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The Arab American Institute is pleased to submit this statement for the record in support of improved data collection on hate crimes and related acts of violence in American communities. The purpose of this hearing is to “examine the Administration’s efforts to collect accurate statistics on and combat white supremacist hate crimes and domestic terror” and “discuss the impact on the communities most victimized and targeted by white supremacists.” This statement will focus on efforts to improve the data collected under the federal Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 (28 U.S.C. § 534 note) and promote greater accountability of law enforcement to the threat of hate crime, including conduct meeting the definition of white supremacist violence or domestic terrorism.

The Arab American Institute

The Arab American Institute (AAI) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization founded in 1985 to nurture and encourage Arab American participation in political and civic life. Historically, and as with many communities in the United States, threats of hate crime and violence, including conduct meeting the definition of white supremacist violence or domestic terrorism, have prevented Arab Americans from full participation in the democratic process. Despite

---


considerable progress, for our community and others, this remains a persistent threat. Recognizing the recent increase of reported hate crime incidents and escalating concerns over white supremacist violence, AAI devotes a considerable amount of its time and resources to promoting hate crime prevention and related efforts to protect communities from crimes motivated by race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender, disability, or gender identity.

AAI provides analysis of state and federal hate crime data submitted through the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system, publishes a comparative review of laws and policies designed to prevent hate crime in each state and the District of Columbia, works in coalition with fellow national civil rights organizations to improve the federal response to hate crime, and convenes working groups with community leaders to promote state and local hate crime reform. Later this year, AAI will publish its 2019 Hate Crime Index. AAI’s current focus is advancing efforts in Congress that would improve the data collected under the Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA).

**Concerns Relating to Hate Crime Reporting and Data Collection**

According to data collected from state and local law enforcement agencies under the HCSA, hate crime incidents are on the rise. In 2017, the most recent year for which HCSA data are available, the United States saw a 17 percent increase over 2016 totals, with 7,175 incidents reported. This represented the greatest single-year increase, not to mention the first three-year consecutive annual increase, since 2001, when hate crime targeting Arab Americans and American Muslims, and those perceived to be Arab or Muslim, surged in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

Of 34 reportable bias motivation categories incorporated into HCSA data collections, an increase was recorded in all but five in 2017. With 2,013 incidents reported, “Anti-Black or African American” bias accounted for nearly half of all crimes motivated by race or ethnicity, which rose 18 percent according to the HCSA data, while “Anti-American Indian or Alaska Native,” “Anti-Multiple Races, Group,” and “Anti-Hispanic or Latino” hate crime incidents all increased over 20 percent (251, 180, and 427 incidents, respectively). “Anti-Arab” hate crime,
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which was reintroduced into the data collections in 2015 after the category became “invalid” in 1996 and was eliminated in 2001, increased 100 percent in 2017, with 102 incidents reported.\(^7\)

As for crimes motivated by religion, which increased 23 percent in 2017, “Anti-Jewish” hate crime surged 37 percent, representing a majority with 938 incidents reported. After increasing 67 percent in 2015 and 19 percent in 2016, hate crime incidents targeting American Muslims decreased in 2017 but remained well above historical averages with 273 incidents reported.

The reported nationwide increase of hate crime coincides with a resurgence of hate group activity. According to the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), which monitors activities of domestic hate groups across the ideological spectrum, the number of hate groups operating in the United States increased for the fourth consecutive year in 2018, with “the vast majority of hate groups—including neo-Nazis, Ku Klux Klan, racist skinheads, neo-Confederates, and white nationalists—adher[ing] to some form of white supremacist ideology.”\(^8\)

Conduct meeting the definition of white supremacist violence or domestic terrorism does not account for every incident reflected in the annual HCSA data. However, that the recent increase of hate crime recorded in official statistics coincides with a reported surge of hate group activity and escalating concerns over white supremacist violence should be noted and not ignored. Moreover, an analysis of HCSA data would likely reveal many examples of hate crime incidents meeting the definitions of both white supremacist violence and domestic terrorism. For example, the mass shooting at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church on June 17, 2015, in Charleston, South Carolina, was reported as a hate crime through the UCR system by the Charleston Police Department and published in the HCSA data.\(^9\)

**Improving the HCSA Data Collections**

As noted on the preceding page, AAI’s current focus is advancing efforts in Congress that would improve the data collected under the Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA). First signed into law in 1990, the HCSA requires the Attorney General to collect data on “crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, gender and gender identity, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity.”\(^10\) The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) carries out this
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\(^10\) 28 U.S.C. § 534 note. Readers should note the multiple definitions of hate crime in federal law. For the purpose of collecting data under the Hate Crime Statistics Act, and in interpreting the quoted text accompanying this note, the FBI defines hate crime as a “committed criminal offense which is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender’s bias(es) against a race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender, or gender identity.” Fed. Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Hate Crime Statistics (accessed Mar. 26, 2019), [https://www.fbi.gov/services/cjis/ucr/hate-crime](https://www.fbi.gov/services/cjis/ucr/hate-crime). We can look to federal criminal law for additional definitions of
requirement through its administration of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program, which publishes annual statistics based on crime data submitted from federal, state, and local law enforcement.\textsuperscript{11}

While federal departments and agencies are required to provide the Justice Department with data on crimes that occur within their respective jurisdictions,\textsuperscript{12} state and local law enforcement participate in the UCR system on a voluntary basis.\textsuperscript{13} However, many states have enacted requirements for law enforcement reporting of hate crime and other types of crime to state-level repositories for criminal justice information.\textsuperscript{14} These entities generally perform the function of state UCR programs, which serve as intermediaries between the federal program and participating agencies.\textsuperscript{15}

As a result, agencies in some states have greater incentives to report hate crime than others participating in the UCR system, as those agencies might be required under state law to submit hate crime data that components of state government customarily transmit to the federal government. These discrepancies could have some effect on the provision of data from state and local law enforcement agencies under the HCSA. Other factors, such as the nature or existence of criminal statutes offering protections for hate crime victims, or laws requiring basic and in-

hate crime, which include: willfully causing bodily injury, or attempting to do so using a dangerous weapon, because of the victim’s actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability (18 U.S.C § 249); intentionally defacing, damaging, or destroying, or attempting to do so, any religious real property, because of the religious character of that property or the race, color, or ethnic characteristics of any person associated with that property; or intentionally obstructing, or attempting to obstruct, by force or threat of force, including by threat of force against religious real property, any person in the enjoyment of that person’s free exercise of religious beliefs (18 U.S.C. § 247); using or threatening to use force to willfully injure, intimidate, or interfere with, or attempting to do so, any person because of their race, color, religion, national origin and because they are engaging in federally protected activities (18 U.S.C. § 245); or, conspiring to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to them by the Constitution or the laws of the United States (18 U.S.C. § 241). As with all federal criminal statutes, prosecution under these statutes requires a basis for federal jurisdiction. For this reason, in addition to the high standard for conviction under federal criminal statutes, not every incident that is reportable as a hate crime in federal statistics would be prosecutable as one under federal criminal law. \textit{E.g.}, United States v. Bledsoe, 728 F.2d 1094 (8th Cir. 2006), United States v. Miller, 767 F.3d 585 (6th Cir. 2010).

\textsuperscript{11} Fed. Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program, \url{https://www.fbi.gov/services/cjis/ucr}.
\textsuperscript{12} 28 U.S.C. § 534 note. While federal departments and agencies are required to report crimes to the Justice Department under this section, hate crime data submissions from federal law enforcement are not incorporated into the FBI’s annual hate crime statistics report.
\textsuperscript{13} There are, however, incentives for state and local law enforcement agencies to participate in the UCR system. For example, allocations to States and units of local government through the Edward J. Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program, authorized under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (24 U.S.C. § 10101 et seq.), are based in part on violent crime data reported to the UCR program. \textit{See Dep’t of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, “Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Fact Sheet”} (updated Oct. 11, 2018), \url{https://www.bja.gov/publications/2018-JAG-Fact-Sheet.pdf}.
\textsuperscript{14} Prior to the 2019 state legislative session, 29 states had laws requiring some form of hate crime reporting or data collection on the part of law enforcement. \textit{See Arab American Institute Foundation, Underreported, Under Threat: Hate Crime in the United States and the Targeting of Arab Americans} (Jul. 2018) (discussion of data collection statutes in executive summary), \url{http://www.aaiusa.org/hate-crimes}.
service training on hate crime for law enforcement, might also have an effect. At the local level, some agencies have adopted specific hate crime policies and devote substantial resources to hate crime prevention. These factors are also worthy of consideration.

The intricacies of the national hate crime data collection system should inform our assessment of statistics published under the HCSA. Despite the reported nationwide increase of hate crime in recent years, we know that many hate crime incidents are not reflected in official hate crime statistics, including the killings of Khalid Jabara on August 12, 2016, in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and Heather Heyer on August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia.\(^\text{16}\) Furthermore, given that many states have not enacted protections for crimes motivated by sexual orientation, gender, disability, or gender identity, and do not require law enforcement to report such crimes as hate crimes through the UCR system, one can reasonably assume that hate crimes against these communities are underreported in the HCSA data collections.\(^\text{17}\)

Congress must ensure that federal hate crime statistics based on data collected under the HCSA are accurate, informative, and promote effective policymaking. The HCSA data collections represent a critical infrastructure and resource for assessing the nature and extent of hate crime, including conduct meeting the definition of white supremacist violence or domestic terrorism, against American communities. AAI recommends holding hearings that specifically address challenges to effective hate crime data collection, drawing testimony from issue area experts, affected communities, and federal, state, and local officials that oversee the administration of the HCSA data collections through the UCR system. Ultimately, Congress should consider legislation that would promote improved data collection under the HCSA and greater accountability of state and local law enforcement.

One approach would require the federal government to study the relationship between hate crime reporting of state and local law enforcement agencies, the legal frameworks to address, prevent, or respond to hate crime in those agencies’ respective states, and the policies those agencies have implemented relating to hate crime or hate crime reporting. This research would necessitate collaboration on the part of state and municipal law enforcement agencies, which would be required to report out on their efforts as a condition of receiving federal funding for hate crime prevention. Should the federal government publish a report on this research, the information provided would assist not only federal policy development, but also potential state-level reform and local efforts to acquire a better understanding of how law enforcement agencies are working to address hate crime in American communities. In addition to this framework, the approach would also authorize funding to incentivize hate crime reporting through the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), which represents a more comprehensive form of data collection in comparison to the antiquated summary reporting format, and state-run hate crime hotlines. This legislation should carry the names of Khalid Jabara and Heather Heyer.\(^\text{18}\)


two victims of high-profile hate crimes that were prosecuted by the federal government, but due to multiple factors relating to the intricacies of the national hate crime data collection system described in the preceding pages, were never reported in federal hate crime data.

Conclusion

Thank you for considering this statement for the record. We are grateful to the subcommittee for holding a hearing on this critical issue.