

HATE CRIME SYMPOSIUM

11th SEPTEMBER 2008: MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY, LONDON

SYMPOSIUM REPORT

Introduction

The need for a forum for interaction in the area of hate crime was identified through consultation with those in the criminal justice sector, in particular by liaison with Victim Support in Enfield. The problem of hate crime in the local area, and the prominence of the issue on the government's agenda meant that an arena for discussion and a catalyst for action was considered timely and appropriate. The symposium aimed to bring together delegates from multiple disciplines to engage with the current debates and practices pertaining to hate crime. The purpose was to facilitate the transfer of knowledge, expertise and experience and raise awareness of crimes of hate by providing a forum for the development of interagency relationships and information dissemination.

Four tracks were identified to provide a cohesive approach to the day. These were, victims' voices; criminal justice responses; academic/empirical; and international perspectives. The day was chaired by Middlesex University's Dr. Joanna Adler, the Project Manager for Forensic Psychological Services. Keynote speeches came from; Len Duvall, the Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority, Prof. Joshua Castellino, Head of Law at Middlesex University, Superintendent Paul Giannasi, from the Office for Criminal Justice Reform, Rachel Griffin, from Victim Support, Nathan Hall a Senior Lecturer and expert on hate crime from Portsmouth University and Rose Simkins, Director of StopHateUK, an organisation which provides support for victims of hate crime.

In order to facilitate discussion and provide a means of dynamic interaction, a number of workshops were run through the day, organised around the themes outlined above. They gave the opportunity for an open forum in which delegates could discuss the issues most relevant to them in a multi-disciplinary environment. These were well received and many delegates commented on the way they promoted a free flow of ideas and information between those active in the field.

Over 70 people attended the symposium, and the feedback was very positive, in particular for the use of the workshop format, and the quality of the speakers. Delegates and presenters agreed that the exploration of this important issue was greatly facilitated by the symposium. The opportunity it provided for cross-organisational relationships to develop was also commented on by many. It is hoped that the symposium will prove to be a catalyst for increased work on hate crime, and that the information and networks developed at the event will help generate continued momentum in the field.

Contents

- Introductory speech:** **Hate Crime: The Victims' Perspective**
Rachel Griffin – Strategic Development Manager, Victim Support
- Keynote address:** **Hate Crime in London: 10 Years on from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry – Police Response**
Len Duvall OBE AM – Chair of Metropolitan Police Authority
- Keynote address:** **Protecting Diversity, Engaging Rights: The Fundamental Importance of Hate Speech Legislation**
Prof. Joshua Castellino – Head of Law, Middlesex University
- Keynote address:** **Current Police Response to Hate Crime**
Superintendent Paul Giannasi – Race Confidence and Justice Unit – Office for Criminal Justice Reform
- Workshops:** **Workshop 1: Barriers to reporting**
Rasheed Sadegh-Zadeh – Borough Manager Victim Support Enfield
- Workshop 2: Investigation and Prosecution, with special focus on LGBT hate crime**
Hywel Ebsworth – Senior Crown Prosecutor, Crown Prosecution Service
- Workshop 3: Academic contributions to hate crime: view from the field**
Prof. Anthony Goodman – Principle Lecturer, Middlesex University
- Workshop 4: Approaches to police training**
Manoj Barot – Director of Studies (Policing), Aegis Trust
- Keynote address:** **Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose? Criminological Research, Professional Practice, and the Challenge of Hate Crime**
Nathan Hall – Senior Lecturer, Portsmouth University
- Workshops:** **Workshop 5: Hate crime: Making Communities Safer**
Elena Noel – Hate Crimes Project Manager, Southwark Mediation Centre
- Workshop 6: Hate crime: work in the Probation service**
Liz Dixon – Hate Crime Coordinator, London Probation Service
- Workshop 7: Hate crime in policy and practice**
Dr. Theo Gavrielides – Chief Executive, Race on the Agenda
- Workshop 8: The G-local face of hate crime and the Muslim experience**
Abdul Tanko – Chairman of Stockwell Green Community Services
- Keynote address:** **Hate crime: victims, effects and responses**
Rose Simkins – Director, Stop Hate UK
- Panel discussion:** Chair: *Dr. Andrew Briers – Police Service*

Introductory speech

Hate Crime: The Victims' Perspective

Rachel Griffin – Strategic Development Manager, Victim Support

Ms Griffin began by considering the place of the victim in hate crime, and specifically, whether she should focus on the victim's perspective or the victims' perspective. Opting for the latter, she then situated the work of Victim Support with respect to the 2006 Crime and Prejudice report. This was commissioned by Victim Support and considered, amongst other things, the support needs of victims of hate crime. Over 3,500 victims of hate crime have been helped by Victim Support in recent years, and the impacts on them were powerfully outlined. The effects were found across the whole gamut of types of hate crime. These included fear, in particular of repeat attacks, anger, and physical and psychological illness. In addition, restrictions in lifestyle as a result of the, often multiple, attacks was not uncommon, as well as the impact on secondary victims including children and the negative financial implications of being a victim of hate crime.

The challenge of reporting hate crime was also considered, and sometimes included specific issues dependent on the type of hate crime involved. Ms Griffin discussed the anxiety about coming out for gay victims, and problems around language barriers in those for whom English was not their first language. This last was particularly problematic as Victim Support historically relied heavily on letters to get in touch with victims. This has been changed in response to an awareness of this issue, and now contact is made by phone. Other avenues being perused by various agencies included online reporting and third party reporting, for example through libraries.

Ms Griffin then gave an overview of some of the recommendations which came from victims for improvements in services. These included improving access to Victim Support, overcoming language barriers, tackling the root causes of hate crime, and creating easier reporting mechanisms. Finally, Ms Griffin stressed the importance of partnership working, and hoped that the symposium would help inform Victim Support's strategy on hate crime moving forward.

Keynote address

Hate Crime in London: 10 Years on from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry – Police Response

Len Duvall OBE AM – Chair of Metropolitan Police Authority

Unfortunately, due to technical problems, it was not possible to record the content of this speech, and as such it cannot be reproduced here. Please accept our apologies for this gap in the proceedings of the symposium.

Keynote address

Protecting Diversity, Engaging Rights: The Fundamental Importance of Hate Speech Legislation

Prof. Joshua Castellino – Head of Law, Middlesex University

Prof. Castellino began by situating the debate in a wider context by considering why diversity is important. He discussed the breadth of knowledge argument, the concept of an equal rights culture, and the intrinsic value diversity lends to the health of a nation. He then moved on to discussion of the problem of 'hate' in multicultural societies, and its effect in undermining diversity. In particular, Prof. Castellino considered the genocide in Rwanda, events in Gujarat and those of September 11th 2001. Consequences of these included the short and long term impacts on individuals and society, including a short term rise in ethnic tension, and long-term impacts including isolation and the possible movement towards terrorism.

Focus then turned to international standards and regimes, including the human rights standards of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination. Prof. Castellino also gave consideration to the arguments for free speech, using the recent example of the Danish cartoons supplemented with discussion of Salman Rushdie's the Satanic Verses and the responses to its publication. Prof. Castellino then briefly discussed the concepts of freedom of expression, and the potential 'chilling effect', where speech or behaviour is suppressed because of the fear of adverse consequences that may result.

Responses to these phenomena were placed in an international context, and consideration was given to a variety of approaches. These included the proscription route, as exemplified in the approach of Germany, China, Singapore and others, and the use of prosecution in countries such as Australia and India, as well as the 'free speech' principle favoured by the UK, USA and Ireland. Difficulties in the prosecution and engagement with hate speech were thresholds i.e. what level of insult constitutes behaviour that should be engaged with and issues of due process. Finally the importance of tolerance, diversity and mutual respect were considered and the interplay between these principles and hate speech was explored.

Keynote address

Current Police Response to Hate Crime

Superintendent Paul Giannasi – Race, Confidence and Justice Unit – Office for Criminal Justice Reform

Superintendent Giannasi began by explaining his background as project lead for 'Race for Justice', the cross-governmental hate crime programme. The importance of an agreed definition for hate crime was addressed, with the definition used by the Association of Police Officers being: "any hate incident, which constitutes a criminal offence, perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate." Crimes which are encompassed by this include football violence, it was also considered whether rape and sexual violence should be covered by this included as incidents of gender hatred.

The victims' perspective was then considered and it was stressed that victims should experience the same standard of service independent of the type of hate crime, or their geography. The deciding factor as to whether an incident is a hate crime is the perception of the victim, or indeed, any other person. Also that the

importance of this individual perspective, rather than a Police Officer's view as to whether an incident is to be recorded as a hate crime was described as vital to accurate and appropriate dealing with hate crime. It was also stressed that there are minimum standards that should be adhered to with respect to the investigation of hate crime. Understanding the roots of hate crime was also emphasised, and it was stressed that people do not commit hate crime from 'day 1', there is a process of escalation and a consequent need to tackle bigotry.

Superintendent Giannasi explained that there are five strands of monitored hate crime. These include disability, race, religion, sexual orientation and transgender. These are specific offences which constitute aggravating factors to be taken into account in sentencing. It was acknowledged that there were gaps in the service provision. These include hate crime with respect to gypsy and traveller communities, asylum and refugee communities, transgender victims, and disability groups. Superintendent Giannasi expressed shock at the scale of the victimisation of this last group, describing the offending rate against people with mental or physical disabilities as 'phenomenal'. According to the Another Assault report, 7/10 people with visible, learning or mental health disabilities would suffer a hate crime attack within a two year period. This was illustrated by the tragic case of Brent Martin, who was murdered for a £5 bet as to which of his assailants could knock him out.

Workshop 1: Barriers to reporting

Leader: Rasheed Sadegh-Zadeh – Borough Manager Victim Support Enfield

Facilitator: Christine Tulle – Victim Support Enfield

Mr Sadegh-Zadeh's workshop started out by considering the definitions of domestic violence and hate crime, and moved on to consider issues around underreporting and the limitations of official statistics. The use of economic models was also outlined, for example where unemployment increases property crimes. Barriers to reporting was discussed, with possible reasons given as a lack of confidence in partners, economic factors, lack of know-how, belief that there's no victim or that they can afford it. The group were then asked their view on what other barriers there are to reporting. Possible solutions given included government policy and third party reporting centres, and consideration was given to whether they were utilised and their effectiveness. Further subjects raised included the 'reassurance gap' of victims, the sentencing of hate crime offenders, the impact of the media and the effect of the legal system creating an "us versus them" feeling. The workshop then split into smaller groups for open discussion, the subject of these group discussions included further consideration of the barriers to reporting and possible solutions including a lack of confidence, lack of knowledge, complacency, consistency across the board, and the fear of repercussions.

Workshop 2: Investigation and Prosecution, with special focus on LGBT hate crime

Leader: Hywel Ebsworth – Senior Crown Prosecutor, Crown Prosecution Service

Facilitator: Anna Gekoski – Middlesex University

Mr Ebsworth began the workshop by giving a general introduction to the work of the CPS, the background and origins of hate crime policy, and the Prosecutor's Code regarding hate crimes. He then spoke of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry and how it gave rise to the first piece of hate crime legislation in the form of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998, which created a number of racially and religiously aggravated offences. Turning to the main focus of the workshop, Mr Ebsworth noted how the Act omitted mention of crimes motivated by hatred of the victim's sexual orientation. This was remedied by the Criminal Justice Act 2003,

which put in place legislation around sexual orientation which allowed judges and magistrates to give stiffer penalties for such crimes, although it has since been criticised for failing to specifically address transgender issues. Mr Ebsworth then briefly outlined the work of police Community Safety Units in dealing with hate crime, and considered special measures available in court for victims. Mr Ebsworth rounded up his presentation by speaking about community engagement and how the CPS works with community groups such as the Greater London Assembly and LGBT networks, and has representatives at local events such as marches and carnivals. The CPS also has internal and external review panels to look at their successes and failures within the area. Mr Ebsworth ended the workshop by giving the group a case study to consider, based on a real case of hate crime against a transgender couple, which prompted a lively debate around the issues of definition and perception of hate crimes.

Workshop 3: Academic contributions to hate crime: view from the field

Prof. Anthony Goodman – Principle Lecturer, Middlesex University

This workshop aimed to address the contribution that academics can make to the knowledge and understanding of hate crime, its impact within communities and issues surrounding good practice. It drew heavily on fieldwork undertaken in Haringey local authority undertaken by Prof. Goodman. The findings of the research highlighted the importance of a unified definition of hate crime, and the lack of knowledge that those within the borough had of the current definition. Further, that there was low awareness around how and where to report hate crime which can lead to a low level of optimism that reporting these crimes will lead to change. The level of homophobia, in particular in secondary schools was pronounced, and there as a need for the council and police to ensure that such discrimination would not be tolerated. Recommendations from the report included a closer working relationship between the police and local agencies to promote joined up working and that the Council consider third party reporting centres.

A lively discussion followed the presentation from Prof. Goodman, and began with consideration of the role of schools. The need for schools to get on board and engage with issues of community cohesion was expressed. It was pointed out that the Department for Children, Schools and Education are beginning to bring out guidelines, but the need for Universities to address the issue was considered important as student groups have reported there are issues in this area. Discussion of policy by local authorities and other public agencies was described as progressing, however it was commented that the discourse of celebrating diversity may preclude a full and frank engagement because of a desire to avoid mentioning hatred. Some advocated for a return to the language of anti-racism to counteract this tendency.

With respect to research, the view was that not enough was being done to look at perpetrators. Problems involved with this include the difficulty of recruiting participants, with the best place being prisons, although it was mentioned that these may be in a different category to those who do not get caught. Research into the children of perpetrators and victims was also called for, in particular to consider the effect it has on identity processes and the consequences of having a parent in that position. The view from the Probation Services was helpfully explained; in particular that perpetrators often say that prejudice was not an issue. Also, that they did not like the label of racist, with the fact that it sticks out on a conviction record, for example in trying to get housing, being a contributory factor. Consideration was also given to the role of law in regulating behaviour rather than trying to change it, but also that in labelling a crime a hate crime, in some cases this helps family members come to terms with the crime because of the recognition.

Workshop 4: Approaches to police training

Leader: Manoj Barot – Director of Studies (Policing), Aegis Trust

Facilitator: Dr. Joanna Adler – Middlesex University

Mr Barot started in a very low key manner explaining about his history working as a police officer. He gradually built up, covering his personal health and stress problems. How he had tackled them, the role of his family and his wife's family in supporting him through a real time of crisis and how that had influenced the way he felt about his job. He then moved to bring in the Holocaust Centre and the work that they have been doing on educating about and challenging prejudice. He also touched on recent cases indicating hate crimes taking place within the police, as well as failures in policing of them within society. As Mr Barot built on this area, he began to tackle some of the inherent challenges faced by police officers who want to be loyal to the organisation, to the duties and aims of a police officer and to themselves. He highlighted the difficulties that targets and performance related pay have brought, particularly in how the police interact with young people and he spoke of how real are the ethical dilemmas faced. This led to some in-depth discussion on police officers' expectations of themselves, and of senior officers. Also, how perceptions of senior officers' expectations had sometimes led to new officers losing sight of some of the fundamentals of policing and how very difficult it can be for new/junior police officers to challenge practices, even when they see them to be not just contrary to police policy and ethics, but not necessarily effective either. There was also some debate of the importance of schools and what they teach, with very different experiences being shared. This lively workshop was enjoyed by all and ran over time as we tried to both share and progress approaches taken within the police and to consider ways to best facilitate improvements within new officers' training.

Keynote address

Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose?

Criminological Research, Professional Practice, and the Challenge of Hate Crime

Nathan Hall – Senior Lecturer, Portsmouth University

The background for Mr Hall's speech was the approaching tenth anniversary of the publication of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry which frames reflection on the last decade of activity in the field of hate crime. In particular the speech considered what we know, what we think we know, and what gaps still exist in our understanding of, and responses to, hate crime. This was posed as a series of questions which organised the speech.

Hate crime was placed in a theoretical framework through an explanation of Jacobs and Potter's model of hate crime which intersects the degree of an offender's prejudice (high or low), and the strength of the causal relationship between the criminal behaviour and the prejudice (high or low). Mr Hall then moved on to a comparison of the number of hate crimes in London and New York. A considerable difference was illustrated, with New York recording between 261 and 484 hate crimes per year between 1997 and 2004, whereas London recorded between 5,862 and 23,346 racist incidents alone without including other categories of hate crime. One feature which Mr Hall pointed out was the increase in hate crimes after the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry indicating the importance of contextual factors in hate crime incidence.

Mr Hall then went on to consider who is affected and in what way, and expressed the view that hate crime happens everywhere there are human beings, and, more broadly, that there have only been 26 days of world peace since the end of World War II. International responses to hate crime were described as varying, with some states in the United States of America reporting no hate crimes at all, and the view of some in Kazakhstan, that to stop recording hate crime meant that the problem went away. Nathan also told an anecdote from a Mauritian with whom he was working, who exclaimed that 'everybody hates the Creoles; they know it, we know it, it's fine!' The fact that hate crime is not new was emphasised, however, society's interest in it was described as a relatively modern phenomenon. Mr Hall also suggested that the situation is better now than it was in the past, citing the example of Queen Elizabeth I who ordered 'blackamoors' from the country.

Research into the causes of hate crime was described as under-developed, with one academic (Dr. Ben Bowling) saying that with the little research done on perpetrators, understanding becomes impossible. With others claiming that no existing theory can account for hate crime, such that each crime may be underpinned by different motivating factors.

Looking at what can be done about hate crime, Mr Hall expressed the view that there were no straightforward answers, but that it was important to 'take a step back and carefully consider what it is that we are responding to in order to ensure that our efforts are appropriate, effective and above all built upon solid foundations.' Finally, Mr Hall addressed the question posed in the title (*the more things change, the more they stay the same?*) and considered the extent to which 'progress' has been made in the decade since the publication of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. His view was that progress had been made, and was better in some areas than others. Looking to the community level was described as likely to be an effective route, and maintaining political interest and funding was key to developing understanding and dealing with hate crime as we move forward.

Workshop 5: Hate crime: Making Communities Safer

Elena Noel – Hate Crimes Project Manager, Southwark Mediation Centre

Facilitator – Jane Healy, Middlesex University

The aim of this workshop was to explore the experience of hate crime from a practitioner and 'grass roots' perspective. It drew upon the collective experiences of the participants and current practice and policy to consider the following three areas:

A) Look at the experience of dealing with those that experience hate crime and those who cause it, and the reporting and recording of it. Outcomes of this discussion included the instability of personnel and ring-fenced time for those dealing with hate crime, feelings of anxiety and worries about personal safety. Further issues were feelings of a lack of personal experience, worrying about not feeling equipped to report incidents and that personal experience can both encourage or prevent reporting. Concerns about the reporting process and possible repercussions were discussed, including staff worrying about giving false expectations to those who have reported incidents or are considering reporting. The lack of clarity as to who incidents can be reported to was also raised, along with the view that hate crime agencies were not appropriately flagging incidents as a hate crime on their databases which can lead to repeat re-victimisation.

B) Exploring working in partnership and possible barriers that may stop this from occurring. Issues raised in the workshop included political issues, historical and cultural issues, and the expectations of the Police. Further discussion was had on the court process and issues pertaining to disclosure as well as getting the message out to the community that it is occurring and its benefits. One issue raised was that statutory agencies were not communicating with other sectors on the issue of hate crime.

C) Looking at how repeat re-victimisation and whether it can be lessened. One way to reduce this was through the use of mediation services, developing a database of victims because of the need to highlight repeat victims. The fact that agencies need to deal with hate crime incidents before they become criminal acts was discussed. It was also considered important to highlight cases of good work and hone the resources available. In addition, to open and improve the communication channels between the different sectors and provide information to the community including the need to reach those who do not have English as a first language. It was considered that housing departments are useful because they already log incidents of hate crime between tenants / leaseholders and are therefore in a position to develop good third party reporting mechanisms.

The workshop aimed to generate lots of rich discussion about this important subject and what approaches are working successfully and to *'think outside of the box'*. It was extremely successful in achieving these objectives. Participants shared their own experiences, brought ideas and took away new ones, and networked with each other. They expressed their enjoyment and usefulness of the workshop in their feedback and many said they wished the workshop was longer in length.

Workshop 6: Hate crime: work in the Probation service

Leader: Liz Dixon – Hate Crime Coordinator, London Probation

Facilitator: Anna Gekoski – Middlesex University

Ms Dixon began the workshop by giving a short presentation about hate crime and the Probation Service in which she shared some of her experiences of working with prejudice and hate crime in London; looked at multiagency issues; explored what works in challenging offending; and considered some evaluations and evidence-based work. Her presentation was followed by the screening of a powerful video showing clips of offenders speaking about committing hate crime; pictures of victims of hate crime and their injuries; case studies; and pictures of hate-themed graffiti. The group then heard about the work of voluntary group RAMU who work in partnership with Greenwich Police, monitoring hate crime and encouraging its reporting. The workshop ended with a case study about the racial harassment of an Asian family, with focus on the offender and his punishment and rehabilitation, which included a prison sentence, drug and alcohol treatment programmes, anger management, writing an (unsent) letter to his victims, and looking at when he himself had been a victim. The case study raised issues for those present about the usefulness of victim-offender mediation and contact, with concerns raised by some about the potentially negative impact upon victims.

Workshop 7: Hate crime in policy and practice

Leader: Dr. Theo Gavrielides – Chief Executive, Race on the Agenda

Facilitator: Anthony Salla – Policy Officer, Race on the Agenda

Dr. Gavrielides began by outlining the work of Race on the Agenda. A social policy think-tank, it aims to achieve social justice through eliminating discrimination and promoting human rights, and particularly works with London's Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities. This is done through research, influencing policy and bringing people together to discuss issues including crime and anti-social behaviour, equalities and human rights and community cohesion. Dr. Gavrielides then explained more about the Restoring Relations project, a London-wide initiative aiming to reduce hate crime through restorative justice and encouraging multi-agency partnerships. The main findings of this project included the problem of definitional ambiguity, the reporting of hate crime and the difficulty of engaging with the problem in London due to the fluid movement of people through and around the capital. A further conclusion was that hate was a multi-dimensional issue, for example victims may be both black and from the LGBT communities, finally that the criminal justice system did not have an effective responses for lesser incidents of hate crime. This led to a number of recommendations, specifically, that prevention was the key to combating hate crime; that supporting restorative justice programmes was important and that building, maintaining and sourcing cross-sector multi-agency partnerships was key.

An instructive and wide ranging discussion ensued. This began by considering the gaps in current knowledge, and the fact that research done in the third sector and the community was not being disseminated effectively. Also, that policy, both in the UK and internationally did not offer sufficient legislative coverage for hate crime. The utilisation of restorative justice was described as insufficient, with mediation being mainly used in juvenile contexts but not yet with adults. It was also discussed that restorative justice is useful as a tool at a low level with respect to prevention, and should not be confined only to the other end of the scale. The view was expressed that there are not adequate mechanisms in place to operate across agencies, where there could be effective countering of negative behaviour before it escalates.

Discussion was then had on the void present when engaging with offenders, and that the national response was not sufficiently strong. Those programmes which are engaging with offenders are being run by the Probation Services in London and Liverpool. Consideration was then given to the view on who a potential perpetrator of hate crime may be, this was described as sometimes misconstrued. The view of some that offenders are most likely to be 'stereotypical' working class, white, males was countermanded by practitioners who argued that in their experience it could be anyone, at anytime.

Workshop 8: The G-local face of hate crime and the Muslim experience

Leader: Abdul Tanko – Chairman of Stockwell Green Community Services

Facilitator: Dr. Joanna Adler – Middlesex University

Mr Tanko explained the work that SGCS has been doing since 1999. His wide ranging presentation touched on the difficulties of engaging with young people at risk of extreme radicalisation and broader criminality; the importance of good communal relationships and the need for openness to innovation in how to approach the problems. He paid particular attention to the projects run by SGCS including, SEED, PROSEED and GRACE (see www.sgcs.org.uk for more information on those projects) and how SGCS had adopted a "triangular

approach” with the community, police, mosque, housing, youth and social services and, of course young people all being drawn into their processes. He spoke of some of the challenges faced by BAME youth in their part of London and some key events in Brixton Mosque’s recent history. He then went on to outline some of the ways of challenging young people’s preconceptions, in particular, how SGCS has successfully brought in a number of Imams to show people how to interpret the Q’uran in more traditional, less “radical” ways. He talked about the problems that can not be surmounted and how SGCS intervene at various levels of severity of behaviour including where (if) it becomes necessary to draw in the help of other agencies. He also illustrated quite clearly how important it had been to develop good relations with the local police, particularly in the context of previous perceived inaction from the authorities. After Mr Tanko’s informative talk, there was very little time for discussion however, most of it centred on how best to draw in young people. There was some sharing of experiences both from SGCS and other participants. SGCS’ work in mentoring newly released prisoners convicted of terrorist related offences was discussed as were the difficulties that many young Muslims feel in interacting with the Mosque, particularly where they have had previous bad experiences, or felt unsupported when in real need. There was also some consideration of the best roles for Victim Support and of the possible roles played by faith schools.

Keynote address

Hate crime: victims, effects and responses

Rose Simkins – Director, Stop Hate UK

Ms Simkins began by giving an outline of StopHateUK and its work. She explained that its main aim is to raise awareness and understanding of discrimination and hate crime, through encouraging reporting, and supporting the individuals and communities it affects. A wide range of impacts of hate crime were discussed including the effect on health and general well being, and the fact that some victims are living in fear and are effectively housebound as a result. Further effects include those on negative self esteem, homelessness and the loss of employment. These impacts were not confined to the individual concerned, and included negative outcomes for child development as well as impacting on personal relationships.

At a broader level, Ms Simkins explained that there was also a consequence at the neighbourhood and wider community level, including a lack of stability due to the short term occupancy of residences. The negative effect on community cohesion in the form of increased hostility, segregation and polarisation were discussed, as well as the creation of ‘no-go’ areas resulting from insecurity. Ultimately these cumulative effects were described as increased fear and misperception between people. These outcomes are not confined to the community level however, with schools, healthcare services and support agencies also impacted upon by hate crime.

Ms Simkins then went on to consider some of the challenges which face victims. Firstly, this revolves around recognition of their status as victims. Secondly, knowledge of the support that is available is not always easy to come by, and knowing that there is appropriate support, for example, to overcome language barriers and being heard is not as straightforward as it should be. Also, understanding that they may discuss the crime in confidence as well as appreciation of whether the response received from agencies is appropriate and fulfilling the needs of their service users.

Ms Simkins then went on to outline the work of StopHateUK which originated from a recommendation of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. Its day to day work involves running a phone line to provide support and information for victims and third-party reporters, and an alternative to reporting to the police. In addition it works at a face-to-face casework level to provide emotional and practical support, as well as working with youth and community services. Some of the outcomes of their work included mediation leading to the cessation of conflict; getting individuals re-housed and helping in raising the housing priority of service users. In addition, they have helped in the conviction and instigation of disciplinary procedures for perpetrators.

The presentation ended with an exploration of some of the ways in which things should move forward; specifically, that the profile of hate crime with respect to reporting, justice and its sometimes severe consequences should be raised. Additionally, that reporting of hate crime should be made more easily accessible, and that partnership working and accountability should be improved. Also that the system for engaging with victims of hate crime should be transparent and victims are kept informed of the outcomes of the cases concerning them. Finally, that work at a preventative level should be increased, so there is more work with potential perpetrators, and an increased understanding of the issues involved as well as individuals' and organisations' capacity to respond to them. Ultimately, that there should be an enhanced feeling of responsibility for the safety of those in our communities, so people may feel safe and free from harassment.

Panel discussion

Chair: *Dr. Andrew Briers – Police Service*
Panel members: *Andrea Clemons (AC) - London Borough of Enfield, Community Safety Manager*
Elena Noel (EN) - Hate Crimes Project Manager, Southwark Mediation
Bennett Obong (BO) - Project Manager, Race Hate Crime Forum
Trudi Sills (TS) - Community Safety Manager, Barnet Borough Council
Rose Simkins (RS) - Director, Stop Hate UK
Mark Welton (MW) - Chief Inspector, Metropolitan Police Service

The panel discussion covered a number of subjects in response to questions from the floor, these were as follows:

Q: If you could make one thing happen with respect to hate crime, what would it be?

AC: To raise the profile of hate crime.
MW: To increase the Safer Neighbourhood Teams because of their ability to work at a lower level in the community, and for more money to be spent on good community engagement.
RS: Increased working with difference with those who have suffered, sometimes for decades. Also, to overcome the cynicism that is sometimes found, with a view to working to make a difference.
EN: There should be a team of long-term support workers to work with clients, because of the long term corrosive effects of hate crime. Working with the children of hate crime perpetrators is also important.
BO: Should scrutinise the Metropolitan Police Service, whilst money is great, it presupposes what is done now. We should concentrate on communicating better with one another, on increased coordination between organisations as they are currently not in sync.
TS: Should work to keep the profile of hate crime high, and address some of the frustrations over reporting, as well as support victims from beginning to end.

Q: What have you each done to contribute to reducing hate crime?

EN: Setting up Southwark Mediation to engage with the victims and perpetrators of hate crime and its effects.
BO: Placing the Metropolitan Police under greater scrutiny, making them accountable, and enhancing compliance with best practice. We have worked to increase reporting, so it is recorded as hate crime rather than being downgraded to anti-social behaviour, and also in holding Borough Commanders to account where necessary.

Q: What causal factors are involved in not reporting incidents of hate crime?

RS: Victims believe it's likely to be too complicated, that they won't be listened to and are not going to be taken seriously. Also, some do not want to acknowledge being a victim.

Q: What should be done to deal with the issue at a young age, where victims often become perpetrators?

- EN: There should be greater engagement with schools, but there is not just one approach. The message should be communicated that all individuals have the right to live in the community safely.
- BO: The Ethnic Minority Achievement Board can be helpful in this. Also, Ofsted should be required to monitor how schools deal with hate crime in order to hold schools to account; this is being progressed at the moment.
- MW: There are currently 200 full time Police Officers working in schools as part of the Safer Schools Partnerships. This is an important resource, and helps with working with victims of crime.

Delegate & contributor list

Name		Affiliation
Jasbinder	Baddhan	London Borough of Harrow, Hate Crime Coordinator
Paul	Harris	Chartered clinical psychologist
Alex	Jones	Office For Criminal Justice Reform, Researcher
Mark	Leighton	Insp. West Yorks Police, Bradford South Division.
Philip	Read	Pacalis Associates
James	Riley	Office For Criminal Justice Reform, Researcher
Scott	Salmon	Chief Inspector, Surrey Police
Parwin	Singh	Pacalis Associates
Jennifer	Temkin	Univ. of Sussex, Prof. of Law
Niki	Nicolaou	London Borough of Enfield, Grants Administrator
Gail	Wilcock	Rotherham MBC, Community Cohesion Officer
Lynn	Walker	Gail Wilcock Assistant
Ian	Tyler	Insp. Herts Constabulary, Hate Crime Champion
Susan	Saxelby	Telford RE&DP, Hate Crime & Harassment Co-ordinator
Phil	Redington	Panel Member for YoT Restorative Justice
Aysha	Esakji	London Borough Hammersmith & Fulham
Gurnam	Singh	Coventry Univ., Dept of Social & Community Studies
Neil	Chakraborti	Univ. of Leicester, Lecturer in Criminology
Paul	Singh	Safer Wolverhampton Partnership, Caseworker
Simeon	Greene	Safer Wolverhampton Partnership, Coordinator
Marian	Duggan	Queen's Univ . Belfast, PhD student
Lucy	Blackwell	Voice UK, EA to J Project Worker
Claire	Hodson	Voice UK, EA to J Project Worker
Jonathan	Grey	Voice UK, EA to J Project Coordinator
Mark	Walters	Oxford University, DPhil student (Centre for Criminology)
Chris	Brill	Equality Challenge Unit, Policy Adviser
Marian	Liebmann	Freelance trainer & consultant in restorative justice
Shashi	Sedha	Race/Hate Co-ordinator, West Yorkshire Police
Lesley	Burton	Crown Prosecution Service, Director of Operations
Anthony	Kralik	Face Front Inclusive Theatre
Martin	Randal	Development Manager, Enfield Disability Action
Peter	Kelley	Researcher and case worker
Simone	O'Neill	Colindale Police Station, Diversity Officer
Susann	Savidge	Somerset REC, Asst Director – Harassment Casework
Ayotunde	Adekanle	London Borough of Newham, Domestic Violence & Hate Crime Unit
Sujeevan	Ponnampalam	London Borough of Enfield, Hate Crime Co-ordinator

Kaunchita	Maudhub	London Borough of Enfield, ASB Co-ordinator
Nicola	Rollock	Runnymede Trust, Research Consultant
Arlene	Hellens	Victim Support
Mashfiqul	Alam	Victim Support
John	Wiltshire	One-to-One
Stephen	Corcoron	One-to-One
David	Porteus	Middlesex University
Kevin	Stenson	Middlesex University
Rachel	Hurcombe	Middlesex University
Linda	Maslin	Chartered Forensic Psychologist
Golda	Smith	Chartered Forensic Psychologist
Rachel	Griffin	Strategic Development Manager, Victim Support
Len	Duvall AM OBE	Chair of Metropolitan Police Authority
Paul	Giannasi	Office for Criminal Justice Reform
Prof. Joshua	Castellino	Head of Law, Middlesex University
Rasheed	Sadegh-Zadeh	Borough Manager, Victim Support Enfield
Christine	Tuille	Victim Support Enfield
Hywel	Ebsworth	Senior Crime Prosecutor, Crime Prosecution Service
Prof. Anthony	Goodman	Middlesex University
Manny	Barot	Director of Studies (Policing), UK Holocaust Centre
Ruth	Barnett	UK Holocaust Centre
Nathan	Hall	Portsmouth University
Elena	Noel	Hate Crimes Project Manager, Southwark Mediation
Liz	Dixon	Hate Crime Co-ordinator, London Probation
Dr. Theo	Gavrielides	Chief Executive, Race on the Agenda
Anthony	Salla	Policy Officer (Hate crime) Race on the Agenda
Abdul	Tanko	Chairman, Stockwell Green Community Services
Saad	Mahmoud	Stockwell Green Community Services
Rose	Simkins	Director , Stop Hate UK
Dr. Andy	Briers	Police Service
Bennett	Obong	Project Manager, Race Hate Crime Forum
Andrea	Clemons	Head of Community Safety, Enfield Borough Council
Mark	Welton	Chief Inspector, Metropolitan Police Service
Trudi	Sills	Community Safety Manager, Barnet Borough Council
Margaret	House	Vice-Chancellor, Middlesex University
Jan	Williams	Dean, Health and Social Sciences, Middlesex University

Supporting organisations



Crime and Conflict Research Centre, Middlesex University

British Psychological Society and The Division of Forensic Psychology

For further information about the symposium, or Forensic Psychological Services, please contact:

Email: fps@mdx.ac.uk

Phone: 020 8411 4502

Or contact the symposium organiser, Sarah Marsden:

Email: S.Marsden@mdx.ac.uk