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INTRODUCTION

The terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon on September 11, 2001 underscored several realities facing the United States. As the first foreign attack on U.S. soil since the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the event moved American public awareness into the era of potentially catastrophic warfare that some had long forewarned. The nature of the attack revealed the depth of hatred that some hold towards the United States and multinational corporate globalization. The American public realized it could not afford to be indifferent to world politics and the profound changes brought by development and foreign affairs. Additionally, the random attacks against those perceived to be Middle Easterners or Muslims within the United States on the heels of the terrorist attacks squarely confronted the public with the problem of ethnic and religious scapegoating within our own borders. In the few weeks following the attacks, the Council on American-Islamic relations had received over 625 reports of attacks against Muslims and mosques in cities across the country, and by the following November, the number of reported incidents including five deaths had topped 1,000.1 In the first few weeks, the FBI opened more than 90 hate-crime investigations nationwide involving alleged attacks or threats on Arab-Americans and Muslims from other ethnic groups, and the number continued to grow.2 Controversy over the practice of racial profiling in fighting terrorism further elevated these tensions.

Both the terrorist attacks and many of the incidents of domestic scapegoating were crimes driven by hatred and animosity, albeit on very different scales and on two different fronts—domestic and international. This article focuses on questions con-
cerning the domestic front: How can we prevent scapegoating from taking place in the future? How can we respond to such events in a humane and constructive way? What systems can we establish and what norms can we reinforce so that we mobilize our differences as assets rather than liabilities in order to become a wiser, more compassionate, democratic and culturally inclusive society?

The problem of social tension and fragmentation has a long history that will not be recited here. Counterproductive divisions and conflicts in the United States along the lines of race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and other identity boundaries have long hindered the fuller development of our society. In this article, I discuss the need for what some have termed a “human relations infrastructure” to address harmful social divisions in an effort to build a more cohesive society respectful of the differences that do exist amongst us. Although such an infrastructure would not directly address the larger problems related to international terrorism and foreign affairs, it would address a longstanding issue that is critical to our ability as a nation to withstand these and other pressures we face in the global arena.

The idea of domestic human relations is not simply a concern over social “harmony,” but it is both a practical and a moral issue. Amid the concern over international terrorism, human relations can be seen as a practical “security” issue. Racial, ethnic, religious and other conflicts we experience within our own borders greatly affect the social health and stability of our nation. The more fractured we are, the more difficult it is to respond in a civil manner to the threat of terrorism. More important, our diversity is one of the greatest untapped assets we have. We have a wealth of knowledge, skills, and insights about the world in our own backyard with vibrant immigrant communities across the country. The greater the participation in democratic processes throughout all aspects of society from education to politics, the more enriched our society will be. And the insights, especially of immigrants, are invaluable to well-balanced and experientially grounded decision making about domestic and foreign affairs that can result in greater global cooperation, mutual respect, safety, and well-being for all.

Our handling of domestic human relations is also a moral issue that reflects our commitment to basic principles of equality, justice, and democracy. Though the meanings of these concepts are constantly contested, our response to scapegoating and hate crime defines our future as a pluralistic and multicultural society while current and future crises test our social values. The nation is navigating the blurry boundary between protecting the people from further acts of terrorism and protecting human civil liberties. On the one hand, there are efforts to protect victims of domestic scapegoating and, on the other, there is intense scrutiny of the actions of those who are likely to be the victims of such scapegoating. This dilemma is the same one we face in our international response to the attack. Some argue that protecting our national security justifies restricting the civil and human rights of individuals. Others warn that harm to innocent targets in the name of national security can undermine our social values and generate greater controversy. In other words, how we respond to current divisions not only affects our ability to respond to global problems, but will also define the character and position of our nation in a changing global political environment.
The United States has clearly made measurable strides forward in the area of human relations and human rights over the past century. At the same time, we still have a long way to go before all groups feel they are treated justly with equal life chances. Meanwhile, new inequities and social grievances arise, especially in the era of increased globalization. The global movement of capital and labor over the past three decades has widened the divide between rich and poor families and between wealthy and impoverished places. New social boundaries emerge between winners and losers in this fast-transforming landscape. And to the extent that they are drawn along preexisting boundaries (race, ethnicity, gender, etc.), newly emerging conflicts reinforce old divisions and attach past grievances to new ones.

There is also a direct link that exists between hate activity and terrorism. Scholars note that within the United States, some overlap is seen between those who commit hate crimes and those who engage in terrorist activity. Lawmakers have already entertained the idea of expanding the definition of hate crimes to include one's occupation and affiliation as bias categories so that attacks, such as the bombing of the Oklahoma Federal Building by supremacist Timothy McVeigh, can be prosecuted under hate crime statutes.

In this article, I argue that we strongly consider the establishment of what I and many practitioners call a "human relations infrastructure" to more systematically address the issue of intergroup conflict and tension in U.S. society. I outline some of the major components that such an infrastructure can encompass. These ideas are based on existing conditions and an examination of programs in California, but can be applicable for other states and localities.

**OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM**

Intergroup tensions vary widely in their scope, intensity, and character. They take many different forms and arise along assorted group boundaries. Scathing against Arabs and Muslims following the September attacks represents racial targeting triggered by a specific event, though latent feelings may have preexisted among many of those who perpetrated those hate crimes. In the early 1990s, a wave of church bombings occurred against African American houses of worship in the South. The nineties also witnessed numerous high-profile hate crimes, such as the brutal 1998 murder of Matthew Shepherd on the basis of his sexual orientation, the brutal 1999 dragging death of James Byrd in Texas by white supremacists, and the 1999 shooting rampage by World Church of the Creator sympathizer Benjamin Nathaniel Smith, who killed two people and wounded eight others.

California, in particular, experienced a number of high-profile cases over the last decade. In August 1999, Buford O. Furrow, Jr., an avowed white supremacist, shot and killed a Filipino American postal worker after shooting children and care workers at a Jewish community center in Granada Hills. Arsonists set fire to numerous houses of worship, including the Congregation of B'nai Israel, Congregation Beth Shalom and Knesset Israel Torah Center in Sacramento, and the St. Mary Magdalene Roman Catholic Church in Los Angeles in 1999. Also, the state saw increased racialized gang violence among African
Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and Armenians that led to serious race riots in the California prison system over the past two decades. Tensions among business owners, workers, and customers in the economic sphere also affected the tenor of social relations within communities, as witnessed in the disproportionate level of vandalism against Korean store owners in the 1992 Los Angeles civil unrest. And many fear a growth in the number and influence of white power organizations, some of which have been implicated in recent hate crimes.

Hate crime data offer one empirical measure of the problem of intergroup conflict and social intolerance. It is important to note that hate crime data capture social tensions manifested only in criminal activity. Also, numerous problems are related to the reporting and defining of hate crimes. Nevertheless, hate crime data are useful as an indicator of existing social faultlines.

The latest uniform crime report, issued by the U.S. Department of Justice and containing hate crime data, shows 9,802 reported victims of bias crimes in 1999. The majority of these victims were selected based on their racial identification (56 percent). This victim category is followed by those of religion (17 percent), sexual orientation (16 percent), ethnicity and national origin (11 percent), and disability (.5 percent). Among the 5,485 race-bias incidents, two-thirds of victims were African American (67 percent) followed by White (18 percent), Multiracial (7 percent), Asian/Pacific Islander (7 percent), and American Indian/Alaskan Native (1 percent). Of the 1,040 ethnicity- and national origin-bias victims, most (56 percent) were anti-Hispanic. Anti-Jewish bias accounted for 76 percent of the 1,686 religious-bias victims. And anti-male homosexual accounted for 69 percent of victims of 1,558 sexual orientation-bias victims. Intimidation was the most frequently reported hate crime (35 percent) followed by property destruction/damage/vandalism (29 percent), simple assault (19 percent), aggravated assault (12 percent) and other crimes (5 percent), including 17 murders. Of the 9,301 separate offenses reported nationally, California accounted for 2,295 or 25 percent of the reported total, as well as four of the seventeen murders.

THE CONCEPT OF A HUMAN RELATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE

A growing cadre of professional "human relations specialists" have the goal of promoting equality, civil liberties, respect for difference, and tolerance and mutual understanding among individuals and groups. They work in organizations such as local human relations commissions, anti-defamation leagues, community relations agencies, and nonprofit organizations specializing in intergroup relations, civil rights, and human rights. Their work entails problem assessment, conflict mediation, dispute resolution, collaborative planning, shuttle diplomacy, community organizing, program innovation, media and public relations, diversity education, curriculum development, political mobilization, issue advocacy, institution building, and organizational capacity building. These activities have been taking place primarily at the local level. From local human relations and human rights
commissions to federal agencies, such as the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice, these entities have intervened in countless conflicts with scarce resources.

In California, there are 64 city and county human relations commissions. Many have developed strategic plans and have joined networks like the statewide California Association of Human Relations Organizations (CAHRO). Many are also part of regional networks, such as the Human Relations Mutual Assistance Consortium (HRMAC) in Los Angeles County. Some have formal agreements outlining areas of cooperation between government agencies. Human relations commissions in California often work closely with local civil rights groups, such as the Coalition for Civil Rights in San Francisco, the San Diego Interagency Coalition for Human Rights, and the Multicultural Collaborative in Los Angeles.

These practitioners and organizations provide a foundation for what some in the field have called a human relations infrastructure. The term infrastructure implies a system comprised of institutions, networks, policies, programs, and resources to facilitate a particular set of activities. Our transportation infrastructure, for example, comprises government and nongovernment agencies, a network of roads and highways, a set of rules and laws governing various modes of transportation, and specialized agencies for planning and physical maintenance along with public norms of utilization that facilitate the movement of people and goods. There is coordination between governmental agencies, such as the federal and state Departments of Transportation, Departments of Motor Vehicles, and nongovernment agencies, such as the Automobile Association of America. And, there is a shared protocol for how the infrastructure can and should be utilized, by whom, and for what purposes. Infrastructures are constantly maintained and developed, receiving retooling as technology and change demand.

We can think of a human relations infrastructure in a similar manner—as a set of institutions, networks, policies, programs, practices, and resources that can facilitate the healthy resolution and mediation of intergroup differences. Broadly speaking, the purpose of a human relations infrastructure is:

- to promote cooperative, healthy, and enriching intergroup relations among diverse populations;

- to increase the capacity of communities and institutions to constructively address intergroup conflicts; and

- to strengthen civic engagement toward an inclusive, democratic, diverse, and multicultural civil society

In developing an infrastructure for intergroup relations, some specific questions we face are as follows: What would a fully developed human relations infrastructure look like? What range of problems would it serve? Who would manage it? And who would use it?
Developing such an infrastructure begins with a better understanding of the problem, a clear vision of the desired future with defined goals and objectives, an understanding of existing policy and programmatic tools, and a participatory framework for planning. Developing this understanding through public deliberation and strategic planning is important to do at the local level. This has already led to the introduction of new policy tools at the state and federal levels, such as hate crime legislation and support for training. Eventually, the necessary components can be put in place to resemble more of an infrastructure than the current patchwork of programs. The next section offers some initial ideas for such public deliberation as localities articulate their vision and engage in planning processes to address issues of intergroup relations, hate crimes, and intergroup conflict.

COMPONENTS OF A HUMAN RELATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE

We can think about a human relations infrastructure as an operational system comprising three major components: (a) structure and coordination; (b) policy, programmatic, and procedural tools; and (c) social capital and material resources. This section will outline the three components and discuss how they can be utilized for conflict intervention and prevention.

Many of these ideas are drawn from existing sources and practices. Published sources include the California Governor’s Advisory Panel on Hate Groups’ A Final Report (2000); the U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, and the National Association of Attorneys General’s Protecting Students from Harassment and Hate Crime: A Guide for Schools (1999), and the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance publication, A Policymaker’s Guide to Hate Crimes (1997). (See insert for list of published resources.)

STRUCTURE AND COORDINATION

Presently, there is no permanent comprehensive plan to coordinate the deployment of government agencies in response to hate crimes or intergroup conflict. There is also no formal structure to address the myriad of intergroup relations issues at the state level of government. However, numerous agencies do address the current problems as mentioned before. They include monitoring agencies, victim assistance centers, trained law enforcement personnel, human relations and human rights commissions, civil rights organizations, and the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice. Official responses to intergroup conflicts at the local level are usually led by local police departments, who may work with other law enforcement agencies. In more volatile cases, other government and private agencies along with political and community leaders may get involved. Although the network of service providers has grown, the lack of coordination and adequate resources has, in some cases, caused greater confusion and frustration.

An organizational structure and set of procedures to coordinate and oversee the activities of relevant agencies and organizations form the skeleton of any so-
cial infrastructure. Depending on the nature of the problem, the appropriate team of professionals, community groups, and civic leaders can be deployed to the field to leverage their effectiveness with a collaborative response. Thus, a variety of organizations can be mobilized, including law enforcement, educational, business, social welfare, media, political, and community organizations.

1. **Oversight and structure**—An infrastructure requires an oversight body at the three levels of government: local, state, and federal. An infrastructure is defined by lines of authority and communication, specific powers and responsibilities, and protocols for the use of those powers and fulfillment of responsibilities. New legislation can assign appropriate powers, authorities, and resources to establish a more formalized structure and a more comprehensive set of programs. In California, this can include the creation of a fully staffed state agency responsible for hate crimes, intergroup conflict, and community relations along with a network of locally-based human relations commissions.

2. **Centralized information gathering and monitoring**—A statewide information-gathering and monitoring system is important to coordinate and design appropriate responses. A standardized database system can house relevant information on the scope and nature of the problem, the responses to those problems, the results of interventions, inventory of resources, and longitudinal trends and patterns. Data sources include hate crime statistics, media accounts, citizen reports, law enforcement investigations, hotline records, resource directories, and human relations agency field reports. Protocols for information sharing and database management could regulate the optimum use of and access to these data (e.g., a centralized database, real-time data, and the support of a geographic information system).

3. **Human relations commissions storefronts**—Local and regional human relations commission offices are needed across the state. City, county, and regional storefronts can provide public access and visibility with trained staff and permanent facilities for sustained work, especially in high demand areas. Virtual web-based storefronts, hotlines, and affiliated organizational facilities can provide additional access to services of the infrastructure.

4. **Long-term planning**—Strategic planning and other types of long-term planning can ensure that activities at various levels of government (e.g., local, state, and federal) and various government agencies are in sync with one another. Periodic planning also ensures that activities stay attuned to the changing social and political landscape. Collaborative
planning methods are useful tools for consensus building and can lead to improved methods, procedures, and approaches.

5. **Training and capacity building institutes**—Permanent institutes sponsored by government agencies or private institutions, including universities, can provide greater support for training, curriculum development, research, and programmatic innovation to support this growing profession. Additional conferences that specialize in specific areas of human relations can also deepen institutional capacity.

6. **Interagency coordination and referral**—Interagency coordination is required at all levels, from problem assessment, program and policy design, and advocacy to implementation, and evaluation. Within law enforcement agencies, some have established vertical coordination to investigate and prosecute hate crimes. Regional “hate crime response networks” and local “rapid response teams” can be especially helpful for immediate intervention in hot spots. Also, a well-publicized referral system can more systematically link health, human services, law enforcement, youth, recreation, civic, education, media, civil rights, and business organizations to the range of specialized human relations services.

**POLICY, PROGRAMMATIC, AND PROCEDURAL TOOLS**

There is currently a variety of policy, programmatic, and procedural tools that can be employed to address the problem of intergroup conflict. Current policies mainly consist of various civil and criminal laws including hate crime statutes. A wide range of programmatic tools include educational curricula, media campaigns, language services, counseling, conflict mediation and arbitration, monitoring procedures, youth activities, specialized health services, and various areas of technical assistance to name a few. And procedural tools include the creation of inclusive, democratic, and deliberative decision-making and implementation processes that encourage cooperative rather than adversarial relations among groups and individuals.

Some of these tools already exist in some form. In California, there are policies that address extreme forms of social conflict, such as criminal laws relating to hate crimes, civil statutes, paramilitary statutes, and laws against “paper terrorism.” For example, the state may prosecute bias-motivated crimes as misdemeanors or felonies and can impose sentencing penalty enhancements for offenders convicted of hate crime. Hate crimes include those crimes for which the motivation for harm is based on the victim’s actual or perceived race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, mental and physical disability, or handicap. In civil cases, the state and private individuals may file for civil damages and injunctive relief for bias-motivated behavior or intimidation. The main civil statutes used in California are the Ralph Act and the Bane Act. California also has statutes that restrict paramilitary activity and “paper terrorism.” The statutes regulate the activity of paramilitary groups by making it illegal to assemble as a paramilitary organization for...
the purpose of weapons practice or to engage in teaching or demonstration activities related to firearms and explosives intended to cause or further civil disorder.\footnote{13}

In the field of education, initiatives include teacher training, credential requirements, curricular mandates, and special programs, such as conflict resolution and partnerships with law enforcement and community organizations. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) establishes credential requirements, including a "Diversity and Equity" requirement for all programs and subject matter areas. These mandate all teacher education programs to promote educational equity for equal access to program content and career options. More specific mandates for social science teachers are designed to promote an understanding and appreciation for human rights and diverse civilizations. Many school districts require the Cross-cultural, Language, and Academic Development (CLAD) certificate, enhancing teachers' understanding of diversity and cross-cultural interactions. And several state initiatives have been established to support school-related conflict resolution and safety programs.\footnote{14}

There are other state and federal programs that address domestic intergroup relations. Federal initiatives are primarily housed under the U.S. Department of Education, Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Justice Department's Office for Victims of Crime, and the Justice Department's Community Relations Service. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms are also assigned to address hate group activity. Only a few state agencies have been established to assist in hate crime monitoring, investigation, prosecution, and training, such as the State of New Jersey's Office of Bias Crime and Community Relations. According to the Governor's Advisory Panel on Hate Groups, the California Attorney General formed a Civil Rights Commission on Hate Crimes and instituted a Department of Justice Rapid Response Protocol.

Though there are fewer initiatives in the procedural realm, many of these organizations provide alternative dispute resolution services, mediation training, and facilitation of participatory planning processes to encourage collaborative problem solving. The U.S. legal system and the policy-making system consist of largely adversarial and competitive processes that oftentimes encourage conflict rather than build cooperative relations. However, we can do a great deal of retooling to create deliberative, participatory processes within a democratic framework to avoid unnecessarily adversarial and counterproductive intergroup relations.

The ideas below outline components that are essential to a more fully developed infrastructure:

1. \emph{Rethink and retool decision-making procedures}—Many decision-making and planning processes utilize public hearings, courts, lobbying, and adversarial campaigning techniques to address day-to-day problems. Many of these processes do little to promote mutual understanding and often facilitate social polarization and animosity. Various procedures can be revised from the standpoint of creating processes that encourage cooperation, collaboration, dialogue, understanding, and shared vision.
Facilitated dialogue information technologies, alternative dispute resolution, and collaborative planning approaches are just a few of the techniques that can be used in creating a different kind of process.

2. Establish a legal infrastructure for hate crime response—Important suggestions have been made to strengthen California laws to restrict hate activity and improve intergroup relations. These include the following: a) making violation of antimilitary laws (Cal. Penal Code § 11460) a felony instead of a misdemeanor; b) amending hate crime statutes to incorporate the “perceived” identity or “perceived” association of the victim by the perpetrator; c) adopting legislation to allow victims of “paper terrorism” to lift liens at minimal costs; d) extending the statute of limitations applicable to actions brought under the Ralph Act (Cal. Civ. Code § 51.7) from one year to three years; e) amending the Penal Code to provide penalty enhancements for perpetrators of hate violence; f) amending the Education Code and the School Safety and Violence Prevention Act to assist local authorities in implementing human relations curricula; g) amending the Education Code to require human relations training for teacher certification and teaching credentials; h) making the definition of hate crimes, hate groups, and hate incidents uniform in all the relevant California codes; and i) making hate crime reporting mandatory for all police departments.

3. School curricula—School curricula can reinforce values of inclusion and acceptance of difference, promote critical thinking, allow us to see the world from multiple vantage points, teach mediation and conflict resolution skills, nurture compassion and understanding, and encourage civic participation and collaborative problem-solving. Educational materials on the multicultural history of the United States, world religions, the struggles for civil rights and civil liberties, among other subjects, can lead to healthier social relations. Policy and programmatic reforms to strengthen competencies related to diversity and conflict resolution include: a) expanded curricular requirements; b) new curriculum on the prevention and treatment of hate crimes by juveniles; c) modification of standardized tests; d) specialized teacher training; e) revised requirements for credentials and certificates; f) revised textbooks and textbook selection guidelines; g) resources for additional curricular materials; and h) pedagogical innovation for these topics.

4. Campus and workplace security—More schools, universities, and workplaces can establish policies prohibiting harassment, violence, and hate crimes. Such policies include: a) the definition of hate crimes and incidents, b) reporting procedures, c) guidelines for investigation, d) identified actions
that could be taken by the institution, e) reprisals for retaliatory actions, f) alternative complaint procedures, g) referral procedures to partnering agencies, h) victim services, i) prevention programs with family involvement, j) guidelines for confidentiality, k) the dissemination of policy; l) staff training, and m) assessment of effectiveness.

5. *Law enforcement*—Law enforcement agencies including police, parole, probation, courts, and corrections are responsible for the reporting and investigation of bias crimes and incidents and for the arrest, prosecution, and incarceration of hate crime offenders. Programmatic tools include: a) vertical tracking of hate crime offenders between law enforcement agencies; b) procedures for hate crime reporting and investigation; c) culturally sensitive victim assistance; d) collaboration with citizens and community organizations in broader tone-setting and community-building efforts; e) enforcement of internal antidiscrimination policies and policies against profiling; f) agreements with relevant agencies for information sharing; and g) memorandums of understanding with school districts to assist with training and response.

6. *Media*—Media messages set the tone for public dialogue by framing and selecting issues. They can control rumors, deepen mutual understanding from various perspectives, and prevent the unnecessary escalation of tensions. Some methods to promote healthier human relations through the media include: a) specialized human relations training for reporters and editors; b) review of human relations issues by editors with human relations training; c) public service campaigns promoting tolerance and understanding; d) media series featuring the history, culture, and issues of diverse groups; e) communication channels between editors and reporters across ethnic and special-interest media; f) consultation with human relations specialists on sensitive news stories; and g) mandating the incorporation of "acceptable use policies" in internet-related businesses to limit dissemination of defamatory material and online hate-group activity.

7. *Victim assistance*—Victim assistance programs are designed to meet the emotional, physical, and financial needs of victims. For victims of hate crime, the fear of group retaliation and fear of victimization among members of the targeted group are especially serious concerns. Programmatic tools include: a) culturally-appropriate counseling; b) financial assistance; c) closer police protection, and d) neighborhood support activities. Public expressions of support for victims also send a message to offenders and potential offenders that these activities are not condoned. Well-facilitated public activities can help to heal social divisions caused by incidents.
8. **Corrections and offender rehabilitation**—Violent race riots and turf wars in the correctional system have become a serious problem in California. There are successful model programs to rehabilitate offenders that can be adopted in California that include a) counseling, b) educational curricula, c) service in communities that offenders targeted, and d) field visits to various religious and cultural centers, depending upon the offense. These programs are not appropriate for all offenders, but can be effective upon psychological assessment. In addition, personnel and operations policies can minimize racial conflicts and violence in prisons through the following: a) specialized training and supervision of correctional officers on hate groups and intergroup violence prevention; b) enforcement of non-discriminatory practices among corrections personnel; c) minimizing group competition for resources and privileges in prison; d) developing partnerships with community organizations in developing appropriate transitional programs in highly conflicted neighborhoods.

9. **Language translation capability**—With well over 100 languages spoken in some counties in California, there is a high demand for multilingual practitioners and for translators. This is critical for human relations practitioners and others who deal with intergroup conflicts. Several steps can be taken including: a) hiring and training multilingual practitioners in a wider range of languages; b) providing “translation on demand” services; c) providing workplace incentives for multiple language acquisition; and d) subsidizing multiple language training for practitioners.

10. **Workplace education**—Workplace-sponsored diversity education programs can promote healthier human relations that could trickle out to households and communities. Educational curricula can include both substantive knowledge and practical skills, such as cross-cultural communication and dispute mediation. Programmatic tools include: a) in-house training; b) tuition subsidies; c) wage incentives for human relations course credits.

11. **Antidiscrimination policies**—Enforcement of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, and sex, along with related laws prohibiting discrimination in housing, education, and access to services, address an important source of intergroup tension.

12. **Social services and recreational programs**—A variety of social services and recreational programs is part of the “toolbox” that human relations practitioners rely upon in drawing youth and adults away from hate-
oriented activity. These include the following: a) job training and apprenticeships; b) counseling; c) sports activities; d) youth programs; e) gang intervention activities; and f) cultural activities. Many existing programs can be retooled to promote intergroup understanding and conflict mediation.

13. Community strengthening activities—Neighbor-to-neighbor dialogues, cultural exchanges, community celebrations, block club activities, civic awareness programs, volunteer youth programming, mentoring projects, community clean-up days, public recognitions, religious exchanges, international food fairs, cross-cultural music festivals, and the everyday expressions of kinship are the basic building blocks of a healthy community able to withstand harmful division.

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND MATERIAL RESOURCES

Infrastructures are built on social capital made up of a foundation of knowledge and a set of requisite skills. This includes a foundation of knowledge about the nature, causes, and dynamics of the problem at hand. This wisdom guides the decisions and actions of those who provide services or who use the services of an infrastructure. What are the potential sources of conflict? How do conflicts escalate? How can they be mediated most effectively? And what is the most appropriate set of tools to use in any intervention? These are just some of the questions that practitioners would be required to answer.

Social capital includes a set of skills to both analyze and intervene in problems. Analytical and investigative skills allow practitioners to accurately assess the problem and devise effective strategies. Interventions taken without the requisite knowledge and skill base can exacerbate problems rather than ameliorate them.

An infrastructure is also dependent on material resources, such as facilities, communications infrastructure, and funding. Some of these resources already exist and could simply be incorporated into a more developed infrastructure. These include limited but existing human relations commissions, hate crime response networks, training activities, curricula, and so forth. In addition, new allocation of resources is necessary to create a fully integrated and comprehensive infrastructure to meet existing and expected needs.

1. State and federal resource stream—A resource stream starting at the state and federal levels is needed to develop and maintain effective prevention intervention programs specifically designed to address intergroup tensions including hate crimes and paramilitary activity in the United States. More specifically, funding and grants programs are needed for operations, training, research, program development, and capital expenses to create a stronger and more visible human relations infrastructure and to support partnerships between government agencies, private nonprofit agencies, and community organizations.
2. *Human relations training*—There are knowledge-focused and skills-focused training needs for personnel in the various agencies and community organizations actively addressing human relations issues.

The knowledge-focused topics for human relations training include but are not limited to the following:

- History and current state of U.S. hate groups
- Historic background of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation in the U.S.
- Historic background to world religions
- Social movements for civil rights, human rights, and civil liberties
- History and dynamics of social conflict in the U.S.
- Lessons from intergroup conflict prevention and intervention case studies
- Evaluations of existing policies and programs addressing intergroup conflict
- Survey of contemporary human relations issues facing specific populations

The skills-focused topics for human relations training include but are not limited to the following:

- Assessing intergroup relations and conflicts
- Investigative methods for hate crimes
- Mapping and analyzing hate crime data
- Providing culturally sensitive victim assistance services
- Community-based strategic planning for intergroup relations
- Quantitative and qualitative research methods for the study of intergroup relations
- Building human relations commissions
- Sustaining collaborative multicultural partnerships
- Organizational management and group facilitation for human relations work
- Dispute mediation among diverse groups

**PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES**

One of the most difficult tasks is to select the appropriate tools for the appropriate type and phase of conflict. Participatory planning by various stakeholders can lead to a balanced and multifaceted plan based on a well-rounded assessment, local knowledge of the problems and needs, and the identification of the most appropriate programs and policies and protocols. Collaborative planning methods can also engage stakeholders and potential participants in the development of an infrastructure. An early "buy-in" from participants usually leads to better implementation.
There are important distinctions to make in designing a plan or intervention, because conflicts a) occur along different and sometimes shifting group boundaries, b) arise from different sources, and c) pass through different phases. First, conflicts fall along different social boundaries, sometimes multiple boundaries. These include race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender, ideology, disability, and other markers of social identity. Boundaries of division can also shift or expand from one phase to another. Second, there are many different sources of conflict. Common sources of conflict include economic competition, supremacist ideology, homophobia, religious intolerance, discrimination or inequality, exclusionary political movements, and the promotion of threatening stereotypes. Sources of conflict can also shift and grow over time.

Third, there are distinct phases of conflict that have implications for intervention. Conflicts can escalate in both scope and intensity. They may grow in scope, that is, the number of groups of people who are drawn into the conflict. And they may increase in intensity, that is, the severity of the incidents that take place. Longstanding conflicts can leave a fragmented community, making it difficult for members of the community to rebuild bridges of communication and interaction. A fragmented community is vulnerable to the rapid escalation of future conflicts. There may be a strong desire to extend support across lines of division, but without reassurance of protection from retribution, this silent support may never be expressed. Without timely intervention, communities in conflict can become highly polarized. Victimized groups may leave the neighborhood, thus reinforcing legacies of segregation.

In addition, there are two types of functions that a human relations infrastructure can serve. One is the facilitation of immediate intervention to stop the victimization of individuals. The other function is prevention; that is, it can equip communities to withstand tendencies by groups or individuals to engage in activities that marginalize, dehumanize, or cause harm to others. Community strengthening activities are also important for the long-term development of civic engagement among people of diverse backgrounds. Prevention and intervention activities work in tandem to stop the cycle of conflict.

"PLAN FOR UNITY AND TOLERANCE":
RESPONSE OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMISSION
ON HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE AFTERMATH OF 9-11

There are many examples across the country where localities have assembled intergroup relations plans. Some have planned proactively while others have developed plans in response to the outbreak of conflicts. The Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations (hereafter referred to as the Commission) had an existing intergroup relations plan, but developed a more specific intervention plan, entitled "Plan for Unity and Tolerance," following the September 11 attacks to combat hate activities targeted against Arabs, Sikhs, and those perceived as Middle Eastern. The purpose of this plan was "to preserve public safety, promote tolerance, and unify county residents in the wake of the trag-
edies in New York and Washington, D.C." Los Angeles is the largest county in a state with an estimated 750,000 to one million Arab Americans. The plan outlines a three-pronged approach by a) mobilizing the community to prevent hate crimes against targeted communities, b) providing public education on the impact of hate crimes on victims, and c) implementing a media campaign. The following provides a brief summary of the Commission’s plan of action as written directly following the attacks.

Mobilizing to prevent hate crimes and discrimination—Law enforcement-related efforts include increased police protection of Islamic mosques and Middle Eastern cultural centers and service agencies along with partnering human relations commissions with key law enforcement personnel in charge of hate crime response. In addition, the Commission’s Hate Crime Victim Assistance & Advocacy Initiative partners were mobilized to provide assistance and education to affected victims. The Commission has expanded mediation services through existing and new partnerships. It has also solicited translators from Middle Eastern and Arab cultural and service centers for a variety of duties. The Commission’s Corporate Advisory Committee drafted a memo for use by corporate executives and community leaders urging people not to succumb to hate and hate activities, with a call for unity and tolerance. Letters were also distributed to religious leaders asking them to promote religious understanding among their congregations. The Commission’s School Intergroup Conflict Program is assisting schools with education about the Islamic religion and is working with the Commission’s new Public Education Campaign Against Hate to promote peaceful conflict resolution and tolerance through youth-oriented marketing venues. They also helped to distribute lists of referral agencies to local colleges and universities as well as to the general public.

Public education—A series of community events, including media events, were organized to provide information on plans to deter hate crimes and to discuss the dangers of thoughtless acts of violence and hatred. The events focused on a wide range of relevant issues. For example, a meeting of the Network Against Hate Crime outlined the Commission’s plans for outreach to the Middle Eastern communities. An event promoting Communities United for a Hate Free Tomorrow was held to commemorate the second anniversary of the hate-motivated shootings at the North Valley Jewish Community Center and the killing of Filipino-American postal worker Joseph Ileto. Symposiaums and candlelight vigils were held in many parts of the county for victims of the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C. Other county agencies also sponsored events, such as training on the Ralph and Bane Civil Rights Acts. And, nonprofit organizations sponsored numerous educational forums featuring films.
and speakers on topics such as the Islamic faith, the Middle East, and Middle Eastern foreign policy.

Media action—The County Board of Supervisors directed the Commission to launch a public education campaign using public service announcements to combat hate crimes. The Commission produced 30- and 60-second public service announcements that reminded residents of the long-term consequences of hatred and hate speech. The Commission staff has appeared on numerous television and radio shows to share their plan for outreach to protect the Islamic and Arab American communities and to ask for public support. Along with its various partners, including its Media Image Coalition, the Commission also undertook an “airwaves watch” to monitor egregious examples of inciting speech.

The extensive experience, vast institutional networks, and existing organizational capacity enabled the Commission to move quickly to develop and implement a plan of action. The Commission was one of only a few to release such a plan in the immediate aftermath of September 11. At the same time, had federal, state and local government provided greater support to build a more fully developed infrastructure prior to the event, much of the prevention-oriented activities listed earlier would have been implemented and may have reduced the number of hate incidents that occurred. Additionally, an infrastructure would have facilitated a faster and more coordinated response that could be implemented throughout all parts of the county on a more uniform and systematic basis. An infrastructure would also have been able to lobby for and manage additional resources necessary to respond with greater impact. The public visibility and leadership potential provided by a developed infrastructure could also have boosted civic involvement in prevention and intervention efforts.

CONCLUDING REMARK

One of the lessons that we can learn from September 11 is that current resources dedicated to domestic human relations are inadequate to match the scale of the problem. Actions such as those of the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations represent an important step toward the establishment of a more sustained and comprehensive plan to address the problem. The vision, leadership, experience and dedication of the Commission and staff serve as a model for similar organizations. Yet, these efforts are sorely understaffed with less than 25 human relations specialists to cover a county of over 12 million residents and 88 cities. Practitioners rarely enjoy the luxury of sustained attention to one particular conflict before another demands their more immediate attention. Most training takes place on the job as practitioners learn by trial and error from their experiences, though there is a growing number of conferences, such as the annual California Association of Human Relations Organiza-
tions conference, and training programs where practitioners share lessons and experiences with others. Moreover, most cities across the nation do not have a staffed commission of their own, nor do they have an intergroup relations plan or hate crime response protocol.

Anticipation of future terrorist attacks, whether well-founded or not, raises the level of anxiety among the U.S. public, thereby increasing the chance of discriminatory attacks against Arab Americans and those perceived as Middle Eastern who reside here. But this tension is only the most recent episode in a history of periodic (and sometimes sustained) moments in which hate violence and intergroup conflict has flared. Although there are pragmatic reasons to solve the problem, our response is ultimately a moral one that reflects our national character and our commitment to values of equality, freedom, diversity, and social justice. Events have created a window of opportunity to generate discussion on the topic of a human relations infrastructure and the meaning of these values.

NOTES


2  For example, an Arab American man was killed on September 29 in Reedly, California, and some Middle Eastern passengers on airline flights were forced to disembark planes due to protest by other passengers based solely on physical characteristics and religion. See Fitzenerger, Jennifer, “Family sees hate crime in Reedley homicide,” Fresno Bee, October 1, 2001.


5  Shuster, Beth. “Sheriff’s Department seeks solution to race riots in jails,” Los Angeles Times, May 9, 2000.


7  It is important to note that there are limitations of these data that include the lack of reporting by many police departments, variations in guidelines used to classify hate crimes by police jurisdictions, underreporting among immigrant populations and controversies over the definition of a hate crime that lead to differences among reporting agencies. See, for example, Balboni, Jennifer M. and Jack McDevitt, “Hate crime reporting: Understanding police officer perceptions, departmental protocol, and the role of the victim,” Justice Research and Policy, 3(1), Spring 2001. <http://www.jrsainfo.org/pubs/journal/past_issues/Spring2001/balboni_etal.html>
According to *Hate Crime Statistics*, 1999, published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 12,122 law enforcement agencies of the nearly 17,000 reporting agencies to the Uniform Crime Reporting Program submitted summary or incident-based reports reported hate crime data to the Hate Crime Data Collection Program. Collectively these agencies represented nearly 85 percent of the population.


For a list of resources, see *Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) Fact Sheet*, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime. <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/help/hbcfts.htm>

Sentencing enhancements range from 1 to 3 years for certain bias-motivated felonies, 2 to 4 years for felonies committed in concert with another, and 1 additional year if the defendant has a prior hate crime conviction. California also makes the death penalty available for hate crimes motivated by the victim's actual or perceived race, color, religion, nationality, or national origin. For a summary of existing legislation in California, see *Governor's Advisory Panel on Hate Groups: Final Report*, Sacramento: Office of the Governor, January 2000.

The Ralph Act protects all persons from violence or threat of violence against their personal property because of such identifying categories as their race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, political affiliation, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability or position in a labor dispute. The Bane Act protects individuals against the actual or attempted interference with constitutionally and certain statutorily protected rights, such as due process or freedom from bodily harm, due to threat, intimidation, or coercion regardless of the motivation.

California also has two limited "paper terrorism" statutes that make it a misdemeanor to file a falsified claim or lien intended to harass or dissuade police officers from carrying out their duties or to repeatedly attempt record a document after a recorder has deemed it unrecordable.

The 1999 School Safety and Violence Prevention Act and the Budget Act provided $71.1 million ongoing and $28.9 million one-time supplementary funds, for which school districts and county offices of education may apply. The State Department of Education has supported limited training of students to attend conflict resolution training and small grants for schools seeking to initiate conflict resolution and youth mediation programs. And the High-Risk Youth Education and Public Safety programs provide $3.6 million for two grant programs for adjudicated youth.