, it's number 7.
10	It's under number 7 in the book.
11	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: There's a long side
12	by side table which has about 2.3 zillion
13	recommendations.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What we want Terri to
15	do who is going to do this for us is to just list out
16	for us the recommendations.
17	MS. DICKERSON: I'm sorry, are you talking
18	to me?
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can you hear me,
20	Terri?
21	MS. DICKERSON: Very, very faintly.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can you hear me now?
23	MS. DICKERSON: I think I can, yes. And I
24	think you're talking about the welfare policy paper?
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. Here's what

we'd like to do and we move to do that and that is to
consider whether we want to approve the
recommendations that are in the staff paper.
MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And that is seeing the
information that is in there, the narrative as
information for us and description for us of the
issues. But what we want to vote on is the
recommendations. Do you understand?
MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So could you describe
for us from the paper what the recommendations are?
COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: There's no list
here.
MS. DICKERSON: Okay, you're not talking
about one by one. You're just talking about in
general, is that right?
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm trying to find my
paper, just a minute. I think I have it here. It's
under number just a minute, Terri.
MS. DICKERSON: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Number 7, I think.
(Pause,)
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Terri, I am talking
about the material that is in the boxes in the
\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\

1 executive summary. MS. DICKERSON: Okay. 2 Those are the overall CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 3 recommendations, right? 4 MS. DICKERSON: Yes. Let me distinguish 5 between those and what's in the table. The table 6 contains about 40 recommendations and the ones that 7 8 are in the boxes of the executive summary really take 9 all of those 40 and summarize them. So everything that's in the 40 recommendations in the table should 10 11 is represented in the boxes in the executive 12 summary. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So when I say we're 14 going to consider the recommendations and whether we 15 are going to approve them, I'm talking about these 16 boxes that -- with the lines around them in the first 17 part of this document that is the executive summary, 18 that's what I mean. 19 MS. DICKERSON: Yes. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Now if you want 21 something to us, in general, about 22 recommendations, please do and then we'll proceed. 23 MS. DICKERSON: I quess, in general, a

concern was that there are still some -- even with the

White House proposals and the House and Senate, the

24

House bill and the Senate proposal, there still are some very important civil rights concerns that are overlooked and the proposals only go so far to address civil rights concerns and in fact, in some cases may make some civil rights concerns even more prominent.

Let me give you some examples. None of the proposals really -- we really recommend that there be a clear applicability of civil rights and labor laws and that legal requirements of state agencies and employers is really part of what finally gets past.

We think that the recommendations say that there should be funding for stronger enforcement of civil rights laws, in general, and much more funding because for training of case workers there is disparate treatment, there is -- depending on recipient, there is a difference between how benefits that people of color receive versus others as well as how long they are on the rolls or what kind of service they get from case workers, so there really needs to be a lot more put into training of case workers and outreach.

We think that there should be a collection and dissemination of data on the recipients on who was denied benefits or who was exempted from requirements.

The Department of Health and Human Services should

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

really collect and disseminate more standardized data by race on welfare recipients so that we can -- this can be monitored.

We also recommend that immediately full benefits be restored to legal immigrants regardless of their date of entry and without reliance on sponsors' incomes for eligibility which is what the current situation is.

recommendation that the We have the work requirement not be I'm sorry, workload, increased as the proposal would do and in some cases that it would be reduced, particularly because this effect, this legislation affects single parents and individuals with disabilities and in this economy part-time work is sometimes the only work that people can get, so increasing the workload, we really think goes against what needs to be -- what needs to happen in order for people to be successful in this program lifted out of and be poverty and in better a situation, after they are off the welfare rolls.

We think there should be increased funding for child care because child care funding has been insufficient, even in the current, under the 1996 Act.

We recommend that child care and care for elderly or disabled people and families count toward

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the work requirement. We recommend that the time limits for people who have legitimate barriers to employment, even if they're temporary, like people who are in rehab programs or for substance abuse, or people who can only find part-time work or people who have a low education level that the time limits for those with legitimate barriers be eliminated and we are recommending that the focus go from case load reduction to poverty reduction and that state bonuses should be based on reducing poverty, not just reducing case load. And instead, give bonuses for lifting people out of poverty.

We are recommending that there be a broad

We are recommending that there be a broad range of education programs that be deemed acceptable as work activities like adult basic education, literacy training, GED prep classes. None of those can really count as work requirement, but they really should because they are part of helping people to lift themselves out of poverty and become more self-sufficient.

We recommend that the education time limits and participation ceilings be eliminated. The current law places a 12-month limit on vocational education and allows states to count education as work activity for only 20 percent of recipients and time

limits don't allow people to complete an academic program that will really raise their job marketability.

We recommend that the clock, if you will, be stopped for those are employed, even if they're only employed on a part-time basis.

As for tribes, Indian tribes. We recommend that they receive resources and technical assistance to help them establish offices and help them to build infrastructure. I know everyone knows from reading the paper that tribes can run their own welfare programs, but they need to have assistance in terms of transportation vouchers and other things that will help them to be more successful.

We are recommending that tribes also receive performance incentives just as states do. States receive bonuses for poverty reduction and we believe that tribal offices should do the same and we believe that the legislation should provide tribes grants for educational programs, transportation and economic development.

Overall, none of the proposals address customer service and eliminating bureaucratic hurdles and establishing minimum standards for service delivery by states and by case workers and we really

NEAL R. GROSS

25

think that overall, across the board, going out into the field and providing child care during visits or on site visits to low income communities, all of those need to be done. Some states are and some aren't, but there need to be some standards for service delivery to help people to participate in the program and to go through the program.

Language assistance ought to be provided which is one of our recommendations. This is required by law, but it really isn't done or monitored.

There was a lot of misinformation after the 1996 law, for example, with respect to immigrant eligibility. Some states and case workers misinterpreted the law and so a lot of people who were eligible didn't receive benefits, so there needs to be much more case worker training so that they will know, be aware of what's available and be able to help people to participate.

And we are recommending providing regular technical assistance to individuals in navigating the immigrants, system, focusing on hard to communities, people who might be illiterate therefore can't read printed information that's circulated.

And just in general, I think all of the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recommendations fall under the category of remedying the inadequacies of the earlier law and addressing the needs of certain populations because people of color low income people are the ones who are and disproportionately affected by this legislation and it needs to have mechanisms that move people toward self-sufficiency and the proposals really don't go far the do it and believe that enough to we recommendations take it to the next level.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, all right. I know Commissioner Meeks you've had some amendments or changes you wanted on the section having to do with Indian tribes.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes. I think recommendations that overall. the are stated really good. I just would like to work with the staff strengthening them, especially on accessing sufficient on-going administrative resources incentives that she mentioned in the report, particularly the high performance the bonus, contingency fund, technical assistance and research and building the infrastructure, helping tribes build And also, I would like to mention infrastructure. economic developing, having flexible resources economic development, because without that, no matter

how good the legislation, welfare reform, it's going 1 to have limited success, because there's just not any 2 jobs in Indian country. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So we could agree we 4 pass this that you -- these would be in the matter of 5 editorial changes and amendments and additions and 6 that we go into that section that you would work out. 7 Does anyone have any other -- just to this 8 section, other changes? Yes, Commissioner 9 any Thernstrom? 10 No, I have a 11 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: general comment about the report, not to -- it's not 12 specifically on the Meeks suggestion. Can I --13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go ahead. 14 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, I'm just 15 convinced that these issues are civil rights 16 that are appropriate for this Commission. 17 issues Increasing the workload is not a civil rights issue. 18 19 Ditto with child care. Ditto with the education 20 And I mean unless you object to the fact programs. 21 that a disproportionately high number of minorities receive welfare benefits, you can hardly object to the 22 23 disproportionate impact of the rules governing those 24 benefits. In addition, there are a lot of changes of 25 'ethnic and racial discrimination and absolutely no

23

24

25

documentation, no evidence, not even footnotes that suggest where these charges come from. They are simply assertions and I would say -- assertions about case workers, when of course many case workers are people of color. I mean I looked at this and it's -- unless a more careful job is done (1), it seems to me, link this to the legitimate work of the Commission and (2) to document the charges being made, it seems to me this is, alas, not a good report.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Terri, do you have any comments on why this a civil rights issue?

We, in the paper, MS. DICKERSON: Yes. pointed out and I'm just briefly going to summarize that women and people of color do disproportionately rely on public assistance and they really, policies really affect these populations disproportionately. And as well, the policies affect They affect tribes. To a great extent immigrants. they affect in fact, individuals with disabilities. As such, they are civil rights issues.

There are proven disparities in access to an utilization of services that -- and there is proven discrimination in the delivery of benefits which we cited in the report.

Study after study shows that there is

differential treatment in the access to services that 1 is experienced by some of these populations and that 2 really makes it welfare, the whole legislation in our 3 view, a civil rights issue. 4 Well, you know, COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: 5 Terri, by that criterion every public policy issue in 6 America is a civil rights issue, everything. 7 of color are Americans and every policy one way or 8 I mean this is a definition 9 another affects them. that just doesn't satisfy me as legitimizing these 10 11 recommendations. MS. DICKERSON: I think part of the point 12 13 is that they are treated differently within this and so the legislation really doesn't go far enough to 14 15 protect the populations that are disproportionately affected and treated differently. 16 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: 17 I would say you haven't established that they are treated differently. 18 19 It really needs to be established with a lot more intellectual rigor than it's been established in this 20 21 report. 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me just point out 23 that this is not a right, is that right, Terri? 24 MS. DICKERSON: Paper. 25 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Whatever.

MS. DICKERSON: It's

It's a briefing memo for

2 the Commissioners.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley?

I think that as the COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Chair and some of the other Commissioners know, Commissioner think I in some agreement with Thernstrom on the question of the breadth or the ambition or whatever it is of some of the reports and things that we undertake here and do agree that that as a general matter we run some questions, run into some questions if we decide to investigate anything, any matter of social policy simply because it is of particular concern to groups about whom we're concerned as a Commission.

And this was indeed one of my strong reservations when we agreed to do this project on welfare reform in the first instance. And I may have expressed that concern at the time.

However, I'm going to go ahead and support because recommendations I kind of lost discussion back in the beginning when had reservations about whether we should look at welfare reform and now that we have done it, and I do have qualms about areas in the recommendations. -- I want to put one side the narrative because I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

indeed that were going forward as a report of the Commission. But as the Chair has framed it, we're not transmitting the narrative as such with all of the particular views about whether welfare reform was a good idea or a bad idea, etcetera. So stripping that away and just focusing on the recommendations and the boxes, in the Executive Summary, there are some tonal things in there and some matters of emphasis in there that still seem to me to be problematic, but I'm gong to support the recommendations nonetheless because we've gone down this path, so fine, we'll go down this path.

would have lots of problems with the narrative, if

Let me say that, and for the most part, I agree substantively with be they civil rights matters substantively not, agree with the or I just would want to emphasize one recommendations. thing for the staff and as you discussed this on the Hill and that is that the first -- the box, let's see, I guess it's at the very first box on page 2, little The third item concerning collection and Roman two. dissemination of standardized data. I just want to underscore that because it strikes me as being quite comparable to the efforts under the No Child Left Behind Act that we've embraced in the context of

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to try to do a better education reform, collecting data and disaggregating that data, so as to track the effectiveness of these social programs and actually producing more opportunity. And so that is frankly, that excited me, among all the recommendations that we've had there. I think they're dramatically better opportunities available in this reauthorization to improve our understanding of the effectiveness of these programs.

And finally, let me conclude, Madam Chair, that while there are several places in here regarding time limits and so forth, work requirements that do, in my mind, skate dangerously close to, if not over the edge, that might separate civil rights policy from social policy broadly, there are some thing in here do do with the discriminatory that have to implementation or management administration of these programs and I would hope that the Staff would give those special attention when communicating these recommendations up on the Hill.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I just in the interest of time and in the interest of clarity, can you hear me, Terry?

MS. DICKERSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Just do this very

NEAL R. GROSS

quickly and maybe it will help the debate, maybe it 1 won't. 2 Beginning with the recommendations on page 3 2 in the box, the one that -- and Commissioner Edley, 4 I'm asking you this, the one that "this should be an 5 6 opportunity to clarify and strengthen the applicability of civil rights and labor laws 7 participants in TANIF activities and to reiterate 8 9 these requirements." Would we all agree that that is a civil rights concern? 10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry, 11 Ι'm lost. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm starting on the 14 first page, I mean not the first, whatever page this 15 is. 16 Where the boxes are, see that box down at 17 the bottom of the page, it has three things in it. 18 Congress should take the reauthorization -- whether or 19 not one agrees with this, we would agree, I think, 20 that that has something to do with civil rights, I 21 suppose. 22 The second one allocating funding for 23 stronger enforcement of civil rights, we're already on 24 record as saying that the Department of Health and 25 Human Services, OCR, should have more money. Wе

reiterated that for 40 years. I think everybody would agree that that's a civil rights concern, whether you agree that they ought to get more money or not is a different issue. I think that asking HHS to collect data on recent ethnicity and the like so that we can figure out what's going on, most people would agree that that should be a civil rights concern, although I would say it ought to be collected in a useable form which I think is really important.

The one on collecting audits of state welfare agencies and making sure that people deal with compliance or plan for noncompliance, that most emphatically, I think, is within the purview of civil rights. I think most people would agree with that.

Do I hear people who say -- I'm not asking whether you agree with the recommendation, but that has something to do with civil rights. Okay. So we've got at least those in that box that have something to do with civil rights.

In the next box, we have the one on data. We've got a recommendation. We're already on record as asking that these benefits be put in place for legal immigrants. We've done that several times because they were being discriminated against. We established that a long time ago.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

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

first three are more problematic and can only justified if we point out, as the Staff will do if they haven't and the data would show that there is differential treatment on the basis of race, ethnicity and the like in how these -- who these people are and how they are treated in terms of work requirements and child care and support services and the like and the But I think that that impact that it has on them. would be a different category than the first four that we've just talked about and I think most people would agree with that. The one about helping people who are disabled, the last one, defined work. We are already on record -- that's one of the recommendations we made a long time ago. I think most people agree with that that that helps to relieve unequal opportunity for people who are disabled.

The one on the next page, I think

So that I think those 1, 2, 3, 4, in that box on page 4 need to have some language pointing out how they are connected with disproportionate treatment or differential treatment of people on the basis of race and ethnicity.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I can say that where there would be elements of discretion that might -that are being exercised or that we have reason to fear are being exercised in a way that's discriminatory.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And the same with time limits, Terri, on the next page. The one in the box about case load reduction requires the same kind of rationale and explanation so that it's clear that it's focused on the differential treatment and the discrimination and not whether this is good social policy or not good social policy.

And the one down at the bottom on education needs to talk about the affected populations and any differential treatment or discretion that is used. For example, we know that there are studies and you have them cited somewhere else that show that people of color, Hispanics and African American women are less likely to get waivers to take certain kinds of education programs. Some of that language has to be there to make sure that this has -- that the differential impact is put into the recommendation in the box and not just that is bad social policy and we don't like it. The same with time limits and then if we do that, and then add the language that Elsie is talking about to the one on the Indian tribes and the way their programs work. Now the last one is a question of training and a question of if there is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

differential treatment and opportunity to have people's attention paid to their needs on the part of women of color in this box that you have on page 5, 6, 7 at the bottom which is, I understood, was the case, and in how this discretion is exercised and that is related to training and sensitivity of the workers, then you have something which is on purely on civil rights issues related to discrimination and anything that's not shouldn't be there.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: But Madam Chair, I'm not wildly enthusiastic about these recommendations. I mean I think that's great. One further thing, I think, that might help Terri is that in those places where there are not reputable studies by the Urban Institute and others, I know the organization has been spending a gazillion dollars doing a lot of this, if there are not reputable studies establishing the fact of these kinds of disparate treatment and differential exercise of discrimination, then I would characterize it recommendation as that preventive orprophylactic, that safeguards be adopted in order to ensure that these risks of discrimination don't, fact, eventuate. So I think -- let me state that -try to state that more clearly.

There are data in some areas suggesting a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

problem exists. I think in other places, experience and the logic of the program suggest that there is a risk though that risk may not yet be demonstrated scientifically and as to that latter category, I think our recommendation should be that Congress adopt appropriate safeguards, Congress and the Administration adopt appropriate safeguards.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you understand that, Terri?

MS. DICKERSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.

A couple COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: One, as everybody knows, I'm all for data, comments. but as Commissioner Edley just indicated, a lot of data is being collected. The Urban Institute does have a gazillion dollars to do so. These questions are being followed very carefully. There is no data in this report, most notably, and if there are no reputable studies showing disparate impact or disparate treatment, it may be because there is not a problem that anybody with the existing data and lots of it has been collected at the federal level, at the state level, at the local level, has found that that is a problem and this report reads as if time had stood still in the welfare offices since about 1965.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Then the other -- two other comments. the instance, on this first, Congress should take reauthorization of welfare reform as an opportunity to clarify and strengthen the applicability of civil rights, etcetera. This assumes that civil rights laws with respect to welfare needs strengthening. still to be established, it seems to me. Ditto with case workers not properly trained. That has yet to be I'm not convinced that that's the case.

And it's just -- you want to make a case for what we're recommending. Fine. But this paper does not make that case and again, any solid case has to be made with solid data.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now in the interest of time, can we take up the motion. And if the motion passes, it will be with the understanding that the staff will do exactly what we have suggested and to cite the studies and to flesh out the contextual basis of the recommendations in the way we have described it here, and that they will listen to the amendments clarified by Commissioner Meeks and that they will go if it passes in this way. And understanding clearly, Terri, is that the paper that you guys wrote is not a report and is not anything to The recommendations, as well as the rationale

1	for them, with the citations that we've discussed
2	today is what the Commission supporting in this regard
3	and that is what we will prepare, what we will issue
4	and what we will put on our website and what we will
5	talk with the staffs on the Hill about.
6	Could I get a call for the question?
7	(Vice Chairperson Reynoso nods.)
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of
9	the motion as it is has been stated, indicate by
10	saying aye.
11	(Ayes.)
12	Opposed.
13	(Nos.)
14	The motion
15	MS. DICKERSON: May I just say one thing,
16	please?
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
18	MS. DICKERSON: I neglected to thank Marie
19	Zesnus who prepared this report. She's a civil rights
20	analyst from the staff and I meant to do that at the
21	beginning.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, thank you very
23	much.
24	Commissioner Braceros?
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No.
1	

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley? 1 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Yes. 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Meeks? 3 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Kirsanow? 5 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair Reynoso? 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: 8 Commissioner CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 9 Thernstrom? 10 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: No. 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Berry, yes. Motion 12 13 passes, 4 to 3. Let me say before, if I can find my 14 agenda, oh there it is. We're going to have some 15 presentations from our SACs, but before we do that, I 16 neglected and I would like you to move that it's 17 18 appropriate for us to do it briefly, to -- Homeland 19 Security, I should have done under the Staff 20 Director's Report and I forgot to do it. 21 So is it all right, does anyone object to 22 us doing this quickly? You got an op. ed. piece and 23 if you object, we can have a motion, from Chris Edley 24 that was published in the Post on Sunday, July 14th 25 and you have a discussion piece from the Staff on

Homeland Security. And could I just get a motion? 1 Could someone move that we take that up at this time? 2 I'll move to take COMMISSIONER MEEKS: 3 I thought it was excellent. 4 that up. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second? 5 6, COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor, 7 8 indicate by saying aye. (Ayes.) 9 Opposed? 10 (No response.) 11 Okay, the question is whether we would 12 13 like to take some action on this subject of a civil rights office or a civil liberties office in the 14 proposed Homeland Security Department if the Homeland 15 16 Security Department is ever enacted and if it is 17 enacted in the wy that it is being proposed. There have been a number of issues raised about the absence 18 19 of a civil rights office. Just by way of context, the 20 Civil Rights Commission has over the years on numerous 21 occasions, recommended when Departments were created 22 or reorganizations took place in the government and so 23 on, that civil rights functions of various kinds be

was one of the bodies that recommended the Inspector

either established or pursued.

24

25

The Commission also

24

25

General operations that are in abundance And your paper tells you, your various Departments. briefing paper, memo, tells you that there are lots and lots of issues that have been raised. Many of them have been in the news about what the government is doing in the area of civil rights and civil liberties in the activities around the threat terrorism and the terrorist things that have already And so in a way it's a pro forma taken place. discussion of the kind that we would be having if any anywhere in the Department was set up kind of We would come to emphasizing that there government. ought to be a nice civil rights function so that Terri's shop could monitor and find out what they're doing and so we'll know what they're doing. comes as not something unusual for the Commission. And so Christopher, do you want to say anything else about your proposal?

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Sure, briefly. My thoughts on it and I was very gratified to see that the staff paper substantially tracks what I had suggested in this op. ed. from last weekend. Let me just emphasize three things in what I was trying to put forward. The first is that this is not about where to draw the line between civil liberties and

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

civil rights on the one hand and the prosecution of the War on Terrorism on the other. There are always going to be debates about what constitutes racial profiling, when should a mosque be bugged, who should have access to counsel, which kind of detainees should be transferred to a military tribunal and so forth. That's one very important realm of debate and I expect that as time goes on this Commission will be a part of those discussions.

But for purposes of this proposal, I'm putting all of that to one side and asking a quite different question and that is wherever that line is drawn in law and policy, it seems to me critically important, number one, that Congress and the public be made aware of that line, if lines are being drawn in the dark in the interest of somewhere the bureaucracy, that Congress and the public be made aware of where the lines are being drawn, balances are being struck.

And number two, that there be effective oversight to ensure that the line is being towed, that the policies are being obeyed. So that's point number one. This is not really about the substance of how the balance is struck, but rather about an effective oversight mechanism to see to it that whatever those

policies are, they're not secret and that they're being complied with.

is an observation that the Number two regular arrangements, Offices for Civil Rights and Inspectors General aren't good enough because they're They don't typically -- at not comprehensive enough. least the Offices for Civil Rights or the Privacy Office that's spoken of in the House bill, don't have of subpoena sufficient powers in terms investigatory powers and the like. And I think that we need an oversight mechanism in this war-fighting context that will be able to deal with all the issues of secrecy and classification that are required. Α lot of this is going to have to be in secret and so we're talking about the need to create a mechanism that may not be fully transparent to the public, but yet in its existence gives us some better legitimacy for the war-fighting effort, so that seems to me to be And that's the second point I wanted to critical. make.

Third finally, small and just one disagreement that Ι do have with the Staff recommendation. As I thought about this and I thought about the President in the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and the like, it seemed

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

24

25

to me that having a Senate appointed --I mean a presidentially-appointed Senate confirmed director of an Office of Rights and Liberties was very important, but that an added safeguard in terms of again, this issue of public legitimacy would be to advisory board to the office, not under FACA as the Staff has recommended, but rather with appointments made by the President and by the Congress, similar to Civil Rights Commission the way that this A difference, of course, is that this constituted. would be a largely confidential exercise. Many, not most of the discussions would be classified, unlike ours, but it seems to me that FACA is not appropriate given the nature of the issues at stake. And again, the two principal safeguards it seems to me that are being created by a mechanism of this sort are the reporting to the Congress and the President in a classified way and to the public in an unclassified And secondly, creating this capacity for a very thorough monitoring of what's happening in the detention facilities, how the FBI, how Homeland Security, how all the agencies, government-wide, not just within the new Department are comporting with whatever the policies turn out to be.

Thanks, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, can we first get
a motion to approve a Commission position that there
should be a civil rights agency or entity within the
Department of Homeland Security, should it be created,
with the details to be worked out, in general, along
the lines as proposed by Edley, with the details to be
worked out by the Staff. But that, in general, we are
in favor of a civil rights entity in the Department of
Homeland Security and believe that that is essential
and that that is the position of this Commission.
Could we get a motion that that is the
case?
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can we have a
discussion?
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We'll have it after
the motion is introduced.
Could we get a motion?
. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: So moved.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?
COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Discussion. Yes?
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think this
is a very serious proposal. In my mind, it's one of
the most serious we've addressed since I've been on
the Commission and I have some very significant

concerns with it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To begin with, I think that the underlying premise of the proposal is that the current mechanisms for safeguarding American civil rights are inadequate. That is an assumption with which I wholeheartedly disagree.

The second assumption underlying the proposal is that the government needs to improve its legitimacy in fighting the War on Terrorism and at the same time preserving civil rights. That is another assumption with which I wholeheartedly disagree. believe the polling data indicates the public is quite confident with the government's ability to balance those interests which are sometimes competing, and I believe that our government has thus far done an excellent job in fighting the War onTerror all safeguarding the civil rights of American citizens.

frankly, I would that Quite ask Commissioner Edley point the particular me to deprivations of civil rights which concern him so much because I think we all know that in the aftermath of 9/11 there were some instances of egregious hate crimes against Arab Americans and Muslim Americans and luckily those instances were acted upon by our

government and prosecutions have been brought and I think our government has acted quite swiftly to handle some of those private acts of violence. And certainly, we all want to discourage things like that from occurring, but as far as our government's own actions, I think that our government has acted quite reasonably, quite honorably and I frankly don't see any pattern of egregious civil rights violations by our government. So I'd be curious as to what the Commissioners believe those are.

I would also say that Commissioner Edley says that this is not a substantive debate, that this is simply a question of where we will draw the lines, but how we will monitor how those lines are enforced. I disagree. I think that it will inevitably become substantive.

Our own Office of Civil Rights Evaluation just gave us a major presentation on other civil rights agencies in our government and one of their complaints with how those agencies operate was that those agencies don't do enough to set policy, don't do enough to involve special interest groups in the setting of policy and the filing of litigation. And that civil rights agencies across our government should be involved in setting policy.

I do not think that we can have a discussion about setting up an Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Homeland Security without it becoming substantive, because clearly this Agency believes that those offices should have a substantive role.

So I do not think that a separate Office of Civil Rights inside the Department of Homeland Security should be setting civil rights policy. I think our civil rights policy in many ways is already set and to the extent it needs changes, that can be done by existing civil rights agencies.

And finally, I would say I am concerned the Department of Homeland Security will be dealing with obviously information that is sensitive than that dealt with in other departments, that it will be dealing with classified information and I know that Commissioner Edley said we could recommend mechanisms for keeping information classified and on a need to know basis. I have concerns about whether that would actually -- whether we would actually be able to do that, I forward to seeing what those recommendations would be. But I do have concerns about that.

But my overall concerns have to do with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the underlying premise of this proposal and I certainly do not want to endorse or put my name on anything that will hamper the efforts of our government to keep us safe.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes, Madam There's precedent for this type of check Chair. I happen to serve on a Commission within an agency. immigration reform which resulted dealing with summarized IRCA, eventually in legislation as Immigration Reform Act. That Commission was set up during President Carter's Administration and finally reported to President Reagan.

And there was a concern there that even though there are laws against discrimination, that one effects of of the changes of the some and recommendations that we made would make for increased discrimination against a folk -- particularly of Mexican ancestry and other folk who form large blocks of this country's population which have recent, some have recent influxes of immigrants. recommendation was made that a special office included within those changes that would be particularly vigilant in protecting rights against ethnic discrimination which already would have been a

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

violation of federal law. And in fact, it's worked I've known some of the gentlemen who very well. headed up that office within the Justice Department. I recall on one occasion when all folk of Latin ancestry were fired from some casinos in Reno, folk not understanding that it was a violation of law and they were sort of tired of dealing with the paperwork of hiring people who to them "looked Mexican" a quick trip by the Director of that agency explaining to the owners of those casinos what the law said and that they had violated the law caused them to immediately rehire all of the individuals who had been improperly So in fact, it turned out to be quite fired. effective. It has been a quite effective portion of

It strikes me in a like manner issues of civil rights are bound to come up in this suggested new Department and it seems to me very appropriate as it was with the immigration reform to have an office within that department that brings those matters to the attention of the director of that department.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ms. Thernstrom?

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, I'm also in disagreement with this idea. The first duty of our government, of course, is to keep us safe and ensure

that reform law.

the survival of the nation and I don't have the deep suspicion that is built into this proposal that our government is going to ignore civil liberties and civil rights and that Congress, the monitoring of Congress, the monitoring -- the fact that the courts are open to plaintiffs, the fact that there are a zillion advocacy groups and public interest law firms and so forth which will also be watching this, that that whole package is insufficient.

I'm also impressed with the fact that whoever is the director of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge or whoever it might be and other officials in the agencies, they are all constitutional officers. They have a duty to uphold the Constitution. It is not a separate function protecting civil liberties and civil rights is not a separate function. That is their job as well.

There are no other civil rights offices within agencies with the one exception of the Justice Department which the Civil Rights Division of Justice which enforces explicit statutory mandates. There are no other offices which function as a check on the Secretary and other officials. No other offices which have substantive policy responsibility, whether you look at HUD or Labor or what have you to the best of

my knowledge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would repeat what Commissioner And Ί What rights have just said. Braceras has violated? Show me the constitutional rights that have been violated at Camp X-ray or elsewhere and show me evidence of a lack of concern in this country. This is a country that is highly sensitive to these issues. There will be an on-going debate and that is our best protection.

. Indeed, if there isn't an on-going debate and if the courts are useless, and if Congress is useless, then such an office will be useless.

If the climate in this country so changes that there is really no public will for such protection, then such an office would be useless and the notion, the references -- well, reference to the Alien and Sedition Act is just not relevant, but to the Japanese Internment Act, this is a different country than it was at that time and I, you know, I don't think that these historical analogies are of much use at all, of any use.

So I am deeply opposed to this.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we have a call for the question?

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Call the question.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of
2	the proposal indicate by saying I.
3	(Ayes.)
4	Opposed.
5	(No.)
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I would like a
7	roll vote.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Braceras?
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley?
11	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Kirsanow?
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Meeks?
15	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair Reynoso?
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
19	Thernstrom?
20	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: No.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Berry, yes. Motion
22	passes, 4 to 3.
23	We will take, without objection, a
24	10-minute break and then we will start the
25	presentation.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: May I make a 1 motion, please, before that break? 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'd like to make a 4 motion that dissenting Commissioners on this vote be 5 6 able to remove their names from any such proposal and not have it presented to the public with our names on 7 I feel too strongly about it to have my name 8 associated with such a proposal right now. 9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What would you like 10 your name removed from? 11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If there's no --12 maybe it's premature. I suppose I could make the 13 14 motion again when we have a particular document. 15 that what you're telling me? 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm just asking you 17 what do you mean? Where do you want to your name 18 removed from? 19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: My understanding 20 is that this a proposal that will be sent to Congress for consideration --21 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: By the Commission. 23 wont say anyone's name. It will say "for the 24 Commission", C-O-M-M-I-S-S-I-O-N. 25 and I'd COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right,

1	like a notation that Commissioners Thernstrom,
2	Braceras and Kirsanow dissent from the report.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's not our policy.
4	You may send up any letter you wish.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I certainly will.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The other thing is
7	that we need a deadline before we go on when dissents
8	will be sent in on the statutory report. If there are
9	any persons who would like to dissent.
10	Terri, do you know what your time line is
11	on getting this thing printed? Are you still there?
12	Do you know what the time line is, Staff
13	Director?
14	Does anybody know?
15	MR. JIN: The time line for hitting the
16	street, of course, is the end of the fiscal year, but
17	in terms of the specific dates.
18	Terri, are you still there?
19	MS. DICKERSON: Yes, I'm here.
20	MR. JIN: Terri, did you hear the
21	question?
22	MS. DICKERSON: I'm sorry, I didn't hear
23	it.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: For a dissent on the
25	statutory report, what time line do you need, a
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	deadline of which for dissent? Do you care? If
2	people would like to write a dissent. Can you hear
3	me?
4	MR. JIN: Terri, Terri? Just tell us
5	later.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm going to say 30
7	days. Thirty days from today for anyone who would
8	like to write a dissenting.
9	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: A dissent on
10	this specific
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The statutory report,
12	I'm talking about.
13	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: The 10-year
14	report.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, to be planted in
16	the report, if you have a dissent in 30 days.
17	. All right, we're going to have a 10-minute
18	break and then we'll start right back.
19	(Off the record.)
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me first say to
21	the Commissioners, that the Staff tells me that in
22	order for them to meet the statutory deadline for
23	their statutory report, you can't have 30 days to do a
24	dissent. If you have a dissent, you have to turn it
25	in within 10 days, otherwise, they will be late

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

getting the report up to the Congress, given how long it takes to get all the work done. So we would appreciate that.

VIII. Presentations from Midwest Regional

SAC members

The other thing is now we turn to the Panel Presentations that we are having today. the reasons why we come here to meet and have been going around the country is so that we can information from and have exchanges with our State Advisory Committee members and somewhere I have a piece of paper that gives me the -- oh, here it is. That has details to show I've got it. I found it. and we want to say to the SAC members right at the outset how much we appreciate them and how much we appreciate the work they do and how we wish we had more in the way of resources to devote to their work and also that we hope that they are able to implement some of the suggestions that have been made, under FACA, for example, meeting over the phone and other kinds of things that will make it more possible for you to stay in touch and to move forward on what you wish to do.

I don't have the piece of paper, so somebody has to give it to me.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first panel has three members and Ivy Davis is Director of Regional Programs Coordination Unit at the Commission and she has worked hard with the SACs in putting this together. And on the first Panel we have from Wisconsin, Emraida Kiram. Am I mispronouncing your name? Help me, please. Emraida And Ms. Kiram is from Milwaukee and she is the Kiram. Chairperson of the Wisconsin SAC and is currently an the University Educational Administrator at Wisconsin, Milwaukee, whose campus I have visited on a number of occasions. She was first appointed to the State Advisory Committee in 1992 and she has been active with several organizations, Filipino American Women's Network; the Wisconsin Minority Women's Women of Color; the Wisconsin Women's Conference, Political Caucus; the Archdiocese of Milwaukee and she is editor of the Filipino American Medical Association Newsletter; and is very active and a very important member of our State Advisory Committee contingent and chairperson of that Committee. And we thank her for coming.

We also have Lester Collins who is a member of the Minnesota SAC and I don't have a description here of all of his -- oh, here it is. Mr. Collins is from St. Paul. He's Executive Director of

with

first

was

Minnesota State Council on Black Minnesotans and the 1 Council was created to research a broad spectrum of 2 issues affecting African Americans in the State and 3 and Legislature Governor 4 report to the He for initiatives. 5 recommendations appointed to the SAC in 1999. He was active in the 6 NAA, the Urban League, African American Leadership 7 Committee and the People of Color Health Force. 8 And from Indiana, Mr. Frank Becerra of 9 Indiana. Where is Griffith, Indiana? Griffith, 10 Anyway, what's that near? 11 MR. BECERRA: Chicago. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So he's from Chicago. 13 He is Corporate Officer and Vice President of 14 No. Security Federal Bank of Lake County, Indiana. 15 first appointed to the SAC in 1997. He's been active 16 17 in a number of civic and community organizations 18 including the Advisory Committee for the Diocese of Gary; Catholic Youth Organization; Carna Lake Home for 19 20 Girls; Lake County United Way; and Habitat 21 Humanity. Ivy, how do you want this to proceed? 22 23 MS. DAVIS: We can proceed in order with Mr. Becerra and then Mr. Collins and then Ms. Kiram, 24 25 if you like. I'm here to report on the Illinois SAC.

Both the Illinois SAC and the Ohio SAC were unable to attend because of scheduling problems, but the Ohio's SAC review of post 9/11 issues is on our website and I do have a summary that the Regional Office has provided for me for the Illinois SAC.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, so we'll go with Mr. Becerra first. Thank you very much for coming.

MR. BECERRA: Thank you. For the sake of time, I'm going to read my report rather than ad lib. I tend to rattle on.

(Laughter.)

Members of this Committee, it is an honor to have an opportunity to share some information and some personal thoughts with you this morning. The Indiana Advisory Committee has recognized the importance and the urgency in reviewing the post 9/11 syndrome involving Arab Americans and Muslims.

On May 30, 2002, our Committee met Indianapolis to discuss this issue. In order further educate us of the potential explosive situation we find ourselves in post 9/11, we invited the following speakers for a fact-finding meeting: Professor Kevin Jock, Indiana at University, Department of Religious Studies; Judge David Shahid, Mark Marion County Superior Court; Michael Shihir from

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bridging the Gap; Sahid Ali, private citizen; and Dr. Shahid Attar, M.D. and author. Professor Kevin Jock summarized the history of Islam to our members. He then went on to talk about Islam in our country. learned that there are between 6 to 8 million Muslims in the U.S., half of whom are African Americans; 20 percent of Arab Americans and 10 percent are South Many Muslim immigrants came from societies where they had limited government freedom, therefore, our governments or law they tend not to trust Because of this, it is estimated that enforcers. there five times more incidents of discrimination against Arab Americans than are actually reported. Judge David Shahid shared his great concerns over many incidents reported in Indiana involving Arab American and Muslims since September 11th. However, he was greatly encouraged to see how some of our government Within a few weeks officials reacted after 9/11. after the attack on our country, Indiana Senator Richard Lugar held a press conference in downtown Indianapolis to urge calm and reason in this time of He invited Muslims from central Indiana to crisis. participate in the press conference and stated in his conduct of extremists did remarks that the

the Nur-Ala Islam Center; Rafael Sahid, founder of

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 represent or reflect true Islam.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mark Peterson, Mayor of Indianapolis in public remarks urged citizens of Indianapolis to avoid jumping to conclusions and targeting Muslims and others merely because of a perceived association based upon the religion or place of birth.

also impressed with Judge Shahid was President George Bush when he visited the Islam Center in Washington, D.C. to acknowledge the virtues of the religion of Islam and support for the Muslims who are good citizens in America. He noted that they stand with America against terrorism. President Bush also condemned the targeting of innocent Muslims and persons of Middle Eastern ancestry.

Judge Shahid ended his presentation with and I quote, "as a balance to this faceless enemy who threatens the security of all Americans, the leaders should continue to educate the public that the vast majority of Muslims and Arab Americans are your good neighbors, coworkers and your friends."

Michael Shihir from the Nur Ala Islam
Center of Indianapolis voiced his concerns to our
Advisory Committee. He shared reports of job
discrimination which included Arab Americans being
verbally abused at the work place and the cases of

24

25

discriminatory firings of Arab Americans. However, he also felt an appreciation towards those many non-Muslim Americans who would quickly approach the Muslim men and women adorned in their Islamic attire and warmly greet them with words of love and encouragement.

Raphia Said, the only women speaker that particular day at our meeting reminded us that a large portion of the problem regarding the discrimination of Arab Americans and Muslims is the lack of knowledge regarding the people and their religion. She went to her movement called Bridging explain the Gap. Basically, she holds cultural seminars in various о£ Indiana inviting Islamic, Jewish and parts Christian speakers to summarize the backgrounds.

Finally, Dr. Saheed Sitar passed out complimentary booklets which he wrote and published called "The 25 Most Frequently Asked Questions About Islam after September 11, 2001." If anyone has not seen this, they should get their hands on a few thousand of them.

He also supplied us with a copy of Indianapolis Medical Society Bulletin in which he wrote the article, "A Muslim's Physician's Jihad

Against Terrorism."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dr. Saheed has written and spoken against terrorism for the last 20 years. He considers terrorism a modern plague that we must fight together, so that we can live in peace and sleep without fear.

As the President of the Islamic Medical Association, he immediately issued within a few hours of receiving the news of 9/11, a statement condemning attacks on American soil, on terrorist civilians in the World Trade Center and the military personnel in the Pentagon. He then immediately urged some Muslim physicians in New York and Washington, D.C. to go and provide emergency medical relief for injured and psychological support for their well relatives, as participate in the blood as donation drives.

At the same time, Dr. Saheed urged Americans, in general, and the media in particular, against unnecessary discrimination, stereotyping and prejudice against Islam and Muslim Arabs and all other ethnic backgrounds.

Because our meeting in Indianapolis was held very recently, our Committee has not yet officially come forward with its unified recommendation regarding the civil rights needs of the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Islamic communities. However, I'm sure it will be 1 forthcoming very, very soon. 2 Thank you all again for the opportunity of 3 Αt having the great State of Indiana represented. 4 this meeting this morning. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, we'll have some 6 exchange in a few minutes. First, let's go to Mr. 7 8 Collins, please. MR. COLLINS: Good morning, at this point, 9 to everyone. Number one, it's a privilege to be here 10 and the discussion that I have essentially witnessed 11 12 thus far has certainly been an interesting and invigorating in terms of the issues being addressed. 13 14 They are issues that are very much common to the challenges, even in the State of Minnesota. 15 Mainly today, number one, I'm coming in 16 17 place of Alan Wineblood, our Chair, and on short 18 notice, I guess, I feel most comfortable, I think, 19 speaking to one of the issues is our proposed project 20 dealing with the media and essentially an update from 21 the 1993 report that was done on minorities and the 22 media and I'm going to try to speak to that as best I 23 can. 24 I actually was looking, and I'm glad, in 25 some respects, took quite a bit of notes at that

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

particular meeting, but the thing I didn't do is write down, and I have a tendency to rattle on --

(Laughter.)

But I'm going to try to be as concise as I possible can and give you a flavor of at least some of the things that we did talk about.

Number one, and very similar to some of the things that you have heard so far, there was a 1993 Minnesota Advisory Committee Report on Minnesota media and minority stereotyping. Ιt dealt with Minnesota newsrooms and kind of spoke to a number of And despite the trend, and even at that time of less stereotyping, other trends also appear to continue in Minnesota media. Number one, very few people of color are in decision making positions in any sector of the Minnesota media. And although progress is being seen in the number of minorities working in the newsroom, little progress has been seen in minorities working in management. The lack of editors is the main reason for the lack of people of color and people in positions of authority have been cited by the American Society of Newspaper Editors as a main reason for the huge number of minorities who are leaving the journalism field.

Another area of concern is coverage of

23

24

25

minority communities and with the Federal Communications Commission deregulation of radio and television stations, most media companies have shifted their focus from public service to what would appear to be profit margins. Many media members and critics argue that this shift has meant the reduction of resources allocated to reporting the issues that are important to minority communities.

The Minnesota Advisory Committee proposes to investigate a number of the issues on dealing with this matter.

I should mention to you as I look at the data, certainly, as related to 1993, and then looked at essentially the two-day fact-finding hearing that I in, I'm concerned that many part recommendations from 1993 while there has been some progress it almost appears to me and I felt somewhat uncomfortable about the whole idea of speaking to essentially those SACs or at least my impression without essentially, our whole Commission having come together and at least concluded some things, but you know, I did volunteer essentially to come and to speak and I'll do the best that I can in that particular regard.

Number one, the news media has an

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

influence of attitudes of views and readers regarding race relations in this country. There's a significant merit in allegations that the media presentation of news is biased when it comes to reporting people in communities of color. The unfair portrayal of minorities in the electronic and print media has produced negative self images of people of color and it has destroyed or bestowed upon white people an undeserved destructive image of superiority.

Business interest drives today's news · coverage and reporting and despite some improvement, minorities are still generally portrayed as a negative segment of Minnesota society. The print media has diverse staffs, but little diversity in management editors the of the three maior positions and in the state admit that negative newspapers stereotyping of minorities continues, however, the editors said the papers are responsive to community concerns.

Television news has people of color on staff, but the minority staffing levels are less than the minority population of the general population and negative stereotyping of minorities does occur, but efforts have been made by several stations to present positive stories about local minority communities.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Recommendations for action from the 1993

report spoke to (1) that press does not -- does and should enjoy a high level of unrestricted freedom to publish and to broadcast. Stereotypes and biases are the result of ignorance. The Congress and the State Legislators should ensure the importance of mandatory curriculum revision in all public elementary and high schools. It was felt that this would provide a complete and an accurate account of the historical developments of America including many contributions of all races.

from Another recommendation that 1993 report was that all Advisory Committees of the United States Commission on Civil Rights should consider examining this very issue of media and stereotyping. The government should encourage the establishment and strengthening of minority-owned news media outlets and that all levels of government should be extra vigilant in enforcing equal employment opportunity laws, that organizations and be alert barriers to employment. The media affirmed its commitment expanding the diversity of their staffs and expanding channels of communications with minority communities. Minorities outside the media should be participants in news reporting process and majority media should aid the development of minority community media by working cooperatively.

number those looked As Ι at one, of those findings, the recommendations and some conclusion, number one, is that there really has not been much success given that 1993 report. Major occurred in regard to education reform has not including diversity studies in public and elementary And for many people interviewed, the high schools. two primary newspapers, the Star Tribune in Minneapolis and the Pioneer Press, it was felt that they were doing a better job of hiring people of color to report the news. Also, and I'm just trying to skip so I can cover some of the highlights, the rise in people of color hired by media in Minneapolis and St. Paul can be partly attributed to the efforts made at recruiting minorities. The members of the media industry reported in the 1993 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights had difficulty hiring Report that they minorities because most people of color who excelled in college chose to pursue careers in more lucrative industries law or medicine.

I'm going to essentially move from that aspect and look at some of the proposed things that were at least talked about. In fact, I'm going to go

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for the sake of time -- I think essentially to some of 1 the recommendations that kind of came out of the 2 3 report. Number one, we need to make newsrooms more 4 There needs to be reflective of the population. 5 increased diversity among the areas journalists who 6 would go a long way towards more balanced coverage. 7 There needs to be -- we need to increase 8 the number of people of color and positions 9 authority at media organizations. News organizations 10 must make a serious effort to avoid stereotyping. 11 consideration to needs There to be 12 advertising campaigns showing people of color in the 13 news business. 14 We need to do more homework. 15 Reporters 16 must get to know communities beyond the surface and then show up in good times and in bad times to cover 17 those communities. 18 19 Reporters should not cover some people as representatives of the whole culture or the group. 20 21 Also, there was a great deal of concern as related to 22 African American and Native American depictions in 23 particular in Minnesota news coverage 24 negative.

More time needs to be spend in the culture

of communities, assigning reporters of color to cover communities of color. We need to interview some cultural elders similar to way European American groups are covered.

Journalists need to be dedicated themselves to making connections variety of in a communities other than their own. And then there be mainstream publications that should to consider providing some coverage in native languages. important to take advantage of involving Ιt is technology, using resources to televise small groups, interbase information. And also an electronic listing of sources shared by all would be helpful. And then news organizations would do well to cover quality of life stories in communities of color such as stories affecting neighborhoods, schools, services, care, etcetera and on and on.

I'm going to stop on that note and I will tell you that again, having dealt in the business of this business for some 20 to 30 years, again, I'm concerned that the 1993 report and then looking at the many individuals that were present at the hearing, the two-day hearing that we had and one of the notes that I received was to try to make mention of the fact that there was representation from the city. And by the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	i
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

way, we have two new Mayors in both of our cities in Minneapolis and St. Paul, two major metropolitan areas. And representatives from both of those offices Members of the Anti-discrimination were present. Individuals were present. Committee University of Minnesota, the School of Journalism, our Human Rights Commissioner, almost all of our so-called minority media outlets or newspapers were present and a number of others. Again, I'm concerned because I happen to be a newspaper clipper, as a matter of unfortunately, I haven't record, and seen improvement in coverage. Now again, we do have a few more faces, you know, in our news. I will tell you that most of them and this is not necessarily a complaint, are individuals of -- they're African Americans, but they're still very little Latino or other types of coverage in terms of individuals in the State. By the way, the State of Minnesota has one of the larger Asian populations and the Somalian alone population in Minnesota is about 40,000 So I think people have a tendency to individuals. kind of think and there are -- well, let me complete that, that Minnesota is basically a European -- but there is a sizeable population of Native American individuals, certainly of the native African

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

population is increasing. The Asian population and I'm, originally from Philadelphia and I've got to tell you I came to Minnesota thinking that there weren't or would not be as many challenges as those, as I witnessed in Philadelphia, but I can tell you that they are ever, if not even greater in terms of a challenge. I'm not really pleased with the findings that we have concluded or come to since that 1993 report.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ms. Kiram, please?

It's a privilege to be able to MS. KIRAM: address the Commission at this time. On a personal level, my greatest incentive in coming is that I can put the faces and the names of the people I red about since Ι seem to be the oldest member Commission, at least on a state level. But more than that I am very pleased to share with you some of the work that we've done in Wisconsin.

The Wisconsin Advisory Committee at the planning meeting on April 11 extended an invitation to several members of the Muslim Islamic community in Milwaukee. Speakers included a Muslim student from India, a female community leader and organizer, a professional couple and a lawyer. In summary, the

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

concerns expressed mirror many of those coming from other Muslim communities in the United States. The Muslim community has been aware and have experienced several forms of discrimination and racism in the city and in the state and have been trying to cope in small measure to get these issues resolved. Most have been advocating changes in state statutes involving ID cards, driver's licenses and passport These areas mandate uncovered heads and photos. visibility of at least one ear which Islamic law requires covered. Up to the time of the hearings, no religious accommodations have been made, although a lot of promises like we'll get back to you has been said.

The head covers worn with pride by Islamic women and by Indian sheiks became identifying symbols of hate and derision. Some received threats of physical and bodily harm, while some became victims. Housing discrimination has also been blatant but nothing like the events of September 11 divided the community among racial and ethnic lines.

Phone calls to Islamic centers were hate-filled. Islamic businesses opted to close. The Arab Fest and Annual Festival in late September chose to cancel. Arab, Middle Eastern, Asian and African

abused

students were individuals. families and verbally and otherwise. People bearing Islamic names or surnames were targeted with venomous calls. In the confusion September 11, name calling arising from fear, misunderstanding or lack of it, became common. Milwaukee is not a very large city, but it is considered among the five top segregated cities in the country and in this cauldron blame can easily escalate to violence.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

city proud of its ethnic This is a heritage, of its ethnic festival of its ethnicity and diversity, yet, failing miserably when put to the test of September 11th.

Out of these are silver linings. The religious communities rallied in defense of the local Invitations to speak and elaborate on Muslim Muslims. beliefs and practices expanded in schools, community and civic associations. Forums with government agencies were organized, lines of direct communication were established. What was most shocking to the local Muslim community was not the knocking of the doors by agents, the very people they felt federal guardians of their rights and privileges as American citizens. One woman testified that in 21 years, she

did not even receive a speeding ticket, yet she was made to feel that her race was a disgrace.

They felt that this was not only harassment, but it was a witch hunt, bringing back anecdotes of the way the African Americans have been treated in the past. Now it is their turn.

Appearances at the residences without prior appointments made them feel like common criminals. While the Muslim community is rather young and not very large, they are proud to be citizens and felt that they have achieved integration until events proved otherwise.

Despite all this, the Muslim community was afraid to speak up because they worried that to do so would strip them of their citizenship. Students were in fear of deportation in the midst of a school term. Individuals were asked to say something against other individuals. Even trips to the store, to schools or one's presence in the streets were carefully planned so as not to insight or attract attention. The insecurity that September 11 created among the Muslim population was traumatic.

In times of national crisis like this, it becomes incumbent upon those who are leaders to come before the public and restore calm. Assurances that

people of color are not representative of the groups that made up September 11 in the shock and confusion would have helped. A lot of blame was being passed It was felt that the media also failed them. around. And in fact, added to the incendiary feelings that were already coming to the surface. The stories that the panel shared were personal and will add to the oral histories of a community that was trying to be They are collectively. And that the understood. people that came before us feel that there are people in this country that do care and that their feelings are being recognized. All in all, the collective feeling of the people that came before our Commission was to say that they were grateful that there were people willing to listen. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ivy, you want to tell us about the two --MS. DAVIS: Mine is going to be real brief

because I wasn't there. But I would like to emphasize that some of the same common themes were highlighted in the two-day forum that was conducted by the Illinois SAC and it focused on the Arab and Muslim communities in the Chicago metropolitan area. There

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

approximately 400,000 Arabs that live in that They heard from witnesses in terms of area. professional well as communities as affected associations, government agencies, including the U.S. Attorney and the Special Agent in Charge of the FBI from the Northern District of Illinois and of course, from individuals who had stories to tell.

One of the things that I'd like to stress is that they pointed out the problems predated post-September 11, that, in fact, there are some problems with respect to discrimination against those communities and highlighted a couple of examples of that. But I think probably the most distressing issue that was of concern to them was the freezing of assets of charitable organizations in the area. examples were cited, two by a gentleman, Mr. Simkins, who is the President of the Muslim Bar Association, cited two examples, one organization called Benevolence International and the point that he wanted to emphasis here is that the Director of that organization, Mr. Enam Arnoudt was charged with perjury and and is being held in solitary was confinement without bail and he thought that this was an extreme and unprecedented treatment of a person charged with perjury. The second example he gave was

of the organization called Global Relief Foundation and he indicated here that he thought the federal actions were particularly racist. According to Mr. Simkins, the government, as indication or proof of the action that was taken cited newspaper articles written by journalists who claimed that the foundation was connected with terrorist organizations and Mr. Simkins pointed out that even members who had been indicted of terrorist plots such as a gentleman by the name of Matt Hail with the Jewish Defense League, have not failed such measures.

And then the third example that was cited was by an attorney who was representing employees of the Holy Land Foundation. Their assets have been frozen and he was talking about the impact that this has had on those employees. They've lost their jobs, true. But in addition, their last pay checks and year end bonuses were removed from their accounts after the charity's assets were frozen. In addition, they've lost their health insurance and the opportunity to apply for COBRA benefits, so that in summary, I think, the main highlights from that particular review.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. I had just one question and I couldn't understand Ms. Kiram, do you think that the situation in Milwaukee, at least,

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

8

10

12

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

now these incidents have receded, and are no longer occurring and that's one question? And the other part of that is whether Milwaukee has been a place where Arab or Muslims have been accused of terrorism or are there any examples of people who actually were detained, arrested or found to be terrorists in that community in Milwaukee? I just wonder what the situation is and how were you impacted by the issue of whether people were terrorists or not?

found They haven't in MS. KIRAM: It's not a very large community and most of the Muslim residents there are professionals. think that the shock was more because they felt that they have arrived in this country as professionals, that they should be subjected to the kind of treatment that others of less education or bearing in the community would have. In fact, I'm Filipino and my country is listed as one of the terrorist cells, so more than I think the general Arab Muslim community, I have felt personally that I have been a lot more attacked because of my country of origin than most of Arab Muslim communities members οf the Milwaukee. The September 11 effects are less now and I think the fear that, in general, everybody felt at the time is lessened and there's a little bit more

20

21

22

23

24

25

understanding, a lot of invitations have been extended Most of the people in the Muslim community to them. feel that it's just that it's more difficult for them to integrate into the community because of their Many immigrants to this country usually join a church and even if they are from another country, the fact that they are a member of a specific congregation helps them to integrate with the larger In the case of the Arabs or the Muslims, community. they have to form their own churches and they're only together with themselves. They are normally not mixed in with the larger Christian community, therefore it is a lot more difficult for them to be understood and And it does make sense when you think of it in a religious standpoint although nobody wants to emphasis for what make that as an happened September 11.

I think that the atmosphere has improved a lot and there were other hearings that I attended, not necessarily something that we initiated, but there were meetings with the Arab leaders that eventually also appeared before our group that was initiated by the immigration, by the INS, the Department of Justice and other federal agencies within Milwaukee to calm the fears of the leaders of the groups and one was

1	held at our campus and I felt that it was a great
2	contribution because the federal agencies were the
3	ones that reached out to the community instead of
4	waiting for the community to demand that their
5	feelings be heard.
6	MS. DAVIS: That was clearly one of the
7	points that came out of the Illinois meeting that
8	folks were appreciative of the fact that the federal
9	agencies did have representatives that were meeting
10	with them and engaging with them and being responsive.
11	Their concern, however, was that there were policies
12	that they were required to carry out and it's the
13	policies that they take issue with and gave as
14	examples these charitable organizations assets that
15	were frozen.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: At this meeting, did
17	you talk about any of the policies?
18	MS. KIRAM: Very briefly.
.19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Mr. Becerra,
20	the same question that I asked Ms. Kiram. How is the
21	situation in Indiana now compared to immediately
22	post-September 11?
23	MR. BECERRA: I would agree with her also.
24	In the State of Indiana there has been a feeling of
25	calm, more so now than, of course, a few months ago.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Perception, I think, is very important. There's been quite a few articles in the newspapers. The media has been very cooperative in defining what is Islam all about and I'll be honest with you. I was in the Catholic seminary for six years studying to be a Catholic priest and I knew very little of the Nation of Islam, the religion. That's why I recommended that book, "The 25 Most Often Asked Questions About the National of Islam."

But I think the perception is very -- I'm looking at you people sitting in front of me and if somebody were to say to me there's one Muslim sitting behind that table, I have no clue who it would be. have a gentleman, I can't remember his name, that was found in Afghanistan who was lily white. We have a gentleman that's jailed right now as we speak, only person jailed related to the 9/11 incident who looks like white to me. I don't know about you people, but he looks white to me. So there is no such thing as a Mohammed, meaning an Indian or Arabic or whatever, Jordanian, it could be any one of us. think the State of Indiana has been very good about defining and explaining and educating the people as to who and what this religion and people are all about.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And then I'll just say

In your

see people

and

their

to you, Mr. Collins. I too, found it distressing, as you did, to see what you described as so little I did have one question for you. progress. presentation, you said that reporters shouldn't take people who they interview as being representative of a particular group just because they're from that group. Do you remember that? And I was just wondering how reporters are about deciding whose views supposed to qo often watch TV and I represented. Ι debating say issues having to do with women, what are called women's issues. And there will be somebody who is from some national organization that has thousands 14 of members who is speaking and on the other hand 15 somebody from some organization that has five members husband, 16 including their children grandmother and they're equally debating these issues, 18 And I often think that in the media, the positions. 19 point is to juxtapose people who will be in conflict 20 for controversy, not to worry about whether anybody is 21 representing anything. 22 So I just wondered what you mean by that. 23 is the media supposed to figure out who How 24 representing what?

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

MR. COLLINS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

25

Yes, and I should say not

1 necessarily was that really my personal view. That happened -- I was reading straight from a particular 2 observation that had been made. I think one of the 3 major concerns, at least in that particular regard is 4 that there needed to be greater effort and it really 5 6 had to kind of do with what was called the Rolodex In other words, the media in any town has a 7 syndrome. 8 tendency and I happen to be one of those individuals 9 that they call or talk to fairly often and it's almost as though there's no one else essentially in the 10 community or that can speak and I think it's more --11 do a little bit more homework. 12 There are many more 13 black Baptist ministers than Reverend Johnson and it 14 just wouldn't hurt to talk to the younger Reverend 15 So it takes a little bit more effort and I 16 think more along those lines. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we -- are there 18 really urgent questions or can we in the interest of 19 time go to the next panel? If you do have an urgent 20 question, you can ask it. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I have a very 22 important question for Mr. Becerra. What does the X stand for? 23 24 MR. BECERRA: Xavier.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO:

25

Very close to

Javier Becerra? Javier. 1 I have a brother named BECERRA: MR. 2 3 Javier Becerra. CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Oh. you're VICE 4 related to Javier Becerra, but not the Congressman. 5 MR. BECERRA: Not him. No, not him. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, we will see you 7 later on lunch. Thank you very much. 8 We will reverse the order of 9 MS. DAVIS: The third panel will appear now 10 the presentations. because Mr. Amad may have to leave. He's got a big 11 event going on next week. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We would be happy to. 13 MS. DAVIS: Great. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We have before us now 15 and we want to thank you for coming, Mr. Haaris Amad, 16 17 who is Executive Director of the Council on American-Islamic Relations, the primary civil rights 18 19 organization that is devoted to civil rights advocacy. 20 He is University of Michigan graduate, hail to the victors, and is at the University of Illinois Law 21 22 School. And we have Mr. Ismael Ahmed who is Executive 23 Director of the Arab Community Center for Economic and 24 Social Services, called ACCESS. He was one of the co-25 founders of the organization which began

storefront operation for newly arriving immigrants. 7 We have Ms. Kary Moss, who is Executive 2 3 Director of the ACLU of Michigan. And we have Mr. Imad Hammad who has been 4 the Midwest Regional Director of the American-Arab 5 6 Antidiscrimination Committee in Dearborn since 1997. Welcome to all of you and we will -- who 7 is the first, who has to leave or can he stay for the 8 9 whole thing? Mr. Ismael Ahmad, please. 10 Good afternoon. MR. AHMED: It's strange 11 that the reason I have to leave is because today 12 13 Detroit is celebrating its largest diversity event and ACCESS is a part of that, along with New Detroit, and 14 so we have to go over to the site. 15 16 knew Sue Hamilton-Smith behind me 17 chomping at the bit to get to work as well. It's also strange that at this same time that we're having this 18 19 kind of a hearing which on the one hand we have the 20 goal on one side where people come together from all 21 countries, all nations and all communities to work together and celebrate each other's cultures and here 22 23 today we look at some of the reality as well. 24 I represent the Arab Community Center for

Economic and Social Services which is the oldest and

largest human service agency serving Arab Americans in the country. We have about 160,000 contacts a year and hover between 3,000 and 5,000 members. Let me also say that recently have begun a project to, along with the Department of National Service, to place Arab-Americans in 14 cities. And so I've been doing a great deal of traveling in the last several months talking to Arab-American organizations who do similar work. And the story really given one incident or another is pretty much the same.

So I think what we'll have to say to you today will be reflective, not only of the region, but of the country.

Let me begin by saying that to start at September 11th would be a mistake. Arab Americans from the very early days have had their difficulties here, including history beginning with their arrival in which many of the Asian exclusion laws were in force.

Initially, Arabs arriving in the United States were listed either as Turkish or Asian and were often excluded from both citizenship and the right to own property, depending on how the state applied it. My own great grandmother arrived at a point at the turn of the century in which her husband had arrived

here listed as Turkish and had worked his way as a peddlar to South Dakota from New York. She came to join him and was excluded. She was listed as Asian and spent five years in Mexico awaiting the ability to come here, changes in the law then made that possible.

So there has been a history of both misnumbering and stereotyping and Orientalism that has dogged the Arab American community since it arrived here, often, having to do with visibility, skin color, and religious belief.

I want to concentrate on the period now prior to September 11th, beginning in the 1970s. There has been several efforts to paint the Arab community un-American, going back that far, including a called Project Bolder, under the Administration in which every Arab American of note in the Michigan area, certainly, and in other parts of the country found themselves either wiretapped or This lasted a period of several years until visited. was publicly exposed. There have been other efforts at surveilling Arab Americans going back since 1967.

So again, the efforts of the government to surveil Arab Americans has a history prior to September 11th. There also have been plans by the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4 5

U.S. government that were also publicly exposed that were shelved, at least the government says that, of holding places in Jacksonville, Florida and funny enough, they had an Arab American mayor there that as a holding place much like the holding places of the Japanese. That took place in the 1980s.

After the bombing, the first bombing of the World Trade Center or the attempt to do that, prior to September 11th, and also what happened at Oklahoma which had nothing to do with Arab Americans, there was an effect on laws which affected new immigrants generally, having to do with due process and other related rights including human service rights.

By the time September 11th rolled around, new immigrants were no longer eligible for Medicaid, general assistance. There was secret evidence was coming into force which meant that people could now, the term secret evidence is not a new term, but at that time it was one pretty much only known by our community and civil libertarians and what that meant was that people could be held without evidence and deported or held indefinitely without evidence.

We were just about the time of September 11th in a position to basically beat back the secret

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

evidence laws and their implementation. We had had several discussions with Janet Reno and the Clinton Administration on this question and promises that they would be repealed or at least that every single case would be reviewed with a panel of reviewers.

On September 11th, I believe the Arab American community generally was shocked, hoping that there were no linkages to Arabs, Muslims or the Middle East and following September 11 as evidence came of Al Ouaeda's relationship to this, Arab Americans became very worried. In my own agency, a percentage of the people left their jobs, took their kids home for fear of retaliation. And retaliation there was in Detroit as there was across the country. There was -- and others will talk to this, so I won't spend much time A Yemeni man was shot dead here in the city. There were dozens of physical incidents and hundreds of minor incidents. Hundreds or thousands of e-mails, phone calls and threats to Arab institutions. The mosques and several other Arab institutions literally shut down regularly in that early period because of bomb threats. At this same time to be balanced about what was going on, several organizations individuals in this city and and corporations came forward to say what needed to be

said in the city.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I especially would like to thank the ACLU for their role and New Detroit for their role. the Michigan Department of Civil Rights who were all the Arab American well as many οf active, as organizations, the Arab Antidiscrimination Committee and the Arab Chamber of Commerce, in particular, who became active in defense of civil rights, exposing attacks on Arab Americans and doing what they could to help that.

That period was an awful period for Arab My view is that while there has been some Americans. remittance and I use the term "some" on the street level that's been replaced by something much more scary and that is the role of government around its relationship with the Arab Americans and Southeast Asian community. We've seen the closing charities the arrests of leaders of charities, here and including the United Holy Land Fund which is considered the premiere Arab charity to give outside of the country. This has had a chilling effect, both on international Arab charities and national Arab charities. People are fearful, even giving to domestic groups. We get asked all the time about where our dollars go and not the normal questions, but

are they going to the Middle East, etcetera. Now ACCESS is a domestic organization and we've seen a fall off of the kind of dollars that we receive and many questions that are raised about this.

the street, we've seen a great deal about change in terms of government. We've seen two sets of visits of Arab students. And while the approach may have been a bit less direct than in some cities where they show up and knock on your door, we resent frankly, that people who are not charged with a crime and not suspected of a crime are visited because of their nationality, their religion or their background. This has happened now twice in groups of about 3,000.

In addition to that, and the charitable organization activity, we also frankly wish to condemn in the strongest terms the use of secret evidence. We have people disappearing. We don't even know who disappears any more. We still do not have the names and addresses and the charges against these people. We were told in a meeting with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security that they didn't know what we were talking about when we asked for the names and the charges. And when we said then why are 20 civil rights organizations suing the

government to know those names and the charges, they 1 said they'll look into it. I have not heard a thing 2 back since that meeting which was several months ago. 3 Basically speaking, we believe that the 4 relationship between our government and our community 5 is not a good one. We believe we are surveilled. 6 believe that the basic rights of most Americans are 7 And while things could not afforded to us any longer. 8 9 be worse, we think they're bad and need to be adjusted. 10 Thank you. 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you very much. 12 13 Mr. Amad, could you focus primarily on what has happened around 9/11 and now and whether 14 things are better, worse, what's going on. 15 16 MR. AMAD: Sure. I'll keep it short. Ι 17 think 10 minutes was allocated. I'll try to do it within that or even less. 18 19 Really since 9/11, Ismael as had 20 mentioned, there have been cases before this, 21 since 9/11 they were highlighted and a lot more came to the fore. 22 23 I have many representative cases from here 24 in Michigan, particularly, and one being from Chicago 25 since this is the Midwest Report. But one of the

24

25

cases that was extremely disturbing that we dealt with was that of Anan Bhutta who was a Pakistani American Muslim doctor who was pulled in by the Flint Police and basically he was beaten and he was interrogated. He was verbally abused, mentally abused. He had no connection to terrorism whatsoever. None was ever found, but basically for two weeks he was not given any contact with attorneys. Finally, he was able 'to make a call, not to attorneys, but to friends in New York which is where he was from. Finally, allowed out on bond and put back in jail during his sentencing because he didn't apologize. He was forced to basically -- he was coerced into making a guilty plea to a bogus charge of sexual harassment and no real evidence was shown, but he was coerced into doing that, so once he did that. He was put back into jail because he had not apologized. He was fed pork continuously despite his protests over that. Of course, for a Muslim that is we are not allowed to eat pork and it's extremely offensive. It was to the point where he was forced to basically eat it because he had to eat it. He had a minor heart attack while He is a doctor, so he can attest to in detention. He had a minor heart attack while in detention. They took him up to the infirmary. He asked to be

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

taken to a hospital. They told him he was a threat to basis. Remember, there's with no There's no basis for association with terrorism. terrorist organizations or any such thing. But he was given an aspirin basically and thank God he survived, but anyways, we were able to intervene with the court once we found out. We were able to intervene and get him out of the state, back in New York right now. extremely shaken. He is an American citizen and so that's why this is extremely scary that this could happen.

The second case that we are currently dealing with is representative of what has been going on across the nation, unfortunately, is that of Nicole El-Gammal who is married to a Muslim and she's from Michigan. She converted to Islam. Four days later, a false report that she was abusing her children. These children are from a previous marriage. One of them is from a previous marriage and one of them is from this marriage. The Family Services came in without actually investigating, took away the children, which in and of itself is a trauma. You investigate first and then take away the children. You look to the safety of the children, of course, but there nothing to indicate that anything had occurred. The

23

24

25

children were taken away. She was placed on child abusers. She had registry οf not been adjudicated as such. That jeopardized her teaching license which was the source of income. She was the bread winner of the family, the primary bread winner of the family and so her income was jeopardized by Her teaching license was essentially going to that. be revoked now, she's on that registry. We were able, the Family Services representative, this is really where civil rights abuse has come in, was working with her mother who is the one who made the false report, to say well, you know what, daughter says that her husband abused the children, everything will be dropped, there will be no problems. Basically, trying to force her to separate her from her husband that effectively has happened right now. The husband has been charged with assault and battery right now and he has no contact with the children for three months until the actual trial. Again, they have Family Services representative there what's going on in the family, but normally, under normal circumstances, they would come in and observe the family together to see what was happening, there was anything remiss and they have not found anything at this point.

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

Anyway, these cases have occurred in other places and I think it's a general misunderstanding of Muslims and I think there's a bias there. Oftentimes there's a predilection for finding that a Muslim will be abusing their children. Of course, abuse occurs in Muslim families and it occurs in all families and we have to protect children, but I think there's a predilection to removing the children right away if it's a Muslim family. I mean that's already

considered abuse. And that's a problem.

case of Ahmed Esa. He's Yemeni American. He has six children. Been working at his job for 17 years, never been late, never missed a day at work, essentially model employee. After 9/11, his boss came in, started to use intimidating language, racial and religious slurs, basically targeted him because he was Muslim and he was Arab and effectively They told him to go home and pray to his fired him. leader. Told him to go home and pray to his God, pray to his leader, implicating or suggesting that Osama bin-Laden was somehow his leader and some ridiculous We have filed a suit in this case and it's notion. continuing even though the boss is on tape for 30 minutes going off on Muslims and Arabs. So he just wants to continue with this. I don't know why.

the

This is a serious

know

if

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

Commission is aware of -- there were three -- well, actually five in total, but three men picked up southwest Detroit after 9/11 at apartment in an southwest Detroit and one of the men's name was Nabil al-Murabh and it's just interesting that Mr. al-Murabh was recently deported, I think a few days ago, without This case really involves any terrorist charges. Farouk Ali-Haimood who is a 21-year-old who happened This was his first night to be in an apartment. staying there. He had come to this country to stay with his mother, his parents are divorced and he had He grew up in Algeria. been in Algeria. His mother who is an American citizen is a Ph.D. and a professor, was a professor at a local college. Fired also because of this situation. In any case, he had come to stay with her. He wanted to be a little bit more independent and so therefore he wanted to move out. It was his first night in this apartment, never been there before. Basically, he was a successor to Mr. Mr. al-Murabh never even knew him. al-Murabh. case, the FBI came and picked them up, the three gentlemen that they found. These were not any list or anything. They just happened to find them in that

Farouk Ali-Haimood.

Ι

don't

involving the government.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

· 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

apartment and just picked them up and took them. Charges were made. Various charges were made.

What's clear to me is that there were some charges related to terrorist affiliations and then The charges were dismissed also some visa fraud. against Mr. Haimood and then he was released. Now what happened after though is he finally found a job. As you can imagine, when your face is flashed all over the news and the media made it their mission that anybody even on a minor traffic violation is now Osama bin-Laden's right hand man, you can imagine it's very employment. He finally difficult to get got employment at the airport at an ice cream shop. The attorney had told them, look, if there's anything further, please discuss it with me first and we'll be more than happy to come in. On purpose, it took 23 FBI Agents to go and arrest him publicly and humiliate him at his place of work at the airport, to make a show of it and they accused him of economic jihad. I've never heard of that term and I'd be interested to see what the explanation behind that is. This is a 21-year-old working in an ice cream shop, really trying to make ends meet.

In any case, he is still in detention, no charges have really been brought against him.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

no evidence against him. And you should really see his mother. If you hear the effect that it's had on her mother. She still has nightmares about actually bringing him to this country now and she's an American citizen. It's quite sad.

There's a case of Samer Kaukab. This is out of Chicago and actually the ACLU is the one who This has to do has filed the lawsuit in this case. I know there's many cases with airport profiling. with airport profiling, but this one, I think, is one of the more compelling ones that illustrate the extent of the treatment that is going on with Muslims and Arabs. Ms. Kaukab does wear the head scarf, religious reasons and she was returning from Chicago to Cincinnati for -- she was returning from a social service conference and she was the Muslim in her She was the only Muslim in her group. She was the only one stopped out of her group. They were going through the security checkpoint together and she was pulled aside and she was checked with the wand and everything. There was a full search. Nothing ever This happens a lot. They went around head came up. scarf and they didn't find anything. The wand did not So the male security asked her to remove her Now a Muslim female who would be using the scarf.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
.20
21
2,2
23
24

head scarf would not find that appropriate. It is not
appropriate for her to remove it in front of a
nonrelative male. And she explained that in a very
nice and calm manner. The security guard insisted and
was very intimidating. They brought more people. They
continued to intimidate her. She stuck to her guns.
She was very calm and very nice about it. She said
I'd be more than happy to remove it, but if we go to
the side, I'll do it front of a female security
officer which were available. They were available.
Finally, they allowed, but the male officer came along
into the room and insisted upon being there. I don't
know exactly why. But insisted upon being there.
Finally, he left after much discussion. Then they
subjected her to a full body search, full body strip
search where they touched her genitalia and they
unnecessary. There was no indication that this was
necessary. They could have done a pat down on the
outside which they did initially and there was nothing
that showed up. This was really to humiliate her and
this case is actually pending, but it just
demonstrates what's going on.

I'll just rap it up. I just wanted to point out some of most common things that we're dealing with and maybe some practical suggestions for

1 | the Commission.

We're dealing with a lot of employment denials. Based on the traditional head scarf, of course, people will be denied employment right off the bat or if they're actually working they will be somehow fired in a creative way. People have become more creative. Based on the Muslim names, résumés, say Muhanne, Ahmed, anything like that. No way. We have temp agencies telling us this, that they're not getting sourced.

Accommodation denials. Not allowing time off for the Eid Holiday or Friday Prayer when other faiths are allowed by the company.

Due process denial. Secret hearings. I'm not even talking about secret evidence. We're talking about secret hearings. I don't know if you saw, but Senator Carl Levin had submitted an inquiry and they're saying 600 people, 600 people were in secret hearings. That's amazing. How can that happen?

Indefinite detentions. People have been in detention since 9/11. Again, major violation.

Secret evidence. Takings without fair hearings. Again, the freezing of assets all over the place.

Denial of bail for minor immigration

2.0

violations and perjury charges for filing suit on the central issue in the case. We're talking about the Arnaudt case. The perjury charge is actually from a civil suit that was actually against the government for freezing the assets and the central issue was whether the relief organization was -- had terrorist connections or not and he alleged that they did not. That needs to be proven. If you filed perjury charges against him, then there is nobody in their right mind who is going to file a lawsuit to vindicate their rights.

Okay, and the practical suggestions, I think the Commission should issue guidelines to employers, for example, just stating clearly some of the things that are considered discriminatory practices, in particular with Muslims because for some reason after 9/11, there is this assumption that because it's Muslims, they're our enemy or something like that and we can discriminate against them, there's no problem and the government will support us. We need to make it clear that no, they will not. Hopefully. And just to make it clear on that.

I have it written on the papers that you have, so thank you very much and I hope I didn't go too much over my time. I think I did.

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

1 ||

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ms. Moss?

MS. MOSS: Thank you very much. I'm Kary Moss. Executive Director of the ACLU of Michigan. I submitted written testimony to you and I'm not going to read that, nor am I going to repeat it.

There were just several points I wanted to make, emphasize and expand a little bit. But first of all, let me thank you all for coming to Michigan. I think it's tremendous that the U.S. Commission on Human Rights took the time to come to Michigan and particularly to give my colleagues and friends in the Arabic community an opportunity to talk to you. We have the largest Arabic population in the country here and I think it's very much to your credit that you made this time.

You've heard from both Ish and from Haaris about some of the things that have been happening here. I wanted to talk for a minute about what I think one of the consequences is. We have seen tremendous movement or culture of fear develop since September 11th that I think is very important for civil rights.

First of all, this culture of fear that we see ultimately is going to undermine trust and law enforcement and therefore ultimately underline the

capacity of law enforcement to effectively deal with terrorism.

There is a tremendous human cost when there's a culture of fear that is created. We know from the days of segregation what happens when you target people because of their race or their ethnicity or because of their religion. We know it leads to social turmoil and we know that it feeds and generates racism.

It is also inconsistent with who we are.

We are not a country of fearful people. We are a country of people who the majority of whom are immigrants themselves or come from immigrant families who have come here for freedom and who take the principle of freedom, the motto on the Statue of Liberty very, very seriously and very much to heart. So it is inconsistent with who we are to be supporting policies that ultimately generate this culture of fear.

In Michigan, and in particular we've been dealing with two series of policies coming from the Department of Justice that are of tremendous concern. The first dealt with the investigations that went on with Muslim men from certain Middle Eastern countries.

Over a thousand men in Michigan were part of what was

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

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

~=

25

called an investigation, but what we view essentially as detention. The article from the -- or the letter from the Department of Justice to Senator Levin that Haaris mentioned actually talks about over 750 who have been detained as part of those investigations, it was a poorly conceived operation.

with conversations law Т had many enforcement officers, including FBI officials who felt that it was a plan or a process that was not only poorly conceived but wasn't going to net them any real information. Instead, what it did was it generated fear, uncertainty and a lack of trust. For many of these men they are here, unfamiliar with the language, unfamiliar with the American justice system. They don't know what their rights are. They often come countries where the police themselves terrorists and did not feel that they had the rights or the capacity to decline an interview or to even bring an attorney with them. So that was something that we worked a lot on. We had a special hotline did in collaboration with ACCESS American Arab Antidiscrimination Committee and the National Lawyers Guild. We provided assistance, pro bono assistance to over 60 men. We went on many of the interviews with them. The questions that they

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were asked were often very inappropriate about their religious faith, their religious belief, where they practice, wanting phone numbers of their friends and colleagues. These were all things that went way beyond what we think was appropriate for purposes of investigating the attacks on September 11th.

Additionally, the Free Press reported that there have been over 650 closed deportation hearings. This has been an important issue in Michigan. actually representing the Detroit News, an alternative newspaper called the Metro Times and Congressman John Convers who attempted to go to one of these closed hearings involving a man named Rahbid Haadad from Ann Arbor, a Muslim cleric who had been living in this country for over 20 years. He was picked up shortly after September 11th on a minor visa violation and was held in solitary confinement, is still being held, but was in solitary confinement and shackled and allowed one hour of exercise a week until Congressman Convers was finally able to get the terms of his confinement changed. Well, we challenged Immigration Law Court Judge Kreppes' memo ordering or giving to the Department of Justice the power to arbitrarily determine which deportation hearing should be closed in a federal lawsuit. We argued that the

closing of these hearings violate the first amendment rights of the press and the public to know what is going on in our justice system. We were successful in Federal District Court and that case is now on appeal in the Sixth Circuit. There's a similar case also pending in the Third Circuit out of New Jersey. So this is an issue that has come very close to home with a very compelling human story and one in which I think really makes very clear what the implications are of having the Department of Justice arbitrarily in a power grab trying to expand its power and to diminish the power of our Federal Courts to act as a checks and a balance.

I want to ask you to not believe many of the polls you see that say Americans agree to give up their freedom in exchange for greater safety. I think the pollsters are having a great time right now. The newspapers are blasting these over the front page, over their front pages and I am very skeptical about the reality. Admittedly, the ACLU often preaches to the converted. We often do hear from the people who agree with us, but I also do believe that the freedom to be free from a reasonable search and seizure, the freedom to be able to say what is on your mind and to be able to say that in the street are freedoms that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

are very much treasured by everybody in this country. And I think the questions that are being asked are wrong. I think if you ask the public if they believe the police should be able to go into their home without a search warrant, they would say no. Asked if it would be okay to give up freedom for security, they might say yes, but when you rephrase it, when you actually talk about the loss of very individual, valued rights, I think you'll hear something very different.

And so I ask you, as the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, to take a leadership role, to be brave and courageous, to support the initiative or the proposal of Mr. Edley to create an independent Office of Civil Rights that acts as another check and balance on many of the government policies that we're seeing coming from Washington. And I ask also that you recommend that the principal of proportionality be utilized in developing federal government policies. That is, policies involving privacy, involving the right to protest, the right to speak out, reflect the level of risk. For example, I've heard very little conversation about why a cockpit door can still be kicked in after all these many years of airline hijackings. How is it that airplanes are still being

in?

built so that a cockpit door can be kicked 1 Instead, we have closed deportation hearings. 2 How is it that the FBI and the CIA can be 3 making all of the mistakes that have been reported in 4 have made about being unable to the press that they 5 process the amount of intelligence they have, being 6 unable to translate the amount of intelligence we have 7 and then we end up with the U.S.A. Patriot Act, a 8 9 tremendous infringement on our civil rights and a law that I think is going to haunt us for many, many years 10 to come. 11 So with all that being said, I really 12 13 again thank you for coming to Michigan and am happy to answer any of your questions. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you very much, 15 16 Ms. Moss. Mr. Hamad, please? 17 MR. HAMAD: Yes, my name is Imad Hamad. 18 19 Regional Director of the American Arab Antidiscrimination Committee. It's the National 20 Association of Arab Americans. It's the prominent 21 civil rights organization in the nation with chapters 22 across all cities. 23 24 I welcome you to Michigan and I commend 25 you for this leadership role. I think it's consistent

your Advisory Board Committee in Michigan played this role last year and this year and I think it's highly needed in this trying and difficult time.

I understand that maybe we're talking about the Arab Americans and the Muslim American community as the immediate beneficiary or recipients of the many directives on policies that have been in effect post September 11th, but I have no doubt that the impact and the effect of these regulations and policies and laws are going to affect every single one of us as Americans, period, regardless of the race, national origin, color or faith.

Indeed, the challenges to the Arab Americans and the Muslim American community was not born on September 11 and I assume this is maybe one of the icons of our society that as great as it is that we have to go through a batch of challenges in order to set the record straight and enjoy the precious freedom and liberty and justice for all that we enjoyed for years and years.

I have no doubt that what we are facing now as an Arab American, Muslim American community, I know it's different in circumstances and nature, what have you, but the concept is the same as far as justice and equality for all. I have no doubt that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

how the other minorities were able to prevail and that our community despite the pain and suffering and the high price that will accompany this process will prevail as well because we're talking about a common goal and a common belief which is our strong belief in the fabric of this great nation and the constitution and the bill of rights where we're all proud of which at this point in time we see that it's been under attack and under siege and somehow is subject to a draft of rewriting through many policies that many speakers before me indicated.

I don't want to be redundant about the question of the issues and the many examples that we We have a breaking record, an unprecedented number of complaints in Michigan which I would say briefly that the concept of racial profiling which has been an ongoing challenge to all minorities and now may be as an Arab Americans, Muslim American community happens to enjoy the hot seat, the front seat, to have a direct taste of it like others before us, made us aware, more appreciative to the struggle others and made us more determined to meet the challenge and proceed. So this concept of racial profiling became so inclusive to a point I cannot exclude any segment of our society that we did not

1

3

5

6

7

8

, 4

9 .10 11

14

13

12

16

15

18

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

receive a complaint or bias, racial discrimination, etcetera in the work place and the health arena, academic arena, law enforcement by all levels, city-wide, county, state, federal, etcetera.

say with no question would September 11th impacted all of our lives and changed so many aspects which put us before a challenge which our government, yes, needs to meet that challenge and develop and advance its capabilities and abilities to deal with this danger. And I'm sure that the strategy that the prevention of terrorism, it's a valid mission to our government because it ensures my safety, your safety, everybody's safety. However, this cannot be an open-ended strategy, it cannot be a strategy that is in the way of our Constitution and our basic It cannot be without the checks and balances rights. It cannot be without the safeguard that's needed to oversee. It cannot be effective without the judicial oversight that is being reduced day after given the law enforcement agencies or Executive Branch to play the role of the jury and the judge and the prosecution at the same time, depriving people of all the basic due process rights.

The impact of this national policy that has been issued by the U.S. Department of Justice are

24

25

not only impacting the role of the federal agencies pertaining to the War Against Terrorism, it's also sending a very wrong message of not only the message of fear versus the message of trust that we need to enhance and advance and preserve and protect, but it's making the question of selective approach, selective treatments, selective prosecution as okay, as a legit style of our life, as an okay practice to every agency and we witnessed that in many practices of many law enforcement agencies, especially police departments. I know that we're used to a term "driving while you're Now we move beyond to say "driving while you're brown or Arab or Muslim or what have you." This has come in to be sending a message that it's okay to abuse those who look different, those who are of Middle Eastern descent or of Muslim faith. I can cite you a number of complaints that we recently received that are very disturbing where police officers in many cities here in Michigan has been stopping people for no apparent reason. Lucky if they give them a citation called traffic citation or minor citation, just to justify the abuse that they make the victim subject to. They drag them out of the car, throw them on the floor, handcuff them, physically abuse them. And in many cases, even the police officer don't give

the person a citation. And we thought that this was a way for them not to be identified, so the person cannot identify who did that. And even in cases where people happen to have like their personal items such as a phone book or in some case it happened that they have their personal bank statement, they took it, without even disclosing that to the individual.

So it's becoming really ugly and it's becoming really very scary and I tell you that despite the fact that here in Michigan we have a role model maybe relationship with the law enforcement, I think we were able to work with the law enforcement at many levels. We had the good U.S. Attorney here who had an open door policy. We were able to meet on a monthly basis. It's a unique situation.

We had an open dialogue between the community at large and the law enforcement, but yet we know that differences continue to exist. It helped to make the situation better. It helped to keep at least we talk, at least we can help in a way or another, but still what is coming from the government, from the top ranking government there, is the source of the problem and I think the U.S. Civil Rights Commission is our voice and you are the voice that we, as citizens, lean on in such a trying time to take a leadership role by

NEAL R. GROSS

voicing your concern aggressively.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We are not here to dispute the need of safety and the need of many reforms and advancement of capabilities or what have you. We're here simply to say that this cannot be taking place on account of our Constitution and our civil liberties. If I talk about the interview process, for instance, we had to deal They called it voluntary, but it with two episodes. I attended many of these interviews. interviews did not have any outcome, but just to be basic information, but it was clear that the purpose of these interviews is simply to create a physical It was more of a psychological contact with people. assessment to people and in some cases they tried to be tricky about the questions that they tried to ask and then yet it's obvious that they want to recruit all of these people to become somehow informants.

And now we're talking about the question of a closed hearing for 611 which it was like shocking news to everyone of us, where people, most of them, not a single case the government brought a charge or link to terrorist acts or criminal record or what have you. And yet, these people are subject to closed hearings mandated by the U.S. Department of Justice. These before September 11 used to be something even

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with. We're not here to advocate on their behalf. What is illegal is illegal. What is a violation is a violation. But our trouble is why they are not subject to the same afforded course of law that is afforded to everyone like when they talked about having a list of 316,000 who are in violation and they will not deport them, yet they have to make a special classification having 6,000 who happen to be of Middle Eastern descent as a type of priority. And a formal memo indicated that you catch these people, you treat them as suspect, you treat them as criminals.

I think it is scary and many people truly believe that we are moving in the direction of having The recent news about -- that was a police state. published by the Associated Press about having alternate agencies, employees, such as a post office and others and even the public service and electricity, etcetera, to become in a way or another informers to the government. Even now, if I have to call for a service at my house, I have to be careful of the serviceman or the servicewoman who comes to my house. That might raise concerns about it.

So finally, I would say that I think you know the Constitution, that's why you are the Civil

Rights Commission on Civil Rights and we hold you 1 responsible at this point in time to do your part and 2 help us dealing with these challenges. 3 Okay, thank you very CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 4 5 much for coming. Amad, you didn't say whether you 6 Mr. thought things were better than they were right after 7 Everybody else did. I just thought you --8 9 MR. AMAD: I'm sorry. It's hard to say because definitely after 9/11 there were, as far as 10 11 volume goes, there was an immense amount of reports and just small things, even like verbal abuse, people 12 trying to run people off the road. 13 I had a lot of reports from that. But now, I think the cases are a 14 little more insidious and they happen to deal more 15 with the government than they do with private actors. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone else, before we -- yes, please. 18 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I just have a 20 question for Mr. Amad. I've been a little bit 21 We had a forum in Washington, D.C. and we 22 had a high official of the INS report to us that the INS was following all of their normal regulations and 23 24 they required that a person be allowed to contact an 25 Then right after that official testified, a attorney.

23

24

25

lawyer testified and he tstified about having a client, he was hired by the family and he hadn't been able to see the client because the client had been moved physically several times, that he flies to this place and then he had just been moved to another place. I'm not quite sure how to put those things together.

You've got testimony from an official saying yes, we're following the rules, and then we have testimony from the lawyer saying, I haven't been able to contact my client.

How do you put those two things together? MR. AMAD: I can corroborate that and I don't know if it's the same case. Ιf it was originally from Michigan, but right after 9/11, I got a call from somebody in Mexico City. He was the brother of a detainee. He didn't know he was a detainee at that time. He was missing, basically. And he thought maybe after 9/11 something had happened.

In any case, after much difficulty we were able to track down where he was and he was being detained in Monroe County and at first the U.S. Marshals told us they had nobody by that name in detention. Finally, we figured it out. Got an attorney for him, an immigration attorney. As soon as

that happened, the first hearing was delayed and then he was transferred to North Carolina for no apparent reason. So I know that that is happening. I don't know what exactly the reason is behind the move, but there have been a lot of moves in that case and definitely, there have been -- I don't know if there have been outright denials of access, but they haven't made it easy for sure.

MS. MOSS: I'd just like to add, a lot of this information we would have if the government would respond to the Information Act requests that have been submitted by the civil rights groups we would get answers about where are people being held, have they been provided an attorney, if they asked for an attorney, I mean, any of those things, but we don't know because it's secret.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Ms. Braceras.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have a question, but I do want to say in response to some of the individual allegations that were brought up of abuse, I am pleased to see that lawsuits have been filed in some of those cases that you mentioned because that is the appropriate vehicle for dealing with many of these concerns and I'm fully confident that the courts will handle these cases in an appropriate fashion. And I

you

folks

government

certainly encourage the other would 1 mentioned who have not filed lawsuits or anyone else 2 feels they have been abused by who authority to do so and to use whatever other outlets, media attention and public relations tactics to draw attention to that. And again, I'm confident that our courts will be appropriate vehicles to ascertain the 7 truth of those allegations and to deal with them, if they are true. My question is with respect to the FBI 10 interviews, what constitutional rights do you claim 11 were violated by those voluntary interviews which I 12 know you and some people on the panel have alleged were coercive, but what specific constitutional right 15 do you allege is violated by those interviews? 16 MS. MOSS: Well, first of all, let me just say that we recognize the right of the FBI to gather 17 relevant information and we're not questioning that. 18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 19 Do you believe 20 constitutional rights were violated 21 interviews, and if so, which ones? 22 Well, not necessarily, MS. MOSS: Well, we took issue with some of the questions. 23 24 were able to obtain a list of the questions that the 25 FBI was going to ask in all of the interviews or I

3

4

5

6

8

9

13

14

in

those

our

the

think it was a list from the Department of Justice. We went through that and for the men that we counseled, we advised them not to answer certain questions and they didn't answer those questions. I can't speak with respect to the others, but we certainly felt that many of those questions were intrusive, were inappropriate, would not lead to relevant information and would perpetuate this climate of fear. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So if I understand you correctly, you believe that some of the questions were inappropriate and intrusive, but you do not believe that they were illegal or that anybody's rights were violated? Well, according MR. HAMAD: perspective, we see it as -- we disapproved of the don't dispute the right for process. We government to gather any information, but to do it in that selective fashion where people were chosen based on religion, gender and national origin smacks of racial profiling and that's a concept we refute. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry, is it your allegation then that the interviews violated

somehow the Equal Protection Clause of the United

States Constitution?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAMAD: I stand by that. I truly believe that the Department of Justice clearly stated that these people are not suspects and they should not be treated as suspects. However, during the course of the interviews, it was clear that regardless how you define it and you name it, describe it; they were suspects

That's the bottom line to it and I think there's a difference when you say it's voluntary and you define voluntary by giving the full rights for the individual simply to decline and not to have a follow-up call while in this case it was by name voluntary, but it was not.

it Although was done in very register we did not say violations or irritations, but in many interviews I attended myself, I noticed that some -- maybe not necessarily of the FBI Agents because keep in mind that this process was conducted by so police officers officers, from many divisions from many cities who were not even aware of what they are doing. And each interview was handled in a different fashion.

So some of it was tricky, yes. Some of it even they did not comply with the understanding that

21

22

23

24

25

took place. However, I would say in Michigan, in particular, I think due to the good relation and the dialogue and the consecutive discussions that we had, with the U.S. Attorney's Office, we were maybe the only state who used the form of letter contact. Because when we came to discuss it, we said but you're telling us it's voluntary. You're telling us these are not suspects. So why do you want to go to their houses, knock at their doors or to their workplace or what have you and this is why we used the form of letter notification.

I think the law enforcement, relatively speaking here in Michigan, they were very cooperative. I don't want to make it rosy that we -- we even initiated a call to all people who were asked to be interviewed to cooperate, to fully cooperate, but yes, we insisted on the presence of an attorney because quote, unquote, there's a question of trust there of the motives and the intentions.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay, I have a follow-up on that and that is well, first of all, there's certainly no constitutional right not to be inconvenienced or even embarrassed or treated inappropriately. As bad as that may be is a policy matter. It's certainly not a civil right not to be

embarrassed or inconvenienced, so I'd like to make 1 But with respect to 2 that perfectly clear. allegation of an equal protection violation and I 3 4 quess I would direct this comment to the attorney on I certainly wouldn't expect non-attorneys 5 the panel. to answer this, but the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals 6 for Michigan, well, it covers Michigan, has recently 7 held in the context of Affirmative Action that race 8 9 can be considered by the government as one factor, 10 among many, and that that constitutes a compelling 11 state interest creating a diverse study body. How can 12 be that creating a diverse student body is a 13 compelling state interest but considering race or 14 ethnicity at airports, not as a sole factor, but as a 15 plus factor, one of many, in order to save lives, is 16 not a compelling state interest? 17 MS. MOSS: I think you're mixing apples 18 and oranges. I don't think one has anything to do with the other. 19 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's the same body 21 of law. 22 MS. MOSS: No, it's not. When you're 23 talking about using race or ethnicity in the context 24 of Affirmative Action which frankly is not the subject 25 of today's panel, but when you're talking about that,

1	you're talking about educational policy question.
2	What we're talking about here is the use
3	of race or ethnicity as a vehicle for the enforcement
4	of our criminal laws
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. It's a
6	vehicle to stop and interview.
7	MS. MOSS: Stop and interview, potentially
8	detain, potentially put in jail, potentially deport.
9	You're talking about the use of race or ethnicity to
10	bring in the full power of the government on to people
11	solely because of somebody's race and we also have a
12	tremendous body
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think
14	that's what the airport stop
15	MS. MOSS: We also have a tremendous body
16	of law that says that using race or ethnicity in order
17	in employment, in public housing, in enforcement of
18	our criminal laws, is unconstitutional for very good
19	reasons. Again, I think it's apples and orange.
20	MR. AMAD: If I may comment. I am also an
21	attorney by the way
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Great.
23	MR. AMAD: The basic premise behind
24	Affirmative Action is actually to redress past
25	discrimination, whereas in this case, the scenario

1	that you present, there's no redress of past
2	discrimination here. This is, actually, you are being
3	used to single out a group with there's not that
4	justification there.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So you believe
6	that redressing past discrimination is a compelling
7	state interest, but saving lives is not, just to be
8	clear.
9	MR. AMAD: No. Actually, I'm just going
10	upon the basis of the Court and what they have stated,
11	actually. So I'm not Supreme Court and I'm stating
12	what the law is.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm done.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Question on some other
15	subjects since the panels didn't come prepared to
16	discuss Affirmative Action.
17	I think they've answered your question,
18	asked, answered.
19	Can we thank yes, Mr. Kirsanow, please,
20	Commissioner.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: First of all,
22	thanks very much for coming here. It's been very
23	informative. Commissioner Braceras asked whether or
24	not you perceived a constitutional violation in the
25	FBI's questioning of individuals.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other constitutional there any Were violations that you can tell us about in the wake of 9/11 in terms of the government's efforts to, for possibly information, deport example, gather individuals, determine whether or not somebody was a member of a terrorist organization, so on and so forth?

MS. MOSS: The ones that we're aware of -again, it's hard to know what has happened because the
government is not providing or opening the books so
that we can see what's happened.

closed deportation Obviously, the hearings, we feel clearly violate the first amendment. We object to the selective enforcement of immigration laws against people solely because of their race, religion, when we hundreds ethnicity or have in country with thousands of people this violations, targeting people only from certain Middle Eastern countries, we feel raises serious protection issues.

We don't know enough about the people who have been detained to know whether or not they've been deprived of their right to counsel. We don't know if they're being held in conditions that would violate the eighth amendment. I can tell you the conditions I

saw Rahbid Haadad held in raise serious concerns for 1 2 me, too. I mean that's our initial -- we're 3 concerned about this TIPS Program, the recruiting of a 4 million people to essentially act as domestic spies. I 5 think the government could find itself faced with many 6 7 lawsuits from private individuals who invite somebody in their house to check their telephone, only to find 8 out that essentially an unlawful search has 9 conducted. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, is that --COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just a follow up. 12 13 In terms of a balancing of interest and I think 14 Commissioner Braceras may have touched on this, you 15 indicated that people were being detained or deported based on race; ethnicity or religion. 16 17 However, it seems to me that there's a 18 number of factors that are being utilized. It's been testified to that isn't exclusive to race and/or 19 ethnicity and/or religion, but a confluence of factors 20 21 based on the very substantial or rational basis that 2.2 may be obtained by what has happened. 23 With respect to 9/11, it seems to me that 24 a similar argument would be made by the government if 25 all of the hijackers, for example, had been

Danish-Americans and had a pin on their lapel saying "I am Danish." Or if any of the other terrorists, any of the other bombings or anything of that nature, World Trade Center of 1993. There is a profile that's not necessarily related to race, not necessarily related to ethnicity, but as I say, a confluence of factors.

I don't think there's a balancing of interest that the government may have as Commissioner Braceras said, a compelling government interest to investigate, to question, to research individuals who fit a profile, not a racial profile, but a profile as has been established by copious evidence since 9/11?

MS. MOSS: There were profiles before 9/11. We have no objection to behavioral profiles. We object to profiles based on race or ethnicity, and let me remind or at least provide you with some information.

On September 11th, those terrorists bought \$14,000 in one-way tickets in cash on the day of the attack. That is behavior that can be profiled. That was a profile that was in existence before September 11th, but the airlines failed to implement it. Had they implemented it, it's very possible that September 11th wouldn't have happened. And we have no objection

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to that. But we see now is people wanting to go beyond that and look at race or ethnicity alone or even some combination and I can tell you this is having a tremendous impact, not just on the Arabic community, but also on the African American community and the Latino community because people are being mistakenly identified as Arabic.

profile ACLU's national racial The coordinator, actually, who is an African American man, but looks Arabic, has been stopped I think on every single airplane he's tried to have flown and I may be exaggerating, but I think it's close to that since September 11th. So this has widespread implications not effective it's as a law for everybody and enforcement took because I think groups like Quaeda, terrorists are going to quickly find ways to circumvent those racial profiles. They'll recruit people with white skin. They are recruiting people who are Dutch. And they're going to find ways to get around it and if you're only looking at people based on their color, you are going to be making serious mistakes, I believe, and miss real terrorists.

MR. AMAD: If I may also point out, you mentioned 1993 World Trade Center bombing, but you didn't mention the Oklahoma City bombing. Timothy

NEAL R. GROSS

McVeigh was a white Methodist with a buzz cut. Now if we use that profile, because we should, right, there is certainly a profile there and also the militia, Michigan militia and various militias certainly fit a certain profile based off of race, I suppose, that you could make an argument for that, right?

Then why aren't we doing that? Definitely, even if we make that argument then, we're definitely profiling here based off of -- we're definitely discriminating here.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I agree with you that Timothy McVeigh did bomb the Oklahoma Federal Building. There was a profile established for certain individuals along those lines and there were considerable number of investigations by the FBI with respect to individuals who fit that profile.

This is a difficult circumstance. There's no if, ands, or buts about it. What we have here are we've got 3,000 people who are dead, potentially more. The last thing we want to see is the Detroit River have a barge with a suitcase nuke on it. When you're asking the government with finite resources to take on an infinite job such as in Detroit, my understanding is and maybe some of you can tell me, 40 million people cross over between Canada and the United States

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

every year. You only have 130 Customs Agents to ask those people questions to make sure there isn't contraband coming through and they've got all kinds of other duties associated with being a Customs Agent. Given that you have finite time, finite resources, and there are immutable characteristics and mutable characteristics. You combine all those characteristics to the best of your ability to focus on those areas that may cause the greatest concern.

With respect to mutable characteristics, I quarantee you another Muhammed Atta is never going to pay cash for airline tickets. Those things are easily Behavioral profiles should be focused on, amended. but they change just as mutable profiles -- immutable profiles will change. The next terrorist may, for example, come from Japan. Who knows? But given what we have right now, given what we have right now, it seems to me it makes perfect sense for law enforcement authorities to focus their attention where they see risk. To do otherwise would be the greatest ridiculous.

If our law enforcement community, for example, decided not to focus on Swedish women over the age of 70, we'd be saying what the heck are they doing?

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And if I may, again, you just MR. AMAD: said there's immutable characteristics and you can the \$14,000, nobody will pay \$14,000 again. Similarly, Richard Reed, Jose Padilla, all of these were different profiles, and it would be remiss of us to focus now on what's already happened, we should looking to the future. I say rely upon start intelligence which we did not do in the past. Get intelligence. have intelligence real You that somebody from Ireland is going to come and there's going to be a threat, then yes, focus on them. But to say that every Muslim male, 1.2 billion Muslims in the world, 1.2 billion Muslims in the world is going to be somehow suspicious and we're going to pull them over, I don't think that's going to work. I think we need to involve the Muslim community, Arab community in actually figuring out how can we -- I can identify pretty easily within the Muslim community, I could say what's suspicious, what's not. But you know what, the government hasn't done a very good job of winning our trust.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We have been very patient and our third panel, our SAC members, have yet been able to say anything. I'm going to let you comment and then we're going to do that.

MR. HAMAD: I'll be very quick. 1 2 have a problem with profiling as long as it's based on conduct or behavior and that is where you don't leave 3 any room for our enemies who are there to manage to 4 5 beat the system that was put in effect. Second, I think the government itself at 6 all levels testified to the level of cooperation in a 7 from the Arab American system that it received 8 community when it became to this mission of their role 9 10 combat the danger of terrorism. Under circumstances we create a false impression that we try 11 and not to care about safety and then trade safety 12 with other rights. Ι think we don't 13 contradiction and I think a balanced system can more 14 15 can be more effective that's in all of 16 interests. And I'm not an attorney. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, thank you 18 very much. 19 Now if we could ask our SAC Members to 20 come before us and this is the last discussion we'll 21 have today. 22 We have here -- and our SAC Members have 23 been here all morning and we first want to tell you 24 how much we love you and appreciate you. That's the 25 first thing we want to tell you publicly.

I don't

first

was

permitted to love you and appreciate you. And the first person I want to introduce is Mr. Roland Hwang of Northville, Michigan. know where Northville is. Is that around here somewhere? He's the Assistant AG with the Michigan Attorney General's Office, Revenue Division and former he Chairperson of the Committee and appointed in 1990. The other is Mr. Noel John Detroit, right here, who is an attorney and Member of the NAA and all of the organizations that do work in this area including the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services, ACCESS, that we heard from, and the Greater Detroit Chapter of the Arab Americans Antidiscrimination Committee. And Ms. Sue Hamilton-Smith who has been here all morning. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Even before the meeting started. She's Vice President CHAIRPERSON BERRY: of Programs for the New Detroit, Incorporated which is having the event today that we were told about and former Executive Assistant to Detroit Mayor Coleman Young. She's on the Board of the Urban League,

Services

Diversified

Youth

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

kinds

of

all

and

20

21

22

23

24

25

organizations that try to make a difference in the life of the community.

So let me recognize you and ask you to please speak to us and, Mr. Hwang, is there something each of you would like to say to us, having heard everything else that's taken place?

MR. HWANG: First off, I want to on behalf of the Michigan SAC thank the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights for coming to Detroit because we think it's extremely timely and it's very important that you come visit the different SACs at the locations to hear first hand from the Panel that we just heard from, for example, about the real testimony, as opposed to through reports or through even our own words, and so we really appreciate your coming out to the field and we hope that it continues as a matter of practice.

Because there are 400,000 to 450,000 Arab Michigan, we thought that it Americans in important for us to face the issues, the civil rights issues facing the Arab American community and that's a community forum in September, why we had September 27, 1999 and for the sake of brevity, I'll just hit the six points that were discussed and they employment discrimination, policing, discrimination on the street, detention at the border,

2

3

4

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

secret evidence and profiling. And those were the issues and let me assure you that those issues have not gone away. And they remain the same as they were in 1999 and at the time that we released our report in May 18, 2001.

want to go through the don't testimony that we heard from Ishmael Ahmed and Imad Hamad because they testified at that community forum. You heard them today. But to talk about some of the other issues. Ron Dezel was called to testify. the Chief of Police in Dearborn. Dearborn has a 30 percent of the population is Arab American. percent of the students in the Dearborn public schools are Arab American and yet he admitted that he did not have very good luck recruiting law enforcement out of the Arab American community, that just 7 out of 100 recruits during his 14-year tenure as Police Chief So that just spotlights one were Arab Americans. problem issue.

Another issue is trust. You've certainly heard a lot about it here, but Maya Berry from the Arab American Institute talked about the lack of trust because the FBI is empowered to guard against terrorism and it also has its Hate Crimes Unit, but how do you trust an organization that has that two

pronged authority and it might come back and bite you in terms of the same agency is charged with both issues. That's testimony from Maya Berry.

Zodar Adel Hack testified about disparate fines. Now it was just empirical testimony, anecdotal testimony, but the fact of the matter is with David Minot, the research individual, the analyst out of Chicago, we have to rely on community forums and we don't have the statistics or the exhaustive research projects to get at more into the detail and so we just rely upon that anecdotal information. But there is some area to research in terms of whether or not there are disparate fines being meted out based upon ethnicity.

Abed Haamoud of the Arab American PAC, political action committee, talked about doing a study and finding that in Dearborn, with that 30 percent of the population being Arab American, only 2 percent of the city work force in Dearborn was Arab American and only 4 percent, if you count, part-time workers. So there's certainly a picture that we're trying to show through the community forum that not is all right with the Arab American community in terms of policing, in terms of discrimination, in terms of employment.

Detention at the border. Carl Levin, our

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

senior Senator, U.S. Senator, talked about innumerable complaints regarding detentions at the border and that was backed up by our junior Senator at the time, Senator Abraham who is now the Energy Secretary that many, many complaints came into his office as well.

respect to the FAA and INS and security at the airport, we did have at the time testimony from Dennis Reading who is the Field Unit Supervisor at Detroit Metro. He filled us in on CAPSS, the computer assisted passenger security system, but he wouldn't talk to us about anything about it, other than the assurance that it doesn't define people by their ethnicity, but he wouldn't talk about it. He said it's all defined in Washington, that he didn't have any latitude to modify the CAPSS But we didn't get any information other than assurance that it was not anything but there's a big hole with respect to neutral. So understanding even the rudiments of the CAPSS system.

With respect to the INS, Carol Jennifer indicated that yes, the process can be intimidating, but that the INS does have people who go through mandatory service training and we questioned whether or not just having mandatory service training is enough to the extent that you can have training, but

is it effective and does it work.

1.4

With respect to secret evidence, it's been around since 1955, but we question the wisdom of the secret evidence procedure. Imad Hamad was subject to that for a 12-year against the INS and you heard from him just a few minutes ago. He went through that process for quite a number of years and beat the INS and was able to stay.

Yes, if you have secret evidence, there's a right to appeal, but it's kind of hard to effectively win an appeal when you don't know what the accusations are, whose bringing it, that sort of thing. And so if Mr. Imad Hamad is still here, he can probably answer that, if you have some questions in that regard.

With respect to profiling, that's already been addressed in terms of driving.

With respect to the situation in the city of Dearborn, Michael Guido is the Mayor and he talked about having two of his six staffers are Arab American. That's on the plus side. They've been named to City Planning, Telecom Board of Appeals and Zoning Commission. There is a Diversity Awareness Program in place. There's a very large Arab American festival in Dearborn.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

<u>1</u>7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But on the negative side, it's kind of curious that it is one of the few cities that has a Homeland Security Office and you wonder why they put it in place in Dearborn.

With respect to discrimination, Mohammed Allahi of the Islamic House of Islam talked about discrimination because of people wearing the hajab, discrimination on that basis or merely being bearded. So that's information that we learned back in 1999.

provided 9/11. the ADC Post has information to us with respect to the November 9, 2001 DOJ directive to do the interviews. Jeff Collins came to visit us and gave testimony about the voluntary And yes, the Department of Justice and nature of it. the Eastern District of Michigan, U.S. Attorney's Office did work with ADC to fashion a quote unquote You heard about that voluntary letter. in the testimony from Imad Hamad about well, is it truly voluntary and they weren't entirely happy about being singled out to be recipients of these voluntary letters.

Of the 5,000 Arabs identified age 18 to 33, males, more than 500 of them were here in the Eastern District of Michigan and that's testimony from Jeffrey Collins.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

question is with respect to the is it selective enforcement orwhatever it is, The issue of targeting? Is it selective enforcement? the 6,000 Arab men that are being singled out, even though there are 316,000 deportation orders that are outstanding and if that isn't targeting, I would be wondering what that is.

With respect to 9/11 and post-9/11, Ismael Ahmed gave us testimony. You heard from him already. But he talked at length in front of us on June 27th about the voluminous e-mails that used the word sand nigger or other racial epithets. He didn't go into detail about that today, but he talked about people calling in thinking that they were surveilled by the FBI without any justification. Lots of incidents of property damage, about 150 in number as reported to us by Imad at the June meeting.

Lila Aman of the Dearborn Public Schools who is the community liaison gave testimony about being proactive, post 9/11, but she also talked about some situations involving the football game and track meet with Monroe, Michigan versus Edsall Ford High School which is predominantly Arab where -- wrong high school in Dearborn, where there were some verbal epithets and I guess some attempted assaults involving

both the track meet and the football game. And so that is something that they're watching and it's something that arose between individuals from Monroe, which is south of Detroit and people at Fordson.

With respect to the pluses and minuses that have arisen post 9/11, Brent Seaver killed Ali Hamansu on September 19, 2001. Just a few days ago he was found guilty and sentence to life without parole and so there a favorable result in terms of sentencing involving this one homicide.

On April 14th, there was a pro Palestine rally in Dearborn and you'd think that people have the right to free speech and have the right to participate and assemble and Iman Al Husseini joined this pro Palestine rally midway through it and was subsequently arrested by the Dearborn Police. I'm happy to report that as of a few days ago, July 15th, the charges were dropped by the City of Dearborn and so I'm happy to report that was a result of some intervention by the ADC.

With respect to the State level, the Attorney General, Jennifer Grandholm has put in place a Hate Crimes Prevention Task Force. We hope it's a model. I'm a member of it, as well as about eight other Assistant AGs. It is a model that is being

watched by Human Rights Watch as being a model that can be duplicated around the country and also the Department of Civil Rights in the state is very active in its community relations work. Lila Sabahana is here as the Arab American Affairs Specialist working with her boss, Dr. Nan Reynolds who is the Department Director. She's been in her position as a specialist since 1995, focusing on a couple of issues involving secret evidence and ethnic profiling. She's been involved with meetings with officials of Northwest Airlines with respect to those issues of profiling at the airport, Detroit Metro Airport.

With respect to the sort of cross involvement by the Department of Civil Rights at the state with the community, Dr. Nan Reynolds is a member of the chapter of the Arab American Discrimination Committee, the ADC and the president of the Arab American Muslim Council, Dr. Yaha Mosabosha is a member of the State Civil Rights Commission.

The Department of Civil Rights is a member of the Advocates and Leaders for Police Community Trust, ALPCT and is a partner with ADC in reviewing discrimination complaints. There is a partnership between the Department of Civil Rights and the ADC. With respect to their involvement in programming,

they're involved in a Street Law Day in Dearborn, I guess, to increase the understanding of civil rights laws, generally focusing on Street Law Day in Dearborn.

So with respect to recommendations, if you will visit our report which was issued in 2001, we ask that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights take a look, if it is empowered, to take a look at the CAPSS program, because we were not able to get behind the CAPSS program to understand anything, even in a rudimentary way, with respect to any assurance that it is race neutral, race or ethnic neutral. And to take some action with respect to profiling. know profiling and legislation has been pending on the Hill with respect to banning the practice of profiling, certainly unless there's some probable cause, but I doubt if profiling can be implemented based upon some inherent race, gender or ethnicity, you know, rule. There's nothing inherent in race of ethnicity that would allow profiling to be actually an effective tool and we would urge that you continue your vigilance in looking at that as an issue.

And I defer to Sue Hamilton-Smith and Noel Saleh, if they have any comments.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ms. Hamilton-Smith, I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wish to hear your voice.

MS. HAMILTON-SMITH: It's such an honor to be before you. You are an icon in Detroit, a courageous civil rights warrior. We really appreciate you.

make one comment that I work in Detroit as I think most of you have this newsletter which shows that two days after September 11th we convened our membership to show this community and to stand as an example that we should unite with our Arab and Caldian neighbors and certainly make an all out call that there are not to be an terrorism against them and we feel somewhat proud that that was well received in our community.

I would like to take one second to disagree with a comment that I believe I heard from one of the members of the Commission earlier that -- that implied that the Japanese internment was not relevant to our current conversation. References to the Mexican deportation that occurred in Detroit in the 1920s, the internment, the McCarthy era, spying on people's neighbors are frequently heard at our New Detroit Multi-cultural meetings.

This area is home to a large number of Arabs and Caldians and statistics regarding detention,

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

secret evidence, loss of due process for immigrants are much more than just numbers to the people in this These numbers are our friends, our relatives of area. There is an friends of people that we know. overriding concern regarding this systemic attack on civil rights, specifically efforts like TIP which encourage reporting on one's neighbors and legislation that is coming down the pike and in some cases, I gather, are already here, allowing wire tapping and other invasive investigations.

According to the United States Census, unfortunately, you probably already know that this area is the most residentially segregated in the country. We have therefore long experience with problems like driving and shopping while black and Mexican and Arab and now certainly flying while Arab. Many of us have worked for many years challenging these barriers and injustices and we would ask the Commission to help us fight against any legislation that would exacerbate the mistrust that exists among people.

Thank you very much for coming to our area.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. Mr. Saleh?

MR. SALEH: I actually want to reaffirm

our thanks to the Commission for the efforts, since you do on an annual basis and coming is especially heart warming that you are coming out to the community and we know that if I might understand it correctly, this is one of your first ventures out to meet in the community and we would strongly encourage you to do it again in other cities throughout the country, that it really is a positive thing to be able to have this interchange and see the Commission and its serious deliberations. I think more and more American people should be exposed to that. It shouldn't be hidden away in meetings in Washington, D.C.

The Commission has heard substantial testimony today and has heard from other State Advisory Committees and then from members of the community here and then Roland and Sue, and for me to add to that would just be redundant and I don't want to do that.

I just would like to say from my particular perspective, the issue of putting civil rights as a major effort in every program is integral for the continued well being and existence of our country. As one Member of the Commission said, isn't the primary duty of the country to protect its citizens? Yes, and an equal primary duty of the

24

25

government is to protect the welfare and the civil rights of its citizens and to have an Homeland Security without having powerful as component relative to monitoring civil rights in that is a dangerous precedent. It does lead and could well lead to situations as embarrassing as the Japanese internment camps in the Second World War. unaware and we're not unmindful of the fact that it was 18 months after the bombing at Pearl Harbor that the internment camps were initiated. We aren't 18 months away from September 11th and if there is, in fact, another terrorist attack on the United States, then such things can be revisited. This is -- while we hope it's a new America, it's not the same America. The history of racism in this country, it didn't stop the fourteenth fifteenth racist when and being amendment were enacted as we're all painfully aware. changed substantially Ιt hasn't orcertainly sufficiently since the SACs of 1964 1864 and subsequent legislation and these are issues that we have to be ever vigilant of in our country if we are not to lose those rights. And so we -- I really think that those are -- the Commission has the unique role to play in our government to keep that portion of our protection as all Americans need to be productive.

I thank you for your work. 1 MR. HWANG: May I add one thing? 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, before we go. 3 As an adjunct professor of MR. HWANG: 4 Asian American History of the University of Michigan, 5 we talk about internment, the internment experiment, 6 the concentration camps of World War II to this day 7 and there are a lot of lessons to be learned from that 8 sad chapter and to the extent that on the one hand 9 it's under inclusive because the German Americans were 10 not interned, the Italian Americans were not interned, 11 and yet it was over inclusive because there wasn't any 12 example of any sabotage by anyone who was Japanese 13 American and it encompassed 70,000 U.S. citizens. 14 Those are lessons not to be forgotten, that they 15 interned 120,000 people, 70,000 of whom were U.S. 16 17 citizens. There are lessons to be learned from that And we hope it never, never 18 sad episode. 19 repeated again. Okay, thank you very 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: much for coming. Thank you for all you do. 21 22 Commissioner Kirsanow? 23 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Hwang, first of all, thanks very much for coming. 24 You mentioned 25 that the City of Dearborn has a Homeland Security

office and the suggestion was that that was peculiar 1 in some respect, although it's my understanding that 2 many cities, I know where I'm from, a number of the 3 cities and suburbs from Northeast Ohio have Homeland 4 Security, maybe not offices, but officers. 5 Has there been any adverse impact that you 6 can define from the establishment of the Homeland 7 Security Office in Dearborn? 8 MR. HWANG: Not that I know right off the 9 Just don't have any information. I'm just 10 bat. wondering why it's created in Dearborn as opposed to 11 12 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Are there no other 13 Homeland Security Offices or officers in the Detroit 14 Metro area? 15 MR. HWANG: Not that I know of. Dearborn 16 is a suburb of the City of Detroit. Detroit, the 17 major city, does not have a specific office 18 19 Homeland Security, so the fact that the City of Dearborn which has this high concentration of Arab 20 American population chooses to publicly pronounce that 21 we're going to create and it's still in the process of 22 creating it, an Office of Dearborn Homeland Security 23 24 is peculiar and that's I think was the meaning of the

comment and the report from the Commission is that we

25

find that peculiar.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: See, the way I view it is, one way it can be viewed is you mentioned the Japanese internment and the Karamatsu incident, the Karamatsu case.

MR. HWANG: And by the way, it's been overturned, an apology by the President and the Redress Act of 1988, the payments.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I agree with Mr. Saleh that we need always to be vigilant to protect civil rights in the context of, even in this context, in the context of being at war.

I would suggest that Homeland Security may be one of the best ways of protecting civil rights because as you alluded to, I believe no matter how many laws we have, how many agencies we have, how many police officers we have monitoring civil rights, that if there's another terrorist attack and if it's from a certain ethnic community or certain ethnicities that the terrorists are from, you can forget civil rights in this country. I think we will have a return to Karamatsu and I think the best way we can thwart that is to make sure that there is a balance between protecting civil rights, but also protecting safety at the same time.

IX. Adjournment 1 Thank you very much. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 2 We thank you all for coming. We appreciate this and 3 will somebody move that we adjourn? 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved. 5 Second? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 6 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second. 7 Without objection, CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 8 Thank you very everyone is unanimous we adjourn. 9 much. 10 (Whereupon, at 2:00 p.m., the meeting was 11 concluded.) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25