

A Case Study of the Seattle Human Rights Commission

Jung Lee

Master of Arts in Policy Studies Candidate

University of Washington Bothell



Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Purpose Of The Study	3
Background & Policy Problems	3
Research Purpose.....	5
Definitions of terms	7
Chapter 2. Literature Review.....	9
1. International Human Rights Principles and Human Rights Agencies	10
2. National Human Rights Institutions and Local Human Rights Commissions	14
Chapter 3. Methodology.....	17
1. Research Criteria	18
2. Data Source:	19
3. Analysis Method.....	20
Chapter 4. Results and Discussion	21
A. Brief History of the SHRC (from 1962 to 1990).....	22
a. Creation of the SHRC.....	22
b. From 1963 to the 1990s	23
B. The SHRC Activities from the 1990s to today	25
a. The SHRC in the 1990s.....	26
b. The SHRC in the 2000s	31
c. The SHRC in the 2010s.....	39
C. Human Rights Commissions in other cities.....	44
D. Other Activities of the Commission.....	49
Chapter 4. Discussion.....	50
Work of the SHRC	50
Other Commissions	54
Limitation of the SHRC and Suggestions for Future Work	55
Chapter 5. Conclusions	57
Works Cited.....	62

A Case Study of the Seattle Human Rights Commission

Jung Lee

Chapter 1. Purpose Of The Study

Background & Policy Problems

International non-governmental organizations (NGOs), governmental agencies and committees such as the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights have been created to address international and domestic human rights issues since the 1940s.¹ As non-state actors began discussing the importance of improving human rights conditions and monitoring human rights practices, many countries started incorporating international human rights norms into their bilateral foreign policy since 1970.²

Even though the United States started to look at human rights issues with international norms early in the 1960's, it took a long time until the US Senate ratified the International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights (1992) and the Convention on Torture & Women Rights (1994).³ Once Senate ratifies, the federal government becomes responsible for the consequences of not complying with the international human rights

¹ (Donnelly 1998) pp.9-11

² Ibid., pp.86-114

³ Ibid.,pp.86-90

treaties. However, the incorporation of international human rights standards was completely dependent on state and local government. Local government and agencies, therefore, have been critical in putting human rights norms into local public policies.

Some state ordinances and resolutions encourage local governments to take international human rights treaty obligations into account when designing local policy and practice.⁴ Without legal framework that mandates human rights perspectives in policies and practices, the lack of implementation and monitoring human rights norms (on both local and federal levels) has often led to human rights infringement. For example, Native American groups have claimed their rights of land, education, health and other issues for a long time but the U.S. has often refused to accept the recommendations from the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the U.N. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.⁵ The rationale of the federal government is that the U.S. has not ratified the UN Convention Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries and it has no legal responsibility to protect the rights of the indigenous people. In addition, the local governments have not implemented the recommendations and treaties to their local policies.⁶

Since the implementation of the international treaties depends on the work of local governments, local human rights agencies have taken important roles to promote

⁴ For example, the Washington State Human Rights Commission created a human rights framework to examine human rights related issues in the Washington State. While dealing with housing discrimination issues of farm workers in Washington, the Commission specifically used the UDHR Article 25 and discussed relevant state housing ordinances to further improve the conditions of farm workers. For more information, see (Kaufman, State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation 2011) p.93.

⁵ (Frontline defenders 2012)

⁶ Ibid

equality in policy-making procedures. With the core mission to eliminate discrimination and to change institutional structures to promote equality⁷, local human rights agencies have actively engaged in the policymaking process by exercising four major activities; 1) advocate human rights issues and policies, 2) monitor and report human right issues, 3) assess local human rights policy and practices and 4) engage in education and training.⁸ The work of the agency, however, varies due to the unique history and economic and social context.

Research Purpose

The City of Seattle has been an active and open community in dealing with social injustice problems such as racial segregation, discrimination and LGBT rights, though problems still exist. The City has worked with diverse civil rights and human rights organizations to address discrimination and human rights issues since the 1960's. Compared to other cities, the City of Seattle created a local human rights agency earlier and collaborated with the agency in dealing with civil rights and human rights issues. As a result, the City of Seattle started to create anti-discrimination policies in the 1960's.⁹

The research question for this research is as follows:

⁷ (Kaufman, State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation 2011)p.89.

⁸ Ibid, pp.96-101

⁹ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 1968) SHRC created the first draft of the Open Housing Ordinance in 1963. The initial ordinance was defeated in 1963; however, it was passed unanimously in 1968.

✓ **Research Questions: What are the roles of a local human rights agency in incorporating international human rights treaties into local policies?**

The main purpose of this research is to document the roles of a local human rights agency (the Seattle Human Rights Commission) in incorporating international human rights norms in the City of Seattle.¹⁰ This research will start by describing the necessity of creating the local agency (SHRC) in historical context. Using the cases that SHRC dealt with, the research will examine the four major roles of the Seattle Human Rights Commission: 1. Advocacy, 2. Monitor and document human rights issues, 3. Assess local human rights policy and practices, 4. Engage in education and training and 5. Other activities.¹¹ By doing so, this research provides outcomes of the SHRC's activities.

Another purpose is to research international human rights conventions and treaties, which the SHRC uses to examine existing local human rights problems and to change local policies. In addition, I will compare the usage of international standards at other human rights commissions to the SHRC.

Lastly, it will investigate the limitations of the SHRC as an advisory body and provide suggestions for further effective work.

¹⁰ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 1963) In 1963, the Seattle Human Rights Commission started its journey to promote equality in the lives of the Seattleites as an advisory committee to the Mayor. The information about SHRC has been drawn from historical documents at Seattle City Archives.

¹¹ (Kaufman, State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation 2011). pp.96-101

Definitions of terms

Since the Commission's work encompasses civil rights and human rights issues, it is difficult to divide its agendas into two categories. However, it is important to define civil rights and human rights; it is because this research examines how the Commission has broadened its focus into human rights over time. In addition, definitions of inward-looking legislation and outward-looking legislation help understand the focus of the human rights legislation and the target group of the legislation.

i. Civil Rights

Civil rights are given to citizens (and residents) institutionally and legally, typically within a society's constitution.¹² The basic civil rights in the U.S. are freedom of speech, press and assembly, the right to vote, freedom from involuntary servitude, and the right to equality in public places. These rights have expanded since the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights through continuous civil rights movements. Civil rights are considered to be institutionally enforceable.¹³

ii. Human Rights

Compared to civil rights, human rights have broader concepts and have been considered not to restrict basic human rights to specific citizens but to encompass all

¹² (Choi 2008)

¹³ Ibid.,

human beings universally.¹⁴ As outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 25 describes human rights as follows, “1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.¹⁵”

iii. Human Rights Legislation

Compared to civil rights legislation, human rights regulations are based upon international treaties, which are often not binding, and the legalization of the treaties are settled by individual governments. According to Burroughs, human rights legislation can be categorized in two ways: inward-looking human rights legislation and outward-looking legislation.¹⁶ Inward-looking human rights legislation begins with recognizing the need to implement international human rights treaties or standards—especially, international human rights treaties that are not yet ratified at the federal level—in state and local government. Inward-looking legislation attempts to bring active human rights discussions into local initiatives or legislation so that the legislation can provide more legitimate protection and governmental accountability.¹⁷

¹⁴ (Ryu 2009)

¹⁵ United Nations General Assembly. "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Geneva, December 1948.

¹⁶ (Burroughs 2005-2006)p.414

¹⁷ Ibid., pp.414-415

Outward-looking HR legislations try to resolve international human rights problems by regulating problematic practices within the state or local community.¹⁸ Burroughs explains that outward-looking human rights legislations try to resolve international human rights problems by regulating problematic practices within the state boundary. One example is Massachusetts Burma Law; it putted restrictions on the state's "contracts with individuals or companies doing businesses with Burma." The Supreme Court held the law unconstitutional in 2000.¹⁹

Human Rights Legislations	Definition	Examples
Inward-looking HR legislations	Recognize the need to implement international human rights treaties or standards at local, state and federal level.	Panhandling Ordinance in Seattle, WA
Outward-looking HR legislations	Try to resolve international human rights problems by regulating problematic practices within the state boundary.	Burma Law in MA

Chapter 2. Literature Review

To examine a local human rights agency, it is important to investigate the historical context of the Human Rights principles and the emergence of the human rights agencies. This section also provides what States and the civil society expect from these agencies and the structures of the agencies.

¹⁸ Ibid

¹⁹ Ibid. p.418

1. International Human Rights Principles and Human Rights Agencies

The International Bill of Human Rights has three key human rights documents: 1. the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), 2. the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and 3. the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The UDHR is recognized as a cornerstone in the history of human rights and is translated in 250 languages and has become a model to create human rights policies in many countries²⁰. However, some countries perceive the ICESCR and ICCPR differently; it is because these principles require more proactive governmental actions to achieve goals of the treaties such as creating new laws and putting efforts to enforce them.

Especially, US, one of the principal actors in drafting international human rights standards, has had ideological disagreement on governmental intervention and political disagreement in ratifying these Bills and other International Human Rights treaties. For example, Franklin D. Roosevelt affirmed the importance of economic rights as one of four elements of human rights: “the freedom of speech and expression, the freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world, the freedom from want and the freedom from fear.”²¹ During economic depression in the 1940s, Franklin D. Roosevelt tried to invent human rights framework that further ensures the socioeconomic rights in the U.S.²². However, as Lewis argues that the conservative party opposes to create governmental social policies, which aim to protect socio-economic

²⁰ <http://www.un.org/rights/HRToday/declar.htm>

²¹ (Lewis 2008)P.108

²² Ibid.

rights such as healthcare and education²³. It was also because the opposing party focused more on negative rights such as voting rights in the time and they tried to build different political mechanism that promotes individual freedom from governmental intervention.

While U.S. has hesitated to implement these socioeconomic treaties, many of the international countries have acknowledged the importance and positive impacts of socioeconomic rights and have fine-tuned their national and local policies according to the treaties. Since the 1960s, the need for an international human rights commission to respond to human rights issues and to mediate conflicts increased greatly after the newly liberated countries from colonization brought forward cases of human rights violations and raised their concerns to the international society.²⁴

Due to this increasing demand, many human rights organizations were created after the 1960's. One of the earliest cases of UN involvement in human rights was the creation of the Special Commission of Investigation in 1968 to investigate human rights violations. Another example is that the UN Ad Hoc Working Group on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile was created to monitor human rights violations during the Chilean military coup in 1970. In 1976, the UN Human Rights Commission was established to monitor the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights.²⁵ Also, in the 1970s, many new non-governmental organizations such as

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid., pp.9-17

²⁵ Ibid., pp.10-11

Amnesty International were created to establish, monitor and enforce human rights standards at the international level.²⁶

As the international community became more aware of human rights issues, many countries have understood the importance of implementing, monitoring, and improving the harsh human rights conditions of minorities. To further promote importance of human rights policies and practices, many countries started incorporating international human rights norms into their bilateral foreign policy.²⁷ For example, since 1973, the US started to actively integrate international human rights norms into the international diplomacy arena. During this time, Congress recommended that the government consider a country's human rights policy practices before awarding international aid funds.²⁸

The active discussion on the economic and social rights in the international level enabled human rights NGOs, advocates and legal scholars in U.S. to continue their advocacy.²⁹ NGOs such as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International actively engaged in documenting and reporting economic and social rights violation such as rights of U.S. workers in the meatpacking industry and the undocumented work forces.³⁰

²⁶ Ibid., pp.10-11

²⁷ Ibid., p12

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Lewis, 2008 pp.132-133

³⁰ Ibid. p.133

Judith Resnik emphasized collective state and local action as “a force for enabling state and local officials to influence national and transnational policy through integrating human right norms³¹.” Many scholars argue that local and state advocacy is a critical factor to “ internalize the international human rights norms and to support national implementation by countering criticisms that human rights are somehow anti-democratic³².”

The active advocacy work of NGOs and activists increased public awareness of economic & social rights and current problems such as lack of access to the adequate health care, housing and education in local community. Also, they began to design and to promote “an economic and social rights-based approach to U.S. economic and social problems in conjunction with existing approaches”; and began “to create pressure for, and lend additional legitimacy to, judicial interpretive efforts, legislative efforts, and administrative interpretations of the recognition and promotion of socioeconomic rights.³³”

So far, the United States Senate has ratified (1) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in 1992, (2) the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in 1994, (3) the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in 1994, and (4) the Charter of the Organization of American States. However, there has been intense

³¹ (Kaufman, State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation 2011) p.90. Resnik, Civin, and Freuh, 2008, 732-65

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid. p.134

disagreement upon the expected roles of government and the levels of implementation of the socioeconomic rights. It took a long time for U.S. to sign following five international conventions: (1) the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, (2) the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, (3) the Convention on the Rights of the Child, (4) the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and (5) the American Convention on Human Rights. And there are still many human rights agendas to discuss in local and state level.

2. National Human Rights Institutions and Local Human Rights Commissions

Human rights agencies often have different models, different perspectives on socioeconomic rights, and different responsibilities. According to Dam, national human rights institutions (NHRIs) and state & local human rights commissions differ in origins, jurisdictions, forms and variations of practices.³⁴

The Principles Relating to the Status of National Institutions (the Paris Principles)³⁵ in 1991 provided the standards for the NHRIs: “1. competence and responsibilities, 2. composition and guarantee of independence, 3. methods of operations, and 4. Principles relating to the status of commissions as quasi-judicial

³⁴ (Dam 2007) pp.1-10.

³⁵ Ibid. p.3 According to Dam, since the 1960s, “the feasibility of national institutions as instruments for protections and promotion of human rights” and accomplishments of several NHRIs led to the creation of the “Principles Relating to the Status of National Institutions (the Paris Principles) in 1991.

bodies.³⁶ Also, the models of the NHRIs are various: 1. the human rights commission model, 2. the advisory committee model, 3. human rights ombudsmen model, and 4. the human rights institute model.³⁷

Table 1. the standards and different models for the NHRIs and different U.S. human rights commissions models and activities³⁸

The Standards For The NHRIs	1. Competence and responsibilities
	2. Composition and guarantee of independence
	3. Methods of operations
	4. Principles relating to the status of commissions as quasi-judicial bodies
The Models Of The NHRIs	1. The human rights commission model
	2. The advisory committee model
	3. The human rights ombudsmen model
	4. The human rights institute model
U.S. Human Rights Commissions by "guidelines for effective human relations service"	1. Various models, but similar to the models of the NHRIs
	2. Shared responsibilities: "to eradicate discrimination and promote equal opportunity"
U.S. Human Rights Commission Activities	1. Monitor and document human rights abuses
	2. Assess local policy and practices in light of international standards
	3. Engage in education and training
	4. Incorporate human rights principles into advocacy efforts
	5. Investigate human rights complaints
	6. Encourage, coordinate, and implement local policies to integrate human rights principles

Also, the forms of the state and local commissions vary greatly based upon their missions and their legal status.³⁹ The state and local human rights commissions in the U.S are based upon the "Guidelines for Effective Human Relations Commissions", published by the U.S. Department of Justice Community Relations Service.⁴⁰ For example, some commissions have integrated the advisory committee model into the human rights commission model. Also, the commissions have different historical contexts and unique status in their own local government; while the names of the

³⁶ Ibid. p.3

³⁷ Ibid. pp.5-6

³⁸ The table has been made based upon the literature reviews.

³⁹ Ibid. p.11

⁴⁰ Ibid. p.11

commission differ. For example, there are the human rights commissions, the human relations commissions and the civil rights commissions; the human rights commissions deal with broader concepts including civil rights; the human relations commissions focus on “inter-group, cross-cultural tension, hate crimes and etc.”; and the civil rights commissions focus on basic rights protected by the U.S. Constitution such as “civil liberties, due process, and equal protection under the laws.”⁴¹

In spite of various names and tasks, state and local human rights commissions share similar responsibilities: “to eradicate discrimination and promote equal opportunity.”⁴² The commissions work collectively with other human rights agencies and local governments to accomplish their mission by the following activities: 1. monitor and document human rights abuses, 2. assess local policy and practices in light of international standards, 3. engage in education and training, 4. incorporate human rights principles into advocacy efforts, 5. investigate human rights complaints, and 6. encourage, coordinate, and implement local policy to integrate human rights principles.⁴³

There have been many discussions and questions regarding state and local governments’ ability to establish laws that affect the federal government’s power and decisions on an international level.⁴⁴ The ratification of the treaties involves not only

⁴¹ (Saunders and Bang 2007)pp.2-3.

⁴² Ibid. p.2

⁴³ (Kaufman, State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation 2011)pp.96-101

⁴⁴ Burroughs explains that outward-looking human rights legislations (the legislation to address human rights problems in international communities-)try to resolve international human rights problems by regulating problematic practices within the state

political agreements from parties but also the federal government's will and ability to promote "positive rights⁴⁵" in feasible ways. In addition, increasing human rights awareness in the U.S. has provided a firm ground for human rights activists to raise their voice for bringing international human rights norms into local communities.

In the following section, this research will analyze the needs of a local human rights agency in historical context and examine roles of the agency by describing its activities.

Chapter 3. Methodology

This research is a qualitative research and a case study of the Seattle Human Rights Commission. A case study method will enable to describe the SHRC and its purpose more specifically rather than to generalize the commission's work with other commissions.⁴⁶ Also, the method offers different research techniques⁴⁷ such as document research and interviews so that it is more convenient to understand the commission's work in depth. This study examines available historical documents, reports of the SHRC and other agencies' reports on the work of the SHRC. Also, it includes interviews with Commission staff, government officials and previous and current commissioners.

boundary. One example is Massachusetts Burma Law; it putted restrictions on the state's "contracts with individuals or companies doing businesses with Burma." The Supreme Court held the law unconstitutional in 2000 (p.418). (Burroughs 2005-2006) pp.411-445.

⁴⁵ Ibid. p.413

⁴⁶Ibid. p.390

⁴⁷ Ibid. p.390

1. Research Criteria

This research describes major roles of the SHRC; 1. Advocacy, 2. Monitor and document human rights issues, 3. Assess local human rights policy and practices, 4. Engage in education and training and 5. Other activities.⁴⁸ Also, the research will examine the usage of international human rights treaties by the SHRC.

To provide historical context of the SHRC's work, I researched reports, correspondences and other related documents from 1962 to 2013. I also researched the reports of the SHRC from 1997 to 2012 more closely because the commission started using international standards from the late 1990's. It is to examine the issues and cases that the SHRC has dealt with. By doing so, this research provides international human rights conventions and treaties that the SHRC has used.

- Issues and cases
 - Local Issues: examples: excessive force by the Seattle Police Department, homelessness, the Panhandling Ordinance
 - National and International Issues: this category includes recent work of the SHRC such as addressing human rights violations in other cities and other countries
- The international human rights treaties and conventions that the commission has used to examine the current issues and to bring recommendations.

⁴⁸ (Kaufman, State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation 2011)pp.96-101

2. Data Source:

This research uses 1) data collected directly from commissioners and the commission's staff, and 2) data collected from existing organizational information or formal repositories or databases such as annual reports and documents.⁴⁹ I found reports and other documents related to the SHRC at the Seattle Office of Civil Rights and Seattle Municipal Archives. The followings are the lists of data.

- Reports and other documents of the SHRC
- Reports and other documents regarding the work of the SHRC from other departments including the Office of Civil Rights or organizations.
- Interviews: Interview participants include the commission staff, previous commissioners, chairman and previous director of the Office of the Civil Rights. Nine interviews had been conducted between March, 2012 to June, 2012. The participants are selected by purposive sampling; and it is to have extensive and supplemental information such as their experience at the SHRC that the documents could not provide. The research contacted over fifty previous and current commissioners via phone calls and emails. In result, nine people participated in the interviews and two staff will be interviewed.
 - Questions:

⁴⁹ (Jody, Sanders and Worthen 2011) pp.348-349.

1. What are the accomplishments of the commission during your service?
2. What would you say are the strengths of the Commission?
3. When you analyze or recommend, do you use international human rights standards? Any human rights toolkits in the SHRC? How do you utilize it?
4. What kinds of responses do you get related to the commission's work? (For example, the commission's report on police misconduct and recommendations, how do other related parties respond?)
5. Who did you work with? Within the OCR, the city council, or others?
6. What would you say are obstacles for the commission's work?
7. What kinds of roles as the commission as a whole and as an each commissioner should consider the most importantly?
 - Reports and documents of the other commissions in western coast cities (San Francisco, New York City, Oregon): The three cities were chosen based upon online documents availability.

3. Analysis Method

Based upon document research and interviews, this research distinguishes major issues and the Commissions activities with tables. For the Commission's work

during the 1990's, the 2000's and the 2010's, more detailed information regarding the background information, work procedure, and outcome of the SHRC work are given. With document research of other commissions, this study also delivers the usage of international human rights treaties by the SHRC. In the later section, the research continues to look at work of other commissions in other cities. In addition, it will provide recommendations for the SHRC's future work.

For the data interpretation, the recorded interviews have been transferred into documents and are compared to the commission's reports or documents; it is important to examine the relevant comprehensive validity of the research data.

Chapter 4. Results and Discussion

This section provides brief history of the SHRC to examine the Commission's work from the 1990's to 2012. By categorizing major four activities of the Commission and issues into a framework, this research examines activities that the Commission has prioritized to address the needs of the local community. The results also show that the Commission began using the international human rights treaties and standards in the 2000's to analyze existing problems with international human rights standards and to provide recommendations to the City Council and to the Mayor. In addition, this section provides works of other human rights agencies in three other cities: Portland, Washington D.C. and New York City.

A. Brief History of the SHRC (from 1962 to 1990)

a. Creation of the SHRC

In 1962, Mayor Gordon Clinton established the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Minority Housing to investigate causes of rising segregation and discrimination problems in the City of Seattle. The Citizens' Advisory Committee on Minority Housing recognized four main problems as follows: 1. overcrowded housing, 2. juvenile delinquency, 3. de facto school segregation and 4. high unemployment problems of minority groups.⁵⁰ Especially, the Committee expressed concerns on Leschi and 3 M areas (Madison, Madrona, Minor in the Central District) and reported racial discrimination as the primary cause of social problems. In 1962, as one of the solutions, the committee proposed the creation of the Open Housing Ordinance that "prohibits discrimination in the sale and rental of all public and private housing accommodations on the basis of race, creed, color or national origin providing criminal penalties for violations."⁵¹ In spite of other civil rights organizations' supports for the passage of the Open Housing Ordinance, the ordinance could not be adopted by the City Council⁵².

In addition, other civil rights activists and the committee realized the necessity of a governmental body that could facilitate communication between citizens and the local government. Therefore, the committee proposed Ordinance 92191 to establish the

⁵⁰ (The Citizen's Advisory Committee on Minority Housing 1962). pp.5-6

⁵¹ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 1963)

⁵² Ibid.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. The City Council passed the Ordinance 92191 and created the SHRC to revise the Open Housing legislation. In the beginning, the Commission started with thirteen volunteer commissioners.

b. From 1963 to the 1990s

i. The Open Housing Ordinance and the Fair Practice Ordinance

For the first decade of the SHRC during the 1960s and the 1970s, the Commission promoted the passage of the Open Housing Ordinance with other civil rights organizations. After 5 years of advocacy work and revision of the Ordinance, the Ordinance was unanimously passed in 1968. Also, the Commission worked on the creation and passage of the Fair Practice Ordinance and other civil rights ordinances. In addition to the advocacy work, each commissioner participated in education activities for the public and government officials.⁵³

ii. The creation of the Human Rights Department (current Office of the Civil Rights)

After five years of work as the civilian volunteer body to the local government, the Commission saw increasing needs for a department, which can legitimately promote civil rights and enact policies.⁵⁴ Therefore, the Commission recommended the establishment of Human Rights Department to the City Council. In 1969, the

⁵³ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 1968)

⁵⁴ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 1968)

Department of Human Rights was created and the SHRC became an advisory body to the Mayor and the City Council.⁵⁵

- iii. Work Place Discrimination, Women and Minority Business Contract and Police accountability issues

The Commission actively engaged in investigation of the discrimination issues. In 1988, the SHRC began investigation on the Washington State Ferry System workers discrimination problems and held public forums to provide opportunities to publicize the issues and to resolve the discrimination problems. Initially, the victims of racial discrimination had brought the issue to the State Governor and worked to resolve the discrimination with the Washington State Ferry System. However, to prevent the continuous discriminatory practices and to improve the affirmative action plan, the African American workers brought the issue to the SHRC. They asked the SHRC to assist them in expediting the resolution procedure and to participate in the taskforce. In November 1988, the SHRC organized public hearings to investigate the racial discrimination issue at the public level and to discuss the case with the ferry workers organization, the Governor's office and the Washington State Ferry System.

Also, after the creation of the Women and Minority Business Enterprise Ordinance, the Commission created the Civil Rights & WMBE Committee and started its work to spread information and to have citizen inputs on those civil rights issues.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 1969)

⁵⁶ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 1996). p.2

The civil rights & WMBE committee held forums to examine Seattle's affirmative action policies and experience.

Since the beginning of the Commission, the Commission continued communicating with the Seattle Police Department and also tried to resolve citizens' complaints with the SPD. As a result, Resolution 28198 was passed in 1990 and it directed the SHRC to "monitor and investigate citizen complaints of police harassment and report on the same to the Mayor and the City Council."⁵⁷ Ordinance 28198 gave the monitoring and investigative authority regarding "all issues pertaining to police harassment"⁵⁸ to the Commission. Due to the growing concerns regarding police misconducts in the community and the necessities of citizens' involvement throughout the closed investigation procedure of the SPD, the Commission had countless meetings with the SPD and held public forums to gather citizen's opinions, especially from the minority community. Also, the Commission publicized many reports and correspondences on the police issues and provided recommendations to improve the trust and communication between the community and the police department.

B. The SHRC Activities from the 1990s to today

To analyze how the SHRC dealt with diverse issues, I researched how the issues evolve in the historical context and what activities the Commission used to promote their agendas. In the early years of the SHRC, the Commission focused on civil rights issues

⁵⁷ Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Report of SHRC regarding the monitoring and investigation of citizen complaints of police harassment*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Department, 1990. p.2

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p.2

such as discrimination at work places and police misconducts. However, from the early 2000s, the Commission often brought international human rights treaties and standards such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the Convention on Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) into investigating local civil rights and human rights problems and it also made recommendations based upon the international standards. The following section delivers analysis on the work of the SHRC from the 1990s to 2012. Even though the Commission began the usage of the international human rights standards in the 2000s, this research looks at the Commission’s work in the 1990s. It is because many issues overlap and it is important to interpret their activities in the historical context.

a. The SHRC in the 1990s

THE SHRC ACTIVITIES	1990s
1. Advocacy	1. The Women and Minority Business Enterprise (WMBE) Ordinance (1994): to examine Seattle's affirmative action policies and experience
	2. The Citizens Review: Police Policies and Procedures (a dialogue on Public Safety Issues and Police/ Community Relations) in 1996
	3. Negative impacts on I-200: "Six Months After I-200" in 1999
2. Monitor and document human rights issues	1. The Women and Minority Business Enterprise (WMBE) Ordinance (1994)
	2. Police Accountability and the creation of the Office of Public Accountability : "Report of the SHRC on Community and Police Relations" (1997)
	3. Report on I-200: "Then and Now: Equity in Contracting" in 2000
3. Assess local human rights policy and practices	1. "Report of the SHRC on Community and Police Relations" (1997)
	2. The police aggressive practices during the WTO in 1999
4. Engage in education and training	Public forums on the WMBE Ordinance, I-200 and Police Accountability
5. Other activities	Annual Human Rights Day Event
	Appeals Panel

The SHRC continued its activities in advocacy, monitoring and assessing human rights policy and practices in the City as well as education and training for public and governmental officials. During the 1990s, the main issues are as follows: Women and Minority Business Enterprise Ordinance, I-200 and police accountability issue.

The WMBE Ordinance and I-200⁵⁹

The WMBE was created in 1980 to further assist in increasing women and minority communities' opportunity to participate in city contracts.⁶⁰ After the revision of the Women and Minority Business Enterprise ordinance in 1994, the Commission created Civil Rights & WMBE Committee to provide information and assist citizens to bring their concerns on the policy.⁶¹ The civil rights & WMBE committee held forums to examine Seattle's affirmative action policies and experience.

Only after 20 years of the City's adaption of the WMBE ordinance, statewide initiative I-200, which prohibited public institutions from applying "preferential treatment" on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in employment, contracting and education⁶², was approved in December 3, 1998.

⁵⁹ In 1994, the SHRC assisted the HRD and City Council members Sherry Harris and Jane Noland in revising the Women and Minority Business Enterprise (WMBE) Ordinance. The WMBE ordinance included regulations regarding 1. setting a side a percentage of City contracts for women and minorities-owned business. It also encourages use of women and minority-owned businesses in purchasing and non-professional services. It sets targets for the overall of participation by women and minority-owned businesses on City contracts in a given year. Seattle Municipal Archives. *Equality for All*. <http://www.seattle.gov/cityarchives/Exhibits/Women/panel11.htm> (accessed 08 2012).

⁶⁰ Seattle Municipal Archives. *Equality for All*. <http://www.seattle.gov/cityarchives/Exhibits/Women/panel11.htm> (accessed 08 2012).

⁶¹ Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Seattle Human Rights Commission 1996 Workplan*. Annual Workplan, Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1996. p.2

⁶² Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Then and Now: Equity in Contracting*. . Seattle: Seattle Office of Civil Rights, 2000.

To address negative impacts of I-200, the SHRC monitored and analyzed the policy. It was to strategize a response to the statewide legislative initiative, which suddenly closed previous programs designed to provide equity in employment, education and contracting.⁶³ In 1999, the Economic Justice Committee of the commission co-sponsored with Councilmember Peter Steinbrueck two public forums: 1. "Six Months After I-200" and 2. "Then and Now: Equity in Contracting." In 2000, the SHRC published the post I-200 report, "Then and Now: Equity in Contracting" based upon the two forums.

The citizen's opinions and survey from two forums provided critical information on the ineffectiveness of the WMBE in regards to I-200. The Commission recognized I-200's negative impacts on the WMBE; for example, there was a dramatic decrease in WMBE utilization rates from 32.8% to 15.2% between January of 1997 and March of 2000.⁶⁴ Also, the Commission pointed out that the BOOST program was not yet implemented; the Boost program was created to serve economically disadvantaged small businesses when I-200 was passed.⁶⁵ The Commission made policy recommendations for improvement of I-200 and the BOOST program.

⁶³ Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Then and Now: Equity in Contracting*. . Seattle: Seattle Office of Civil Rights, 2000.

⁶⁴ Ibid, p 2.

⁶⁵ The Commission gave recommendations 1. to publish Federal goals and requirements that have distinct disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE) requirements frequently and to distribute to the entire contracting community so that all DBE-eligible contractors can maximize the participation. 2. to start "joint venture partnerships among WMBE Business", 3. to expedite the BOOST program and publicize the goals and objectives. Ibid., p.3

In spite of the hard work, small minority businesses that previously contracted with the City had financial struggles and there were continuous complaints about the BOOST program since it was not implemented as it was intended in the beginning.⁶⁶

When Germaine Covington was asked about the significant roles of the SHRC, she highlighted the advocacy role. She said that the SHRC was a very active body addressing social issues in the community and intervening between citizens and the local government.

“The significant role of the Commission is advocacy. When the Office of Civil Rights can’t prove the causes; then, the Commission can intervene and recommend better practices. They sometimes relieve the burden of proof. They can take a position and stand up. They are also free to discuss other issues that are external to the OCR such as I-200. The Commission’s work was excellent with this issue. They testified down in Olympia and they held several meetings. They also supported the work of the department in many ways. The Commission was also able to educate citizens and city officials about the roles and limitations of the HRD and the OCR. The SHRC’s involvement was very meaningful.”

Germaine Covington, a previous SOCR director (1994-2007)

Randy Gainer, a previous interim director of the HRD shared his background knowledge and experience in the process of creating WMBE ordinance. Also, he shared his opinions regarding I-200 during the interview.

“In the 1980’s, minority contractors were getting 7% of the city contracts and women may be getting 1 % of the city contracts. Based upon research of available contractors, the women and minority population, the numbers of the business and available city contracts, we proposed to increase the set aside ratio for those two business groups, initially 15% to 20% and later more. That was a long process and controversial especially among the majority contractors and.

At that time, those types of programs were not unique to the City of Seattle. There were federal programs that minority and women be given the parts of the work such as department of transportation program. The Justice Department of the State of Washington adapted the program.

In the 1990s, there were the US Supreme Court cases involving the federal program, which held the program initially unconstitutional at least to do so as a quota. The same principal was applied to state and local programs, so the City of Seattle had no choice but to comply with the Supreme Court decision.”

-Randy Gainer, a previous interim director of HRD (1985-86)

⁶⁶ (Anderson 2001)

Police Accountability and the Creation of the Office of Police Accountability Issues

In 1996, the tragic death of Edward Anderson by a SPD officer shooting (Jan 15, 1996) and the accused police officer's exoneration provoked an outcry in the city, especially amongst minority communities. The SHRC began its monitoring and communicating activities by creating the Public Safety Committee and communicating with the SPD over the SPD's internal investigation procedure. The SHRC held the public forum "Citizens Review: Police Policies and Procedures (a dialogue on Public Safety Issues and Police/ community relations on May 2, 1996.)" and conducted 28 interviews with community members, city government officials and representatives of several human rights organizations.⁶⁷

After investigating the procedure and conducting interviews with the citizens, the SHRC published another report regarding the investigation policies of the Police Department, "Report of the SHRC on Community and Police Relations (1997)." In the report, the SHRC recognized possible causes of police misconduct such as 1. perception of racism and abuse, 2. necessities of frequent and open communication between the police department and the minority community, 3. the closed procedure of the Internal Investigation of the Police Department and 4. inadequate racially diverse recruitment and training.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Report of the SHRC on Community and Police Relations*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1997. p.2

⁶⁸ Ibid., pp.2-15

The Commission addressed a great need for the Civilian Review Board to “check police authority, to provide the City with a truly impartial system for investigation allegations of misconduct and to restore the public trust.”^{69 70} However, during the interviews, it was revealed that the police officers and officials of the police department strongly opposed the creation of the Civilian Review Board. Their arguments were inefficiency and ineffectiveness from the potential costs for reform and longer investigation procedures.

As a result of continuous efforts, On December 3, 1999, the City Council passed Ordinance 119816 to create the Office of Professional Accountability (OPA) headed by a civilian director within the Police Department to investigate the allegations of police misconduct; thus, the OPA was created in 2000.⁷¹

b. The SHRC in the 2000s

⁶⁹ Ibid., p.12

⁷⁰ The Commission also recommended 1. to open communication channels between the community and the police department, 2. to increase the recruitment efforts for minorities population and to increase the cultural sensitivity trainings, 3. To establish a police community task force composed of a diverse mixture of police of various ranks, community/civilian representatives, and HRC for improving the communication and trust between the department and minority communities, and lastly 4. to establish the Civilian Review Board.

⁷¹ In 2001, the SHRC endorsed the formation of the OPA Civilian Review Board to expand the roles of the OPA. The SHRC expressed the concerns from the community and proposed examples of how the review board should be implemented to improve the investigation procedure in the OPA. Later, Mayor Paul Schell declined the proposal while Council member Jim Compton and other citizens agreed to its implementation.

THE SHRC ACTIVITIES	2000s
1. Advocacy	1. Participation in a long-term plan, "A Roof over Every Bed in King County: Our Community's 10 year plan to End Homelessness" in 2004
	2. Task force formed: The Homelessness Task Force of the SHRC to deal with concerns about homelessness in 2008
	3. To add homelessness as a protected class under the Seattle Malicious Harassment's Ordinance"
	4. The aggressive solicitation ordinance in 2009: consequences of the ordinance on underrepresented population of the City.
2. Monitor and document human rights issues	1. The Public Safety Task Force of the SHRC: recommendations for relocating the Office of Professional Accountability and the Complaint Process
	2. The Seattle Malicious Harrassment Ordinance(SMC 12A.06.115) (2008)
3. Assess local human rights policy and practices	1. Reports on Aggressive Solicitation Ordinance in 2010
	2. The Seattle Malicious Harrassment Ordinance(SMC 12A.06.115) (2008)
4. Engage in education and training	1. Educational forum: "What is the future of the civil and human rights in the city of Seattle?" in 2000/ 2. Public forum on the aggressive solicitation Ordinance
5. Other activities	Annual Human Rights Day Event
	Appeals Panel

72

The highlighted works of the SHRC during the 2000's are participation in the "A Roof over Every Bed in King County", the passage of the Seattle Malicious Harassment Ordinance, relocation of the OPA office and active advocacy against Panhandling Ordinance. While advocating homelessness issue, the SHRC began using the international human rights treaties to provide and promote the standard of living according to the international human rights law. During the 2000s, the Commission started to extend the scope of rights, not only local civil rights but also international human rights, especially economic and social rights such as rights to housing and health care. Since then, the SHRC has utilized the international treaties and standards

⁷² The table categorizes activities and issues of the SHRC. Created by Jung Lee

more often to examine current policies and to provide recommendations for future policy and implementation.

Homelessness Issue

In 2004, the Committee to End Homelessness in King County (CEHKC) was formed to address homelessness and to bring long-term and feasible solutions through collaborative works with human rights organizations and governments in King County. The CEHKC proposed a long-term plan, “A Roof over Every Bed in King County; Our Community’s 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness” in 2004. Since the goal required supports from local communities and government agencies, the committee proactively requested various organizations to participate in actions such as raising the public awareness, investing resources and bringing recommendations to the Committee or local governments.⁷³

The SHRC also recognized basic rights of homeless people in areas such as housing, health care and education rights; therefore, in 2004, the Commission participated in collective actions to promote the basic rights of homeless people. The Commission collaborated with the Seattle Office of Civil Rights and the Interfaith Task force on Homelessness and had a conference, “A Denial of Human Rights: Creating the Political Will to End Homelessness IV” in September, 2004. Utilizing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Commission stated that citizens of Seattle have “the

⁷³ Seattle Office of Civil Rights. *10-Year Plan To End Homelessness In King County*. Seattle, WA: Seattle Office of Civil Rights, 2004.

right to an adequate standard of living including the right to adequate housing.⁷⁴ It also made recommendations to the City of Seattle that the City must “establish the right of access to affordable, adequate housing as a basic human right and that laws and policies must be amended to reflect such a position.⁷⁵”

In 2008, the Homelessness Taskforce of the SHRC recommended that the City of Seattle give notice in advance for future encampment removals, provide proper ways to ensure the personal safety and personal property, give options for alternative housing and refer homeless people to community services.⁷⁶ In spite of the collective actions, there was a continuous reduction in funds for homeless shelters and an ongoing removal of homeless encampments since 2004.

Lubna Mahadeen talked about the homelessness issue during her service.

" I have led efforts with the Homelessness Taskforce to add homelessness as a protected class under the “Seattle Malicious Harassment’s Ordinance” (SMC 12A.06.115). Councilmember Nick Licata collaborated with us. After working with stakeholders such as community advocates, City Councilmembers, the SPD and City departments in analyzing and finalizing the ordinance and City polices, the ordinance passed unanimously by the City Council. It was a great success as it added protection to homeless individuals who were discriminated against solely because they were homeless and a penalty was added to perpetrators. An awareness campaign was launched to educate organizations and advocates around the City with special emphasis on schools since some of perpetrators were between the ages of 15-19 years old. Additional efforts were focused to issue an informational card that was distributed around the City of the ordinance with appropriate information to reach help if needed"

-Lubna Mahadeen, a previous commissioner and Chairperson (2006-2009)

Recommendations for OPA relocation

⁷⁴ Ibid

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ The Homelessness Taskforce of the SHRC, recommendation letter to the City of Seattle. Feb, 2008

In 2008, the Commission's Public Safety Task Force provided recommendations to the City Council panels regarding the location of the Office of Professional Accountability and the complaint process. The Commission expressed concerns that complainants might feel uncomfortable and daunted due to the closed office space and the location of the OPA, which was located at the underground level in the SPD building. To make the OPA more accessible to the general public, the commission requested that the OPA move to a different building. Also, the task force team emphasized the needs to reform the whole complaint process of OPA and to increase police accountability.⁷⁷

Panhandling Ordinance (Aggressive Solicitation Ordinance 116807)

In September 2009, Councilmember Tim Burgess proposed Aggressive Solicitation Ordinance. This ordinance would give police officers authority to give 50 dollars penalty to people who would not give up soliciting money or help when "reasonable people" may feel "unsafe and fearful."⁷⁸ The majority of the twelve Councilmembers supported the ordinance. However, the Commission and Councilmember Nick Licata saw potential problems and began research on possible consequences of the ordinance on underrepresented populations of the City. The Commission held a public forum to examine potential problems with the ordinance and to have an open discussion with the public at Seattle University School of Law in March

⁷⁷ —. "The Public Safety Task Force Report." *The Public Safety Task Force Report*. Seattle: SHRC, February 2008.

⁷⁸ Ervin, Keith. "Seattle panhandling ordinance moves closer to passage." *The Seattle Times*. April 10, 2010. http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2011546286_panhandling08m.html (accessed February 2012).

2010. After the forum, the Commission gathered its analysis, citizens' opinions and recommendations of other local organizations and it published a report, "Seattle Human Rights Commission Report to the Seattle City Council on Council Bill 116807: Aggressive Solicitation (April, 2010)."

The Commission expressed concerns with potential human rights infringements of vulnerable populations such as the increased possibility of being charged with a criminal misdemeanor and possibilities of involuntary testing and treatment. The Commission argued that the rights of due process would not be protected under the proposed ordinance.⁷⁹

Also, the Commission pointed out that the \$50 citation would "create a consequence disproportionate to the offense committed. The consequences will likely be felt disproportionately by vulnerable populations.⁸⁰" Another serious problem the Commission highlighted regarding the ordinance was the possible involuntary testing and treatment of the violators. The Commission strongly argued in the report that failing to respond to a citation does not provide reasonable cause to put violators under those forced test and treatments.⁸¹

⁷⁹ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 2010)

⁸⁰ Ibid

⁸¹ Ibid, p.5

On April 19, 2010, the Panhandling Ordinance was passed in favor of 5 to 4 by the City Council. However, on April 23, 2010, the Mayor vetoed the accepted ordinance after receiving recommendations from the SHRC and other human rights organizations.

While Chris Stearns talked about legal problems of the Panhandling Ordinance, he mentioned structural vulnerability that minority populations have faced in the community. He also highlighted the cooperative work between Council member Nick Licata and the Commission.

“From a civil rights perspective and labor rights perspective, problems with aggressive panhandlers were not very big and solutions that the City proposed such as citing aggressive panhandlers would not solve the problem. So, the Commission looked into the problems. We thought that the way that the city and a few city council members approached this issue could lead to serious civil rights and labor rights problems. Also, the commission has the independence, being apart from the city government and the Mayor’s office. So, we as a commission were able to say that “the ordinance is wrong and we need to fix it.”

-Chris Stearns, current commissioner and current chair of SHRC (2009-present)

The death of John T. Williams and concerns for policy accountability

Police accountability and police misconduct have been ongoing issues to many in the Seattle community and within the Commission for a long time. In 2010, a Native American wood carver, John T. Williams was shot four times by a police officer after being ordered three times to drop his carving knife. The facts were revealed later that he had hearing impairment and health issues and they generated concerns from the public, especially minority populations.

The SHRC published a recommendation paper for the Mayor and the Seattle Police Department to urge them to begin a transparent investigation process and to bring resolutions that would increase the accountability of the SPD.⁸²

Since 1997, many community organizations and the City Council have recommended that the Seattle Police Department (SPD) create a civilian oversight body for reducing public mistrust toward the SPD and improving police accountability.⁸³ In the 2012 report, the Commission argued that the Office of Professional Accountability (OPA) auditor or the OPA board did not have any authority to change decisions after the Chief of SPD decides cases regarding police misconducts. It also revealed that the OPA has limited access to the investigation information.⁸⁴

After many years of movements toward reform of the SPD, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the Seattle Human Rights Commission and other civil rights organizations requested that the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) investigate the Seattle Police Department.

After 11 months investigations, the DOJ published a report and it said that its “investigation finds a pattern or practice of constitutional violations regarding the use of force that result from structural problems, as well as serious concerns about biased

⁸² Solomon, Roslyn, and Chris Stearns. "Statement of Roslyn Solomon, Chair and Chris Stearns, Vice-Chair SHRC hearing on John T. Williams Shooting." *Seattle City Council Committee on Energy, Technology, and Civil Rights*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, September 15, 2010.

⁸³ Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Report of the SHRC on Community and Police Relations*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1997.

⁸⁴ Seattle Human Rights Commission. "Report on Police Accountability and Recommendations." Seattle, 2012.

policing.⁸⁵ With findings and recommendations of the DOJ, the Commission published a recommendation paper in January 2012 and has collaborated with City Council and other organizations to make sure that the SPD could bring feasible reform plans.

c. The SHRC in the 2010s

As noted previously, the Commission started using international standards more often since 2004. Compared to the previous decades, it is evident that the SHRC focused more on bringing international human rights standards as ground rules for local policies. Also, the SHRC has more actively collaborated with community groups and other organizations since late 2000s. The Commission has produced a large number of correspondence, reports, and letters to related parties compared to previous decades of work. Moreover, since 2011, the Commission has actively used social networking services to communicate with the general public and to spread valuable information to local community.

The distinguished works of the Commission since 2010 are organized as a table below and some of them are continuous works from the 2000s. Since the Commission began advocacy works of other regions based upon international human rights standards, this section categorizes the Commission works into inward-looking advocacy work and outward-looking advocacy work. The inward-looking advocacy works includes continuum of the Commission's works such as 1. recommendations for

⁸⁵ U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division. *Investigation of Seattle Police Department*. United States Attorney's Office Western District of Washington., 2011.

Civilian Review Board on the internal investigation procedure of the SPD, 2. Resolution 31420 (Seattle as a Human Rights City), and 3. Resolution #12-02 (Support for Seattle Care Council: Caring Across Generations). The outward-looking advocacy works of the Commission are 1. Support for U.S Grants to Guatemala to include funding for LGBT rights and Anti-Trafficking efforts in 2012, and 2. testimony for the rights of the indigenous people. It is evident that during the last three years, the SHRC has expanded its advocacy works not just about the local community but also to state, federal and international community.

Among these accomplishments, this section will focus on Resolution #12-02, Resolution 31420, support for U.S grants to Guatemala, and Resolution for House passage of Senate VAWA Bill and Resolution #12-04.

Table The SHRC's work in the 2010s⁸⁶

⁸⁶ The table categorizes activities and issues of the SHRC. Created by Jung Lee.

THE SHRC ACTIVITIES	2010s	International treaties or standards that the SHRC uses
1. Advocacy	1. Rights of the vulnerable population in the City of Seattle (Panhandling Ordinance) in 2010	UDHR
	2. Civilian Review on the internal investigation procedure of the SPD (from John T. Williams' death)	
	3. Seattle as a Human Rights City in 2012 (Resolution 31420)	UDHR/ ICCPR/ ICEAR/ CATOCIDTP/ COA
	4. Request on U.S. Department of Justice Investigation on SPD in 2011	ICCPR (article 2,6,7,26, 9,10,14)
	5. Support for Seattle Care Council : Caring Across Generations (Resolution # 12-02)	The Charter of the United Nations/UDHR (Article 25/ ICCPR (Articles 22,26)/ the International Covenant on Economic and Cultural Rights (Articles 6,7,8,9,11,12)
	6. support for ending death penalty in WA in 2012	
	7. Support for U.S. Grants to Guatemala to include funding for LGBT rights and Anti-Trafficking efforts in 2012	the Charter of the UN /UDHR (Articles 2,7,10)/ICCPR (Articles 2,3,14,25,26)/ ICESCR (Articles 2)
	8. Support for House Passage of Senate VAWA Bill (Resolution #12-03) in 2012 & 2013	UDHR/ CEDAW/ CERD/ ICCPR
	9. Ellimination of Native American Mascots (Resolution #12-04) in 2012	CERD
	10. Support for Temporary Protected Status for Guatemalans(Resolution #12-06) in 2012	ICPR of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (Article 56)
	11. Testimony for the rights of the indigenous people in 2012	
2. Monitor and document human rights issues	1. Reports on Panhandling Ordinance in 2010	
	2. Report on Police Accountability and Recommendations (2012)	ICCPR (article 2,6,7,26, 9,10,14)
3. Assess local human rights policy and practices	1. Panhandling Ordinance in 2010	
	2. SPD accountability and reform plan in 2012 and 2013	
4. Engage in education and training	Public forums in Panhandling Ordinance and Civilian Review Board	
5. Other activities	Annual Human Rights Day Event	
	Appeals Panel	

Support for Seattle Care Council: Caring Across Generation

In 2012, the Commission agreed to support the Seattle Care Council's campaign that supports home care workers and the public who are hiring care workers. The Commission participated in advocacy work especially for the passage of local, state and federal legislation and promoted "1. to protect funding for Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, home care jobs and worker's right to organize and 2. to create jobs necessary to meet the growing demand for direct care and to provide a path to legal status and citizenship for undocumented care workers and their families.⁸⁷"

⁸⁷ "Resolution #12-02: Support for Seattle Care Council: Caring Across Generation." Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, June 7, 2012.

The Commission addressed growing needs of home care workforce and home care workers' legally unprotected and unstable working conditions based upon the King County data.⁸⁸ The Commission also used Article 1,2,3,7,23,24, and 25 of the UDHR, Articles 22 and 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Articles 6,7,8,9,11 and 12 of the International Covenant on Economic and Cultural Rights.

Resolution 31420: City of Seattle as a Human Rights City

In celebration of the sixty-fourth anniversary of the UDHR, the Commission declared Seattle as a Human Rights City. By doing so, Seattle became the sixth Human Rights City followed by Washington D.C., Pittsburgh, PA, Richmond and others. It is to recognize the City's effort to apply human rights principles into local policies and to create a model of "leadership and advocacy on behalf of human rights for all people."⁸⁹

The Commission argued that human rights principles such as the UDHR, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICEARD), the Charter of the Organization of American States have been instrumental in creating local human rights standards and policies and in improving the impacts of related policies.⁹⁰

The Commission also recognized the importance of the signed treaties such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESR), the

⁸⁸ Ibid. According the Commission's report, "62.5% of direct care workers earn less than 200% of the poverty level, and in Seattle, only 24.4% of home care workers have employer-sponsored health insurance." And immigrants are critical workforce in the home care sector.

⁸⁹ Resolution 31420." *City of Seattle*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, December 2012.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the American Convention on Human rights. The resolution was adopted by the City Council.

Resolution #12-03: Support for House Passage of Senate VAWA bill & Resolution #13-01: Support for Reauthorization of Violence Against Women Act

The SHRC put their best efforts in urging the Congress to reauthorize Senate version of VAWA bill during 2012. The Commission supported the Seattle Women's Commission's work toward VAWA bill and co-sponsored a public rally with the Women's Commission in 2012. Based upon UDHR, ICCPR, ICEARD, and ADHR, the Commission strongly advocated the Senate version of VAWA bill, which included Native Americans, LGBT communities, and immigrant women as a protected class.

Resolution: Support for U.S. Grants to Guatemala to include funding for LGBT rights and Anti-Trafficking efforts & Resolution #12-06: Support for Temporary Protected Status for Guatemalans

This resolution is an outcome of cooperative work of the Seattle LGBT Commission, the Seattle Women's Commission, the Seattle Office for Civil Rights (SOCR), and the Seattle Human Rights Commission. Three Commissions and the SOCR agreed upon addressing needs to protect LGBT groups in Guatemala. Three commissions and the SOCR requested that the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) provide direct financial support to governmental and non-

governmental agencies in Guatemala that support human rights, anti-discrimination, LGBT rights, and prevention of human trafficking and protection of women's rights.⁹¹

As seen in the above table, the Commissions used various human rights principles such as the Charter of the United Nations, Articles 2,7,10 of the UDHR, the UN Slavery Convention and the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slavery Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery and others to emphasize needs of the minority population in Guatemala.⁹²

In addition to urge human rights protection of the LGBT communities in Guatemala, the SHRC also urged the US to grant temporary protected status for Guatemalan in the States (**Resolution #12-06**). After an earthquake in Guatemala in 2012, Guatemalan President Otto Perez Molina requested Temporary Protected Status (TPS) for Guatemalans. Based upon the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (article 56)⁹³, the SHRC agreed that “ the conditions in Guatemala meet the requirement necessary for TPS designation⁹⁴” and urge the President and the Secretary of Homeland Security to grants TPS status for Guatemalans to protect their human dignity and to help the country recover from the disaster.

C. Human Rights Commissions in other cities

⁹¹ The Seattle Human Rights Commission, The Seattle Women's Commission, the Seattle LGBT Commission, and the Seattle Office for Civil Rights 2012

⁹² Ibid. pp.1-2

⁹³ The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families establishes in article 56, part 3 that “ (i)n considering whether to expel a migrant worker or a member of his or her family, account should be taken of humanitarian considerations”, p.2 Seattle Human Rights Commission 2012

⁹⁴ (Seattle Human Rights Commission 2012) p.2

a. Portland, OR

The City of Portland's Human Rights Commission was established in 2008. The HRC is committed "to advocate and promote understanding, inclusion and justice not only for residents but also for all who work, play, worship and travel in Portland."⁹⁵ Since its creation, the Commission adopted the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights in their bylaws⁹⁶; the Commission addresses human rights issues, makes recommendations, educates the public and advocates human rights policies based upon the UDHR.

The Commission also has several sub-committees to work for specific human rights agendas in the City. The Community and Police Relations Committee (CPRC) has worked on improving the communication and trust between the Community and the Police Department especially with racial profiling, police misconducts issues.⁹⁷ The Committee also provided recommendations on police training programs.⁹⁸ The Committee for Inter-Group Understanding was created to address conflict between racial groups and began "an Inter-Group Dialogue (IGD) project" to bring different social groups together.⁹⁹

Also, the Commission actively held public hearings to communicate with the Community and it provided recommendations to the City Council to improve proposed Ordinances related to human rights issues such as the Sidewalk Management

⁹⁵ Portland HRC report 2011 p.1

⁹⁶ Ibid. p.1

⁹⁷ Ibid. p.2

⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 2

⁹⁹ Ibid. p.3

Ordinance in 2011.¹⁰⁰ The Commission held forums such as “Oregon Community Forum: Combating Human Trafficking¹⁰¹” and “Hate Crimes Forum¹⁰²” to provide information about new policies and to communicate with the community. It also provides various services such as human rights education program for schools and trainings for government officials, advocacy groups and housing providers.

b. San Francisco Human Rights Commission

According to the San Francisco Charter¹⁰³, San Francisco Human Rights Commission (HRC) was established in 1964 in a response to communities’ needs for representing diverse culture and addressing discrimination issues in the City.

While the SHRC is an advisory body to the City Council and the Mayor’s office, the SFHRC is a governmental office similar to the Seattle Office of Civil Rights. Under the Commission, the Equity Advisory Committee (EAC) and LGBT Advisory Committee (LGBTAC) take advisory roles for the HRC so that they examine current human rights practices in the City and provide recommendations for future policies and better practices. The EAC examines problems in the City and specializes in areas such as human trafficking, homelessness, environmental and criminal justice, immigration, healthcare, senior quality of live, youth and education, housing access, workforce

¹⁰⁰ *ibid.* p.4

¹⁰¹ Oregon Community Forum: Combating Human Trafficking

¹⁰² A Community Hate Crimes Forum

¹⁰³ SF charter

diversity and equality of opportunity by organizing working groups within the Committee.¹⁰⁴

The LGBTAC examines issues related to LGBT communities and persons with AIDS/HIV; it also provides recommendations for LGBT communities and people with AIDS/HIV.¹⁰⁵ Previously, the LGBTAC created LGBT Policy Task Force to address LGBT seniors' issues and their living conditions. Also, the Committee's LGBT Youth Workshop has continuously advocated LGBT youth issues and supported education of the group.¹⁰⁶

Based upon the HRC's annual report, it is obvious that two committees actively engage in work of the HRC. Also, the two committees promote the HRC's policies such as SF Collaborative against Human Trafficking (SFCHAT), Coalition against Hate Violence (CaHV) and Coalition for Safe San Francisco (SafeSF).¹⁰⁷

c. New York City, NY

The New York City Commission on Human Rights has a long history of its work on civil rights and human rights. It started as the Mayor's Committee on Unity in 1944 and the Committee was changed to the Commission on Intergroup Relations (COIR) in 1955. At that time, the Commission was given the enforcement and investigation powers by the City Council.¹⁰⁸ Later in 1965, the COIR was renamed as the Commission

¹⁰⁴ SF HRC <http://sf-hrc.org/index.aspx?page=71>

¹⁰⁵ SF HRC <http://sf-hrc.org/index.aspx?page=15>

¹⁰⁶ San Francisco Human Rights Commission 2012 Annual Report p.5-9

¹⁰⁷ San Francisco Human Rights Commission 2012 Annual Report p.5-9

¹⁰⁸ NYC commission on human rights website. The history of the Human Rights Commission.

on Human Rights and continued its work on advocating human rights, investigating complaints and problems, making recommendations to the local government.¹⁰⁹ Compared to the other Commissions, NYC Commission on Human Rights has specified its work in several areas: employment, housing, public accommodations and bias-related harassment.¹¹⁰

According to the Commission's report, the Commission currently has two major bureaus: Law Enforcement (to take, investigate and prosecute of complaints of violations of the Human Rights Law and the Title 8 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York) and Community Relations (to improve understanding and relationships among diverse communities in the City and to educate the public about the protections of the law).¹¹¹ It published an information booklet, which guides the process of filing complaints, requests for investigations, explanation of the legal works of the Commission and descriptions of their services¹¹² and it is translated in six major languages to assist diverse groups.

Based upon publicized resources of the Commission, it is revealed that the work of the Commission focuses on the enforcement of the present law of the City rather than advocating general human rights issues based on international human rights standard. It is because the City has its own Human Rights Law (the Title 8 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York) and it provides specific definitions, guidelines,

¹⁰⁹ Ibid

¹¹⁰ (New York City Commission on Human Rights n.d.).

¹¹¹ (New York City Commission on Human Rights 2012) p.3

¹¹² NYC Commission on Human Rights Informational Booklet

enforcement process and penalties for the public, business and government in the following areas: gender identity discrimination, fair housing, equal access to the law, racial discrimination at work, immigrant employment rights and others.¹¹³

D. Other Activities of the Commission

Appeals Panel

The SHRC has taken an important role in the hearing process. The appeals panel is one of the subcommittees of the SHRC and is responsible for the monthly Seattle Office of Civil Rights (SOCR) appeals process. The appeals panel is expected to “advise the SOCR regarding appeal presentations, claims investigation and enforcement generally.” According to the Seattle Office of Civil Rights, the appeals process begins when SOCR completes the investigation of a complaint case with a decision of ‘No Reasonable Cause’ and the person who filed the complaint requests an appeal for the SHRC’s review on his/her case.¹¹⁴

As Germaine Covington states in her interview, “giving a second chance to the charging party when he/she does not have enough evidence” is an important process for both a local government and the community member. It is often difficult for people to describe or prove violations of rights since discrimination can happen verbally or conditionally without any records. As previous SHRC chairperson, Lynn Iglitzen

¹¹³ (New York City Commission on Human Rights 2012)

¹¹⁴ SHRC/SOCR. "No Reasonable Cause Decisions and Appeals." *Seattle Office of Civil Rights*. August 2009. <http://www.seattle.gov/humanrights/Documents/HowToFileAnAppealWithSHRC.pdf> (accessed October 2012).

emphasized, it is this quasi-judicial process, which makes the SHRC significantly different from any other commissions.

During interviews with former commissioners, most of them recognized the appeals panel as an important role of the SHRC. Germaine Covington said, “even though there were times that we did not agree on the cases and decisions, it was a very meaningful process since it gives a second chance for the SHRC to look at the case independently.”

Also, Lubna Mahadeen highlighted the work of the appeals panel during the interview. “One of the most important jobs that the Commission has is the appeal hearing. As a chairperson, I strongly encouraged commissioners’ participation in the Appeals Committee. The SOCR provides documents and the Appeals Panel reviews cases once a month with a city attorney. The panel researches the case and panel members discuss it to reach a consensus. After reviewing written statement(s) from the charging party, the SHRC can independently make a decision among 1. Affirm no reasonable cause decision, 2. Remand with instructions, or 3. Schedule a hearing. If the Appeals Panel finds there is not enough evidence or questions the validity of the issue, it can order to remand with instructions. In this case, the SHRC recommends to the SOCR to review the case and re-examine the case. If the appeals panel orders a hearing, the charging party and the SOCR should attend the hearing, provide further information and make statements for the case.”

-Lubna Mahadeen, a previous commissioner and Chairperson (2006-2009)

Chapter 4. Discussion

The SHRC has taken an important role in promoting civil rights and human rights in the City of Seattle. This section analyzes how the SHRC changed the civil rights and human rights policies and practices in the City of Seattle. Also, I would like to discuss limitations of the Commission and provide suggestions for future works.

Work of the SHRC

The SHRC has brought positive changes in civil rights policies and practices in the City of Seattle. First, the SHRC began examination of civil rights violations in the City from the 1960s and accomplished policy changes to racially discriminative practices in the 1960s. The Commission examined loopholes of the existing policies such as racial segregation covenant to provide feasible solutions, which was the Open Housing Ordinance in 1968 for both the minority community and the City government.

Second, the SHRC played a pivotal role in expanding its capacity and creating the governmental office, which was Human Rights Department (current, the Seattle Office of Civil Rights (SOCR)). By doing so, the SHRC has been able to focus on its advisory role and transferred its policy-decision roles to the Department. With more budgets, legal authority, and more staff, the SOCR works to implement policies and to bring best practices in the City with collaborative works not only with the SHRC but also with other Commissions such as Seattle Women's Commission and LGBT Commission.

Third, the SHRC has been successful in advocating various issues such as workers' rights, women and minority businesses, homelessness, police reforms and violence against women issues. The Commission also actively engaged in communication with the local community and other local civil rights or human rights organizations by holding public hearings and public forums. Recently, the SHRC began using social network services to communicate with general public. Furthermore, it has actively published its works and events to the public.

Fourth, the Commission put its best efforts into examining current policies and providing recommendations to the local government by publishing its reports on various issues. The reports not only deliver public concerns but also include specific data and in-depth analysis of the problems as well as feasible recommendations to implement. Therefore, many of their suggestions have been accepted and implemented in the government; for example, the Panhandling Ordinance was repealed by the Mayor McGuinn based upon the SHRC's recommendation. Another example is that the Office of Professional Accountability was relocated after the SHRC addressed the public's complaints to the City Council.

Fifth, the SHRC has taken collaborative actions with local human rights organizations or the local government to begin statewide projects or to draw the federal government level attention. To participate in the long-term plan such as to end homelessness in Seattle, the Commission participated in the project with the King County and other organizations. Also, to initiate the investigation on the police misconduct and internal investigation process of the SPD, the Commission worked with other organizations to request the Department of Justice; as a result, the DOJ conducted its investigation for 11 months and provided results of investigation and mandates for the SPD to reform.

Sixth, the SHRC began bringing international human rights standards into analysis of existing problems and local policies since the 2000s. It has been four years since the Commission actively used international treaties and standards in their reports

and provided recommendations based upon those standards. It is also noticeable that the Commission began to make recommendations more often to the federal government regarding the federal policies such as granting Temporary Protected Status to Guatemalan and reauthorization of VAWA bill based upon international human rights standards.

The SHRC has put their efforts to bring the local government's attention to positive rights such as economic and social rights. As Donnelly pointed out, economic and social rights are recognized as less important rights than cultural and political rights in US.¹¹⁵ Since many people do not have means to ensure adequate housing, health, and social insurance, many of social problems have resulted because of lack of acknowledgement of these social and economic rights. The Commission has taken an important role as an advocate agency to increase public awareness of social and economic rights of minority population in the City.

It also made efforts to provide concrete policy recommendations based upon international human rights standards. The effort to end homelessness in the King County and to protect homeless people as protected class was a great example that emphasized positive rights such as right to adequate housing (Article 25 of UDHR.) The Commission looks into not only the ratified human rights standards but also the signed treaties such as the ICESCR. By encompassing those norms and bringing them

¹¹⁵ (Donnelly 1998) p.25 US ratified ICCPR but only signed the ICESCR.

into local policies, the Commission emphasizes the importance of strengthening human rights standards in the City of Seattle.

Other Commissions

Based upon research of other human rights commission, it is obvious that each local commission was established to address the needs of its unique local community. Also, the size of the commission varies based upon the City's diversity and the population. For example, San Francisco Human Rights Commission and New York City Commission on Human Rights were established in the early 1960's and in the 1940's; and later on, they became governmental bodies and sub-committees of the Commissions act as an advisory agency to the Commission. The City of Portland's Human Rights Commission was established recently to address needs of its growing diverse population in the City. It is also revealed that all of them have similar agendas such as campaign to address problems of hate crimes and discrimination on housing. All of the Commissions publish reports on their works regularly and post their events on their websites for the public.

While San Francisco Human Rights Commission and New York City Commission on Human Rights focus more on already established civil rights laws and legislations and on enforcement of these legislations, the City of Portland's Human Rights Commission and the SHRC have recently focused not only on the local human rights issues but also bringing international human rights standards into local human

rights policies and practices. Especially, the SHRC began looking at outward-legislations and has provided recommendations to the federal government.

Limitation of the SHRC and Suggestions for Future Work

- **Size of the Commission**

Compared to the amount of work and the broad scope of the work that the SHRC has dealt with, the size of the Commission is small; there are 15 volunteer commissioners. However, other Commissions have more commissioners; for example, the Seattle Women's Commission has 21 commissioners. Also, there is only one paid staff to assist the SHRC and the staff also assists the Seattle Commission for People with DisAbilities. Since the Commission has various activities such as holding public forums, Human Rights Day event, and research, there is a great need for more staff positions and commissioners. To continue effective work of the Commission and to address increasing needs of the local community, it is critical to have more commissioners and staff.

- **Resource Constraints**

The Commission has faced the lack of financial resources since the late 2000s. Because of the continuous budget cuts, the Commission had to consider cutting their budgets for activities such as the Human Rights Day event. It also influences training programs for the commissioners and publishing activities.

With the importance of the sustainable fund to the Commission, Kaufman recommended that the federal government design funding system for state and local government.¹¹⁶ She also recommended that the federal government or a federal agency such as U.S. Commission on Civil and Human Rights utilize grant programs to provide a local human rights agency or to support specific human rights agenda.¹¹⁷ Utilization of the grant program has other benefits for each party; for example, agencies and the funding government can collaborate in “monitoring, reporting and data analysis.¹¹⁸”

Saunders and Bang also suggest organizational change of the Commission into a tax-exempt organization and looking for private funds; it is because there are more private funds available in the human rights field than governmental grants.¹¹⁹ For instance, the Orange County Human Relations Commission was once an advisory body under the city government and changed its organization to a non-profit organization. By doing so, the Orange County Human Relations Council has had more chances to apply for private and public grants and increased their financial capacities.¹²⁰ It has been able to secure funds for more staff and to diversify its activities and programs.¹²¹

- Other Suggestions

From the document research and observation of the Commission’s meetings, it is very clear that the leadership of the Chair of the Commission takes an important role to

¹¹⁶ (Kaufman, State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation 2011)p.106

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ (Saunders and Bang 2007) pp.10-11

¹²⁰ Ibid

¹²¹ *ibid.* p.11

form the Commission's agendas and to achieve its goals. The SHRC has been under direction of effective and efficient leaderships since the late 2000s. It has accomplished many achievements and expanded its capacity into research and active participation in collective efforts with local human rights agencies. To make sure the consistency of the Commission's work, the Commission needs to develop frameworks or mechanisms to strengthen roles of each commissioner and to hold them accountable for their responsibilities in case of the absence of the strong leadership.

For the last few years, the SHRC has diversified its activities and has hired graduate students interns to extend its research activities with local universities. The cooperative research has provided valuable resources such as publishing its history report and designing a human rights toolkit. The collaboration work should extend not only to the local academia but also to other commissions in other areas.¹²²

Chapter 5. Conclusions

Summary

This research investigated the Seattle Human Rights Commission and its activities to promote equality in policy-making procedures. Based upon historical documents and interviews, this research has looked at four major roles of the Commission; 1. advocate human rights issues and policies 2. monitor and report human

¹²² (Saunders and Bang 2007) pp.12-13

right issues 3. assess local human rights policy and practices and 4. engage in education and training.¹²³

The SHRC has taken an important role in promoting civil rights and human rights in the City of Seattle. Especially since the 2000s, the SHRC expanded its capacity and made efforts to bring the international human rights standards into the civil rights and human rights policies and practices in the City of Seattle. From comparisons to other Commissions, I found out that local agencies have different legal status and different agendas in the local government due to the unique history and economic and social atmosphere.

Limitation of the study and suggestions for future investigation

This research used a qualitative methodology to provide case specific information about the SHRC and its work throughout its 50 years of history. Since it focused on the SHRC, this research cannot generalize the work of other commissions. Also, this study did not look at the Commission's budget and funding. For the future work of the Commission, it will be beneficial to research its funding structure and various ways to secure its funding. Also, collaborative research with other Commissions for specific agendas and cases will provide feasible ideas and solutions for the SHRC.

Appendix

¹²³ Ibid, pp.96-101

Table 1. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)	Homelessness as Protected Class/Rights of the vulnerable population (Panhandling Ordinance)/	Article 2	Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.
	Seattle As a Human Rights City/	Article 7	All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.
	Support for Seattle Care Council/	Article 10	Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.
	Granting Temporary Protected Status for Guatemalans/	Article 25	1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.
	Passage of Senate VAWA bill		2. Motherhood and Childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Table 2. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

--

<p style="text-align: center;">The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights(1966)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Seattle as a Human Rights City/ Report on the Political Accountability/ Panhandling Ordinance/ Support for Seattle Care Council/Support for Senate VAWA bill</p>	Article 2	1. Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. 2. Where not already provided for by existing legislative or other measures, each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to take the necessary steps, in accordance with its constitutional processes and with the provisions of the present Covenant, to adopt such laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to the rights recognized in the present Covenant. 3. Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes: (a) to ensure that any person whose rights or freedoms as herein recognized are violated shall have an effective remedy, notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity; (b) To ensure that any person claiming such a remedy shall have his right thereto determined by competent judicial, administrative or legislative authorities, or by any other competent authority provided for by the legal system of the State, and to develop the possibilities of judicial remedy; (c) To ensure that the competent authorities shall enforce such remedies when granted.
		Article 3	The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to ensure the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of all civil and political rights set forth in the present Covenant.
		Article 6 (1)	1. Every human being has the inherent right to life. This right shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life.
		Article 7	No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.
		Article 9	1. Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law. 2. Anyone who is arrested shall be informed, at the time of arrest, of the reasons for his arrest and shall be promptly informed of any charges against him. 3. Anyone arrested or detained on a criminal charge shall be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law to exercise judicial power and shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release. It shall not be the general rule that persons awaiting trial shall be detained in custody, but release may be subject to guarantees to appear for trial, at any other stage of the judicial proceedings, and, should occasion arise, for execution of the judgement. 4. anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detention and order his release if the detention is not lawful. 5. Anyone who has been the victim of unlawful arrest or detention shall have an enforceable right to compensation.
		Article 10	1. All persons deprived of their liberty shall be treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human persons. 2. (a) Accused persons shall, save in exceptional circumstances, be, segregated from convicted persons and shall be subject to separate treatment appropriate to their status as unconvicted persons; (b) Accused juvenile persons shall be separated from adults and brought as speedily as possible for adjudication. 3. The penitentiary system shall comprise treatment of prisoners the essential aim of which shall be their reformation and social rehabilitation. Juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and be accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status.
		Article 14	1. All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals. In the determination of any criminal charge against him or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The press and the public may be excluded from all or part of a trial for reasons of morals, public order (ordre public) or national security in a democratic society, or when the interest of the private lives of the parties so requires, or to the extent strictly necessary in the opinion of the court in special circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice; but any judgement rendered in a criminal case or in a suit at law shall be made public except where the interest of juvenile persons otherwise requires or the proceedings concern matrimonial disputes or the guardianship of children. 2. Everyone charged with a criminal offence shall have the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law. 3. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, everyone shall be entitled to the minimum guarantees, in full equality. 4. In the case of juvenile persons, the procedure shall be such as will take account of their age and the desirability of promoting their rehabilitation. 5. Everyone convicted of a crime shall have the right to his conviction and sentence being reviewed by a higher tribunal according to law. 6. When a person has by a final decision been convicted of a criminal offence and when subsequently his conviction has been reversed or he has been pardoned on the ground that a new or newly discovered fact shows conclusively that there has been a miscarriage of justice, the person who has suffered punishment as a result of such conviction shall be compensated according to law, unless it is proved that the non-disclosure of the unknown fact in time is wholly or partly attributable to him. 7. No one shall be liable to be tried or punished again for an offence for which he has already been finally convicted or acquitted in accordance with the law and penal procedure of each country.
		Article 22	1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of association with others, including the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests. 2. No restrictions may be placed on the exercise of this right other than those which are prescribed by law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order (ordre public), the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. This article shall not prevent the imposition of lawful restrictions on members of the armed forces and of the police in their exercise of this right. 3. Nothing in this article shall authorize States Parties to the International Labor Organization Convention of 1948 concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize to take legislative measures which would prejudice, or to apply the law in such a manner as to prejudice, the guarantees provided for in that convention.
Article 25	Every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity, without any of the distinctions mentioned in article 2 and without unreasonable restrictions. (a) To take part in the conduct of public affairs, directly or through freely chosen representatives; (b) To vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret ballot, guaranteeing the free expression of the will of the electors; (c) To have access, on general terms of equality, to public service in his country.		
Article 26	All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.		

Table 3. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	Support to end homelessness in King County/ Support for Seattle Care Council/ Seattle as a Human Rights City/ Support for granting TPS to Guatemalans	Article 6	1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right to work, which includes the rights of everyone to the opportunity to gain his living by work which he freely chooses or accepts, and will take appropriate steps to safeguard this right. 2. The steps to be taken by a State Party to the present Covenant to achieve the full realization of this right shall include technical and vocational guidance and training programmes, policies and techniques to achieve steady economic, social and cultural development and full and productive employment under conditions safeguarding fundamental political and economic freedoms to the individual.
		Article 7	The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of just and favorable conditions of work which ensure, in particular (a) remuneration (fair wage and decent living for themselves and their families); (b) safe and healthy working conditions; (c) equal opportunity for everyone to be promoted ; (d) rest, leisure and reasonable limitation of working hours and pay
		Article 8	The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to ensure: (a) the right of everyone to form trade unions and join the trade unions of his choice; (b) the right of trade unions to establish national federations or confederations; (c) the right of trade unions to function freely subject to no limitations other than those prescribed by law (d) the right to strike 2. This article shall not prevent the imposition of lawful restrictions on the exercise of these rights by members of the armed forces or of the police or of the administration of the State. 3. Nothing in this article shall authorize States Parties to the International Labor Organization Convention of 1948 concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize to take legislative measures which would prejudice or apply the law in such a manner as would prejudice, the guarantees provided for in that Convention.
		Article 9	The States Parties to the present Convention recognize the right of everyone to social security, including social insurance.
		Article 11	1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing and to the continuous improvement of living conditions. The States Parties will take appropriate steps to ensure the realization of this right, recognizing to this effect the essential importance of international co-operation based on free consent. 2. The States Parties to the present Covenant, recognizing the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger, shall take, individually and through international co-operation, the measures, including specific programs, which are needed: (a) to improve methods of production, conservation and distribution of food by making full use of technical and scientific knowledge, by disseminating knowledge of the principles of nutrition and by developing or reforming agrarian systems in such a way as to achieve the most efficient development and utilization of natural resources; (b) taking into account the problems of both food-importing and food-exporting countries, to ensure an equitable distribution of world food supplies in relation to food.
		Article 12	1. The States Parties to the present Convention recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. 2. The steps to be taken by the States Parties to the present Covenant to achieve the full realization of this right shall include those necessary for (a) the provision for the reduction of the stillbirth-rate and of infant mortality and for the healthy development of the child; (b) the improvement of all aspects of environmental and industrial hygiene; (c) the prevention, treatment, and control of epidemic, endemic, occupational and other diseases; (d) the creation of conditions which would assure to all medical service and medical attention in the event of sickness.

Table

Table 4. The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their families			
The International Convention on the Protection of the rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (Article 56)	Granting TPS to Guatemalans	Article 56, part 3	In considering whether to expel a migrant worker or a member of his or her family, account should be taken of humanitarian considerations and of the length of time that the person concerned has already resided in the State of employment.

Works Cited

City and County of San Francisco. "Article IV, Section 4.107: HRC as a Charter agency ." *San Francisco Charter*.

Anderson, Peggy. *Minority Contractors Struggle since passage of Initiative 200*. november 2001. <http://community.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/archive/?date=20011123&slug=contractors23> (accessed October 2012).

Bloom, David. *Alleged Discrimination Against Black Ferry Workers*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1988.

Burroughs, Gaylynn. "More Than An Incidental Effect On Foreign Affairs: Implementation Of Human Rights By State And Local Governments." *New York University REVIEW OF LAW & SOCIAL CHANGE* (HEIN ONLINE) 30;411 (2005-2006): 411-445.

Choi, Hyun. *Human Rights*. Seoul: Vita Activa, 2008.

Congress Link. *Major Features of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964*. (accessed March 2012).

Cordone, Claudio. *Pursuing Justice:For all rights, for all people*. Annual report, Amnesty International , New York: Amnesty International USA, 2010, 18.

Dam, Shubhankar. "Lessons from National Human Rights Institutions Around the World for State and Local Human Rights Commissions in the United States." *Executive Session Papers:Human Rights Commissions and Criminal Justices*. Boston: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 2007. 1-10.

Davis, Lonnie. "Background and Comments on Draft Advocacy Action Agenda." Seattle, WA: Washington Coalition of Citizens with disAbilities, December 20, 1994.

Department of Planning and Development. *Seattle's Population & Demographics*. The City of Seattle. March 2012. (http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Research/Population_Demographics/Overview/default.asp).

Donnelly, Jack. *International Human Rights, Dilemmas In World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.

Ervin, Keith. "Seattle panhandling ordinance moves closer to passage." *The Seattle Times*. April 10, 2010. http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2011546286_panhandling08m.html (accessed February 2012).

Frazer, Angelyn. *Racial Profiling & Police Accountabilityq*. Seattle: Seattle Office of Civil Rights, 2000.

Frontline defenders. *Human Rights Defenders Carrie Dann and Mary Dann*. 2012. <http://www.frontlinedefenders.org/node/483> (accessed October 17, 2012).

Holmes, Alexander. *Seattle:The Growth of the City*. New Jersey, NJ: Chartwell Books, INC, 2007.

Jody, Fitzpatrick L, James R Sanders, and Blaine R Worthen. "Planning how to conduct evaluation." In *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*, by Fitzpatrick L Jody, James R Sanders and Blaine R Worthen, 340-374. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., 2011.

Kaufman, Risa E. "State and Local Commissions as Sites for Domestic Human Rights Implementation." *Human Rights in the United States: Beyond Exceptionalism*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2011. p.90.

Lewis, Hope. "'New' Human Rights: U.S. Ambivalence Toward the International Economic and Social Rights Framework." In *Bringing Human Rights Home (Volume 1): A History of Human Rights In the United States*, by Cynthia Soohoo, Catherine Albisa and Martha F. Davis, 103-144. Westport, CT: Praeger Publisher, 2008.

New York City Commission on Human Rights. *2012 Annual Report*. annual report, New York City Commission on Human Rights, NYC: New York City Commission on Human Rights, 2012, 1-32.

—. "Discrimination is illegal in New York City." *New York City Commission on Human Rights*. <http://www.nyc.gov/html/cchr/home.html> (accessed March 28, 2013).

New York City Commission on Human Rights. *NYC Commission on Human Rights Informational Booklet*. NYC, 2012.

—. "The History of the Human Rights Commission." *New York City Commission on Human Rights*. <http://www.nyc.gov/html/cchr/html/history.html> (accessed March 28, 2013).

Orange, Tony. "Public Meeting Summary and Suggestions." Seattle, WA: Seattle Human Rights Commission, November 17, 1988.

Ryu, Eunsook. *Human Rights for all*. Paju, Kyungki: Purunsoop, 2009.

San Francisco Human Rights Commission. *San Francisco Human Rights Commission Agency Overview*. <http://sf-hrc.org/index.aspx?page=59> (accessed September 15, 2012).

Saunders, Kenneth L., and Hyo Eun April Bang. "A Historical Perspective on U.S. Human Rights Commissions." *Executive Sessions Papers: Human Rights Commissions and Criminal Justice*. Boston: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 2007. 1-18.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Resolution #12-06: Support for Temporary Protected Status for Guatemalans*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, December 2012. 1-3.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Annual Report of Seattle Human Rights Commission*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1963.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Annual Report of Seattle Human Rights Commission*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1964.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Annual Report of Seattle Human Rights Commission*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1965, p.7.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Annual Report of Seattle Human Rights Commission*. . Annual Report, Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1963.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Annual Report of the Seattle Human Rights Commission*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission , 1969.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Annual Report of the Seattle Human Rights Commission from 1966 to 1968*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1968.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Annual Report of the Seattle Human Rights Commission: 1966-1968*. annual report, Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1968.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Office of Professional Accountability Review Board*. Seattle: Seattle Office of Civil Rights, 2001.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Public Forum, Citizen Review: Police Policies and Procedures*. Seattle: Human Rights Department, 1996.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Report of SHRC regarding the monitoring and investigation of citizen complaints of police harassment*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Department, 1990.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Report of the SHRC on Community and Police Relations*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1997.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. "Report on Police Accountability and Recommendations." Seattle, 2012.

—. "Resolution #12-02: Support for Seattle Care Council: Caring Across Generation." Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, June 7, 2012.

—. "Resolution 31420." *City of Seattle*. Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, December 2012.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Seattle Human Rights Commission 1996 Workplan*. Annual Workplan, Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1996.

—. "Seattle Human Rights Commission Hearing." *Seattle Human Rights Commission Hearing*. Seattle, WA: Seattle Human Rights Commission, November 3, 1988. 1-5.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *SHRC report on Council Bill 116807*. Seattle : Seattle Human Rights Commission, 2010.

Seattle Human Rights Commission. *Then and Now: Equity in Contracting*. . Seattle: Seattle Office of Civil Rights, 2000.

Seattle Human Rights Department. *Annual Report of Human Rights Department*. Seattle: Human Rights Department, 1974.

Seattle Human Rights Department. *Human Rights Department Annual Report*. Seattle: Human Rights Department, 1980.

Seattle Municipal Archives. *Equality for All*.

<http://www.seattle.gov/cityarchives/Exhibits/Women/panel11.htm> (accessed 08 2012).

—. *The Seattle Open Housing Campaign "An open hearing for closed mind"*.

<http://www.seattle.gov/CityArchives/Exhibits/Housing/panel8.htm> (accessed January 2012).

Seattle Office of Civil Rights. *10-Year Plan To End Homelessness In King County*. Seattle, WA: Seattle Office of Civil Rights, 2004.

SHRC/SOCR. "No Reasonable Cause Decisions and Appeals." *Seattle Office of Civil Rights*. August 2009.

<http://www.seattle.gov/humanrights/Documents/HowToFileAnAppealWithSHRC.pdf> (accessed October 2012).

Silva, Catherine. "Racial Restrictive Covenants:Enforcing Neighborhood Segregation in Seattle." *Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History Project*. 2009. http://depts.washington.edu/civilr/covenants_report.htm.

Solomon, Roslyn, and Chris Stearns. "Statement of Roslyn Solomon, Chair and Chris Stearns, Vice-Chair SHRC hearing on John T. Williams Shooting." *Seattle City Council Committee on Energy, Technology, and Civil Rights* . Seattle: Seattle Human Rights Commission, September 15, 2010.

The Citizen's Advisory Committee on Minority Housing. *Report of the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Minority Housing*. Seattle: The City of Seattle, 1962.

The City of Portland Human Rights Commission. *Report to the Community*. annual report, Portland: The City of Portland Human Rights Commission, 2011, 1-4.

The Dirksen Congressional Center . *Major Features of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964*.

http://www.congresslink.org/print_basics_histmats_civilrights64text.htm (accessed February 2012).

The Seattle Human Rights Commission, The Seattle Women's Commission, the Seattle LGBT Commission, and the Seattle Office for Civil Rights. "Resolution: Support for U.S. Grants to Guatemala to include funding for LGBT rights and Anti-Trafficking efforts." *Resolution: Support for U.S. Grants to Guatemala to include funding for LGBT rights and Anti-Trafficking efforts*. the SHRC, LGBTBC, SWC, and SOCR, August 24, 2012.

Thomas, Dorothy Q. "Are American Human? Reflections on the Future of Progressive Politics in the United States." *Human Rights in the United States: Beyond Exceptionalism*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2011. xx.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. *History of Fair Housing*.
http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp/aboutftheo/history (accessed February 2012).

—. *History of Fair Housing*. (accessed March 2012).

U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division. *Investigation of Seattle Police Department*. United States Attorney's Office Western District of Washington., 2011.

United Nations General Assembly. "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Geneva, December 1948.

unknown. "Sequence of Events in Conduct of Investigation." Seattle , wa: Seattle Human Rights Commission, 1988.

—. "The Public Safety Task Force Report." *The Public Safety Task Force Report*. Seattle: SHRC, February 2008.

Volscho, Thomas W. Jr. "Minimum wages and income inequality in the American States, 1960-2000." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 2005: 343-368.