Written evidence submitted by the National Police Chiefs' Council

I am the National Police Chiefs’ Council lead for hate crime covering England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

I understand that you are carrying out an inquiry into Hate Crime and I wanted to offer the following information about the police response.

Executive Summary

We believe that the UK has one of the most robust legislative and policy responses to hate crime globally and has developed probably the most comprehensive data collection of any state. Much of our action builds on the response to the tragic murder of Stephen Lawrence and the report of the public inquiry that reported in 1999. Successive Governments have committed to providing transparent data about hate crime and we regularly publish criminal justice data and information from the Crime Survey of England and Wales. The police are working to improve the accuracy and consistency of hate crime data and we use our analysts to examine our information so as to help to prevent crime, bring offenders to justice and reassure communities.

Hate crime has been a priority for the police since the failings of the enquiry into the tragic racist murder of Stephen Lawrence in 1993.

We believe that effective police and criminal justice responses to hate crime are vital, but this is only part of the solution. A holistic response is needed, including effective contribution from state actors, civil society and communities.

I believe that it is important for all actors, including the police, the media, politicians and the Internet industry, to reflect on what has occurred over the summer period and ask themselves whether what they are doing is helping to solve or adding to the very complex problem of hate that exists in our society.

I believe that the UK has significantly improved its response to hate crime and is positioned as a world leader in this area. However, there is still a lot that we need to improve. Most notably, despite our data being significantly higher than any other state, the Crime Survey for England and Wales demonstrates that most victims do not report hate crime and there are many others that are reported but not recorded as hate crimes. Another significant challenge presented by the survey is that too many victims are dissatisfied by the police response, despite its prioritisation.

We have brought around significant improvements since 1999 and this has been achieved through a strong and collaborative relationship with Ministers and officials across Whitehall, as well as with other criminal justice agencies. Since 2007, we have overseen development within the Cross-Government Hate Crime Programme and I believe that this is an ideal model for maintaining effective relationships and
improving services to victims. All relevant ministers are represented on the Strategy Board, which coordinates responses to and oversees activity around Government hate crime action plans, whilst the relationships formalised through the Board are most valuable in times of increased challenge. This is particularly true for the police relationship with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). We work most closely with prosecutors, who attend our regional and national strategic meetings and through coordinated policy and training development.

A key part of our operating model is the Independent Advisory Group (IAG) on Hate Crime, which brings together victims, advocates and academics. They meet regularly and have representation in all relevant meetings, including the Strategy Board and my own national police meetings. Whilst democratic authority ultimately rests with ministers, we can be confident that our views are taken into consideration.

The hate crime programme was instrumental in the development of ‘Action Against Hate’, the UK Government’s plan for tackling hate crime, which contains many of our commitments for further improvement.

I believe that our responses adhere to a human rights based approach, it protects everyone equally and our aspiration is that everyone should have the right to live their life free from targeted abuse.

Whilst public concentration in recent months has understandably been on race issues at a time of enhanced tensions, it is vital that we consider all hostilities and particularly disability and transgender hate crime, which we know to be massively under-reported and are a focus of our efforts.

I would respectfully urge the Committee to consider the role of education in combatting hatred. It is obviously preferable to prevent crime than to detect it and too many people in our communities harbour unacceptable attitudes towards ‘the other’. We are aware of many innovative and effective educational programmes, not least of all the excellent resources developed by a partnership led by the CPS (http://www.report-it.org.uk/education_support). However, our IAG has repeatedly told us that delivery is sporadic and that consistent delivery is needed from suitably qualified educators, so that all young people receive the information that will help them become responsible citizens who value the diversity in our society.

**Hate Crime Data**

In the year ending March 2015, the police in England and Wales recorded 52,528 hate crimes which included (these add to more than the above total, as some recorded multiple hostilities):

- 42,930 race crimes
- 5,597 sexual orientation
- 3,254 religion
- 2,508 disability
- 605 transgender
In addition to the above, the Police Service for Northern Ireland recorded a further 1,419 including:

- 980 race crimes
- 79 sexual orientation
- 230 religion
- 117 disability
- 13 transgender

The Crime Survey of England and Wales suggests that in the same period there was 222,000 hate crimes, which means that our commitment to closing this gap is still important. 2014/15 was a promising year in this respect, as we observed an 18% increase in reported crime at the same time, as a similar decrease in the Crime Survey’s estimate of ‘experienced’ hate crime. The Survey also provides evidence that hate crime has a greater emotional impact on victims than non-targeted crime.

Whilst I do not believe that there is more hostility in the UK than there is in many other states, our recorded crime is significantly greater than in other states. In comparison to the above, in 2014, the USA recorded 6,385 and Italy recorded 596 hate crimes respectively. To give perspective to this disparity in recorded crime data, the Metropolitan Police Service records more hate crime than any country outside England.

This disparity in recording makes international comparison very difficult, but I believe that the difference comes from years of efforts to:

- Build confidence in victims to encourage reporting.
- Provide accessible reporting structures.
- Build relationships with third party organisations.
- Improve data recording systems.

I also believe that the shared definition of ‘Monitored Hate Crime’ has been an important foundation to our policies and that it has contributed to our advanced recording, particularly because it puts the victim at the heart of the recording decision.

We work to understand the risks to communities by monitoring and analysing local, national and international trends and events. This allows us to quickly coordinate a response, deter offenders and reassure those affected. It is also clear to me that some of the most isolated parts of society can be the most vulnerable and often the least likely to seek support. This is why we try to concentrate our active efforts on such groups and those who we think are most likely to be targeted.

One area of data that is difficult to obtain is concerning the use of enhanced sentencing by courts. I understand that work is ongoing to replace IT systems for the courts and I hope that this will provide us with more comprehensive data, as it can provide a clear message that the state takes a firm stance against hate crime.
Community Tensions

One of our recent developments in hate crime recording is that the NPCC has signed national Information Sharing Agreements with three key trusted partners. This allows us to share anonymous information and get a fuller picture of the extent of hate crime. Our National Community Tension Team also provides us with the ability to swiftly recognise rises in tension or to predict local, national or international events that are likely to require targeted policing responses.

In the past, we have detected rises in recorded crime around the time of significant international events, such as international conflict, terrorist activity and other high profile crimes. This indicates that those who have a propensity to violent hostility are more likely to act in retribution in the period after such events. However, I also believe that there are other factors that impact on reporting, such as the raised fears and alertness in targeted communities and the enhanced exposure in the media of hate crime services such as our own online reporting facility True Vision (www.report-it.org.uk).

Whilst each critical incident and the community context at the time means that there is some variation, we tend to detect a significant ‘spike’ of recording in the days following the incident and then a gradual drop-off in the following days and weeks, with ‘normal’ levels often returning relatively quickly.

There are other factors to consider when examining this data, notably:

- Many hate crimes do not get reported to the police and others are recorded but the hostility element is not noted and it is therefore recorded as a ‘normal’ crime.

- Conflict and critical incidents also raise the fear of crime and the perceived threat levels increase the proactive responses from the police and partners. Any of these factors may positively influence victims to report crime.

The latter point is noteworthy, as the CST and ourselves have noted signs that the increase in recording seen around the 2014 Gaza conflict did not reduce in the way we observed after the 2008/9 conflict, when we saw 4 years of decrease. We expect the 2015/16 data to be significantly higher than the levels we had recorded before the 2014 conflict.

In our regular exchanges of data with the CST, we noted a rise in antisemitic crime after the terrorist attack on the Jewish Supermarket in Paris on 9th January 2015. This would appear to be counterintuitive, as the only Jewish role in the incident was as victims. We met with colleagues from the CST to examine this rise and shared a belief that it was most likely a result of increased alertness and fear in the Jewish community and proactive engagement from police and partners, rather than being indicative of any significant increase in offending behaviour.

Raised recording in June 2016
June 2016 saw a number of significant events that all had the capacity to influence hate crime reporting, including the mass murders targeting the LGB and transgender community in Orlando, the horrific murder of Jo Cox MP and the divisions that emerged surrounding the referendum. In such times, we are constantly in touch with partners and we monitor for signs of increases in hate crime. In mid June we saw several indicative signs of raised tensions, including increased reporting through True Vision and concerns raised from partners and advisors.

As part of our response, I requested an enhanced national collection of data, including weekly returns from individual chief officers to highlight local hate crime data. These data, which are normally taken quarterly, were analysed each week alongside information received from our partners and were collated into a reporting product to inform policing decisions.

We believe that we are seeing some early signs of an abating in these increases, although the drop is not as clear or consistent as we have noted after other major trigger events, such as conflict in the Middle-East or terrorist attacks.

Some of the key information we took from this collection and analysis included:

- In the period **between 16th June and 25th August 2016 (10 weeks)**, **there has been 15,621 hate crimes reported** to the police in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (note: this figure is likely to rise over time, as some crimes will be reported retrospectively or where the hostility is detected during enquiries). This equates to a **28% increase** over the same period in 2015.

- **76% of recorded hate crimes are racist** and **7% were religious hate crime** and these two categories were where the significant rises were recorded.

- **63% of recorded offences are ‘Violence against the Person’**, which would include threats of violence and harassment.

- Weekly hate crime levels rose in the week following the Referendum to a weekly high of 1827 reports, a level which fell somewhat in the next two weeks, before **peaking at 1863** in the fourth week after.

- We note that The Referendum did not happen in isolation and it coincided with a series of terrorist attacks in mainland Europe, a factor which has historically led to increased reporting. The four weeks in August 2016, however, have shown a steady decrease towards pre-Referendum levels.

We will continue to examine all data sources, including the Crime Survey for England and Wales, to try and judge how much of this increase in recorded crime was the result of more criminality and how much was the result of greater awareness or willingness to report crimes, which we believe were both factors in the raised levels.
Enhanced Police Responses

We have enhanced our responses to hate crime in light of the raised tensions and this proactive activity has doubtless also contributed to the rise in recording outlined above. One example of this came in the days after the referendum, where we noted a number of crimes that had targeted Polish residents. We wanted to reach out to reassure the community and so used social media to target messages to Polish speakers in the UK. The below is a screenshot of a promoted social media message. It can be seen that the message and poster in Polish reached over 41,000 people and 808 interacted by either, sharing, liking or commenting on the post.

Building Community Partnerships

We have strong working relationships with many groups representing communities affected by hate crime, which we find invaluable in our work and part of my role is to maximise the value of these. Perhaps the most developed relationships are with the Community Security Trust and Tell MAMA, who are close allies in our efforts to protect communities from antisemitism and anti-Muslim hostility.

One key development in our relationship with the CST and Tell MAMA is the national Information Sharing Agreements, which were signed off in May 2015 and posted on the True Vision website at http://www.report-it.org.uk/information_sharing_agreements. The agreements allow for local relationships to be built with individual forces, which supplement national arrangements. They allow for ad hoc exchanges, as well as the national meetings that share information every 6 months.
We carried out a review of the arrangements in 2016 and all parties recognised their value. We have updated them and made efforts to agree similar arrangements with other suitable national groups, such as the recent agreement with GALOP, who support Lesbian, Gay Bisexual and Transgender victims of hate crime.

One example of the effectiveness of these partnership came when Greater Manchester Police worked closely with the CST in response to a violent attack on a Jewish boy in Bowker Vale in September 2015. They agreed a community engagement strategy and used CST experts to provide briefings to key personnel. This partnership was invaluable, not only in reassuring the local community, but also to counter some of the sensationalist public statements made by organisations and individuals who were often not informed of the complete and, often sensitive, information and intelligence available to the partners.

Another example was in Merseyside, where the Countering Extremism Unit has a strong relationship with community groups including both Tell MAMA and the CST. These partners have been involved in the planning and preparations for a number of ‘White Man Marches’ that took place in the Merseyside area.

**Guidance to Colleagues**


I have commissioned a Learning Needs Analysis from the College of Policing and this work is examining the development needs for all relevant police roles. As part of the development for this, and in partnership with the Crown Prosecution Service, we held a two day ‘masterclass’ training for the force policy lead and the area Lead Prosecutor. This training included input from our Independent Advisory Group and included table-top exercises based on responding to antisemitic, anti-Muslim and disability hate crimes.

**Examples of good practice**

**One – Golders Green**

One example of a positive response to hate crime, in this instance antisemitism, surrounding a planned march in July 2015, which was intended to take place in Golders Green, London, the home to many UK Jewish citizens.

The planned event aimed to bring together ‘far-right’ supporters to march through Golders Green protesting at the ‘Jewification’ of the area. It led to the prosecution of ‘stirring-up racial hatred’ by one of the organisers of the planned protest. The police worked with the community and partners at a national and local level to reduce the fear of crime and the potential for community disorder, whilst allowing legal protest.
Given the concerns in the community about the planned march, we wanted to maximise our messages to reassure the community that we were actively working to protect them from the antisemitic crime that they feared would accompany the protest.

In the weeks before the planned march, a complaint was made about the below material. It appeared online and was apparently linked to one of the event organisers. The perpetrator was arrested the same day and remanded in custody pending trial and eventual imprisonment for more than 3 years, having been convicted of stirring up racial hatred.

The Metropolitan Police Service led on community engagement activity and, alongside key partners such as the CST, they carried out extensive local community reassurance activity.

Whilst I believe that the local response was strong, we recognised that the event was raising concerns nationally and even internationally. We were concerned that the lack of journalists in court and the ‘sub-judice’ issues meant that the coverage of the remand hearing was not as extensive as we would have wished, so we supplemented the local activity by highlighting the pending prosecution.

The below summary document highlights the social media advert that targets Jewish residents of the UK. It shows that the advert reached 76,122 people, which equates to around a quarter of the Jewish population, with 877 people interacting with the article, by either liking, sharing or commenting on it. We use this cost effective method extensively, as it enables us to reach specific target groups for relatively small cost (£130 in this instance).
Perhaps the most rewarding part of the response was that a demonstration did take place in Golders Green, but it was a demonstration of non-Jewish local people. They stood in solidarity with the Jewish community under a banner of ‘Golders Green Together’.

Two – We Stand Together

A very recent example of a joint initiative is the work of British Transport Police colleagues under #WeStandTogether. A short summary is provided here http://www.standard.co.uk/news/crime/police-and-tfl-launch-westandtogether-antihate-crime-campaign-a3300126.html.

Three - True Vision (report-it.org.uk)

One of the key outputs of our response to hate crime is True Vision and, in particular, the web facilities that are a key part of our response. It is intended to:

- Provide information to victims, advocates and professionals.
- Facilitate online reporting of hate crime, including anonymously.
- Build confidence in affected communities.
- Provide a library of resources for local use.

The website home page receives around 16,000 visits per month and visitors view 6-8 pages per visit.

Since it went live in 2011, the site has:

- Had over 730,000 total visits to the home page (not total site visits but homepage only).
- Received 4,764 incident/crime reports from members of the public and NGO’s in the last full year of data (2015/16).
- Had 24,200 visitors access the educational support material developed in a partnership led by the Crown Prosecution Service.
- Been used to send social media messages to the pages of up to 800,000 people (per advert) and targeted specific groups defined by characteristic, interests, geography, age etc.

We will continue to develop True Vision and, during 2016, we will refresh the site, providing specific culturally-appropriate ‘landing pages’ for groups who may be better served by the site. Such groups include young people, internet users, transgender victims and Gypsy Traveller and Roma communities.

Through True Vision, we have funded the continuation of the ‘No Hate Speech UK’ initiative, which is equipping, training and supporting, predominantly young people, to challenge online hate, support victims and to report damaging or illegal material to hosts or authorities as appropriate. We think that there is much scope to increase this effort and to maximise its impact.
We are planning a counter-narrative ‘masterclass’ in late 2016, which will bring together Internet industry groups, practitioners and academic experts from around the world, to share learning and to develop a ‘toolkit’ to inform new groups in how to effectively counter hate speech, whilst staying safe and respecting the right to free speech.

**Education**

One area for consideration going forward is the role of educators, both in supporting young victims and educating students in the value of diversity, equality and shared human rights. Our Advisory Group have regularly told us that young people are among the most likely to be victimised but also, too often, they are the perpetrators of hate crimes themselves.

I understand the position taken by successive ministers - that this work is vital, but that it should be delivered by local strategies. Despite this, our advisors say that delivery can be sporadic and, whilst there are many positive examples of innovative work, I believe that more could be done to deliver consistency and ensure that every young person benefits. This could be achieved by more consistent delivery of educational responses and through the work of inspectorate organisations like Ofsted.

I would highlight the examples below of work that has been well received and seems to help educators in this task:

**The Sophie Lancaster Foundation** (www.sophielancasterfoundation.com ) who are led by one of our advisors, Sylvia Lancaster OBE, and deliver excellent training to young people, using the tragic murder of Sophie as the foundation for a very positive but challenging intervention.

**The Crown Prosecution Service schools packs** (www.report-it.org.uk/education_support) are excellent resources developed by a partnership led by prosecutors. They are available on our True Vision website for downloading and include all of the resources needed to deploy them in schools.

**Local Heroes** (www.lhdiversity.org.uk) is an initiative that works with local celebrities, including successful sportspeople, going into schools to address the issue of hostility and inequality that they had to overcome to succeed. They provide positive role models to many and help young people develop positive attitudes.

**The Journey and other exhibitions at the Holocaust Memorial Centre** in Nottinghamshire are excellent resources, which use accounts from the Holocaust to positively influence young people in an age-appropriate way. They pick out parts of the victim’s experience in a way that is easily transferable to modern day settings.
I hope that this information is helpful to you and your parliamentary colleagues and I would be happy to provide any further information that may be helpful.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Hamilton
Assistant Chief Constable
National Police Lead for Hate Crime