

Michigan Civil Rights Commission

1964-2004

Forty Years and Beyond



In recognition of the importance of knowing and understanding history, the Michigan Civil Rights Commission (MCRC) and Michigan Department of Civil Rights (MDCR) gratefully acknowledges MDCR colleague Harold Core for researching and composing this booklet.

MICHIGAN CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Forty Years and Beyond

Background of Civil Rights in Michigan

Michigan already had an illustrious civil rights history by the time the Michigan Civil Rights Commission came into being in 1963. Civil rights can be defined as federal, state, or local laws designed to protect individuals from discriminatory treatment by the government or private citizens and organizations, especially when that discriminatory treatment is motivated by the stipulated illegal reasons for such treatment. Common illegal reasons or motivations for discriminatory treatment include race, sex, and disability. Michigan ranks as a progressive state because its history of civil rights protections is long and far reaching.

Laws forbidding slavery, for example, are even older than Michigan's statehood, as the Northwest Ordinance began the tradition of disallowing slavery even before Michigan's first state constitution. It is also interesting to note that Michigan never passed laws forbidding the ownership of property by Blacks.¹ Michigan also has a long history of being proactive in extending protections against discrimination. As early as 1867 legislation was passed prohibiting racial segregation in public education. In 1869 life insurance companies doing business with the state were no longer allowed to treat Blacks differently from Whites.

Interracial marriages have been legal in Michigan since 1883. In contrast, some states had laws on the books prohibiting such marriages as recently as 2000. In 1885 legislation was passed barring discrimination in public accommodations, and five years later the Michigan Supreme Court rejected the separate but equal doctrine and allowed civil action as the recourse for citizens subjected to discriminatory treatment.

Three other statutes increasing the protections against discrimination in public accommodations were passed in 1937, 1952, and 1956. Also, in 1952 government housing was included as an area where discrimination was prohibited. Finally in 1955 the Fair Employment Practices Act guaranteed the opportunity to gain employment regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. It also established a method of enforcement for these rights by creating the Fair Employment Practice Commission (FEPC).²

Laws however are often not enough to bring about change, and civil action remedies require attorneys willing to pursue the matter in court. While Michigan's laws offered more protections than most states, discrimination and overt racism were still very prevalent in Michigan. Also, while the Fair Employment Practice Commission was a step in the right direction, it did not address problematic areas of discrimination such as housing, police misconduct, and public accommodations.

By the Constitutional Convention of 1962, civil rights leaders recognized that there was a need for comprehensive and extended civil rights protections in all areas of Michigan life. The result was the creation of the eight member, nonpartisan Michigan Civil Rights Commission (MCRC). The Commission was part of the new state constitution that went into effect on January 1, 1964. The Commission's members are appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the senate, serving four years in staggered terms.

According to the new state constitution, the MCRC was prescribed by law "to investigate alleged discrimination against any person because of religion, race, color or national origin in the enjoyment of civil rights guaranteed by law and by this constitution..."³ Michigan is unique in that its civil rights commission is constitutional, rather than statutory. Professor Harold Norris, in the Commission's 1992 Annual Report indicated,

“The reason why the Constitution is paramount law is because it’s the only direct act of the sovereignty of the people. The Statute is a product of a representative group, the legislature. But the Constitution is the direct act of 10 million people in the State of Michigan...”⁴

As the new MCRC would also enforce discrimination in employment, the same section of the new constitution also authorized the transfer of staff, funds, equipment and duties of the Fair Employment Practice Commission to the new Civil Rights Commission.

Michigan Civil Rights Commission Through the Decades



John Feikens, J.D. Damon Keith, J.D.

In its first meeting January 3, 1964, Commissioners John Feikens, J.D. and Damon J. Keith, J.D. were elected co-chairmen. Commissioner Sidney M. Shevitz, J.D., who also served on the Fair Employment Practice Commission, was elected secretary. The Commission immediately agreed to begin to receive, investigate, and attempt to conciliate complaints of discrimination, including active complaints that were taken by the Fair Employment Practices Commission. The Commission’s first policy action was moving to keep the names of the person alleged to have committed the act of discrimination confidential until and unless a formal complaint was taken.

On April 1, 1964, Burton I. Gordin, former executive director of the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, joined the Commission as the first executive director of the Michigan Department of Civil Rights (MDCR). Gordin was murdered in 1970 by an unknown gunman, in what some believe was an

assassination because of his civil rights activity. MDCR provides a staff compliment for the implementation of the Commission's mission of securing and protecting equal opportunity and treatment. Over the next few months several other important Department positions were filled and the Commission opened offices in Grand Rapids, Detroit, Lansing, and Flint.⁵ Even though the Michigan Department of Civil Rights was not officially formed until 1965, in the beginning the Department functioned using staff and investigators from the Fair Employment Practices Commission.



Pontiac Public Inquiry Hearing panel (l. to r.) Assistant Attorney General William Bledsoe; Commissioners Fr. Theodore E. LaMarre, Rev. Dr. A.A. Banks, Jr. , John Dempsey, Julian A. Cook, Jr., Mrs. Frank W. Wylie and Sidney M. Shevitz. (1968)

For the most part, the Commission and Department have had three main categories of actions during their existence. The first two categories are used to create and maintain equal opportunity and treatment, specifically in the areas of housing, employment, education, law enforcement, public accommodations and public service. As part of the first category, processing complaints of discrimination filed by individuals has always been a very important part of the Department's work. The Department receives, investigates, and attempts to resolve complaints of illegal discrimination. If the Department is not able to resolve a complaint, but has discovered enough evidence of illegal discrimination, the complaint proceeds to the Commission to begin the process leading to a Commission ruling. In this capacity, the Commission serves as a quasi-judicial system where financial penalties and policy changes may be levied when there is sufficient evidence to support a charge

of discrimination. Commission rulings may be appealed by either party through court. To a great extent, the Commission has used the same complaint resolution process since 1964.

The Commission also holds public hearings or adopts reports on issues too broad to address as individual complaints. For example, in 1983 the Commission conducted public hearings on housing rental practices and policies throughout Michigan. Beatrice Banks, then Commission Chair,



Commissioner A.A. Banks, Jr. views housing conditions in Saginaw's second ward. A tour of the city's ghettos was part of the equal housing hearing held in Saginaw. (1966)

concluded that the hearings confirmed suspicions that housing discrimination was rampant in Michigan. By the end of that year the Commission adopted a report detailing the findings regarding discrimination in Detroit, Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Flint, as well as specific recommendations for ending housing discrimination in each city. Recommendations included training citizens and property managers on civil rights and fair housing laws, and challenging media not to accept discriminatory advertisements related to housing.⁶

The second category of actions is disseminating information and educating government entities, citizens, and private organizations about the protections and responsibilities provided by Michigan civil rights laws. The Commission, through regular meetings around the state, also gathers first hand information about the particular civil rights related struggles endured by citizens in the local area.

As part of the responsibility to disseminate information, the Commission will also issue opinions to outside organizations regarding civil rights related issues. In 1986, the Commission, then under Commission chair Dorothy Haener, issued a position statement urging all law enforcement agencies in Michigan to adopt comprehensive written deadly force policies consistent with the standards of the United States Supreme Court as expressed in Tennessee and City of Memphis v Garner, 471 US 1 (1985). This opinion permitted use of deadly force only when the officer has a reasonable belief that there is an immediate threat to the life of the officer, or another person.⁷



2001 Commission meeting. Pictured from left to right: Commissioner Evelyn L. Crane, Ed.D., MDCR Director Dr. Nanette Lee Reynolds, 2001 Commission Chair Francisco J. Villarruel, J.D., Commissioner Gary Torgow, J.D., and Commissioner Bishop George E. Brown.

A year earlier in 1985, the Commission issued a position statement supporting the rights of American Indians to enjoy the same protections against discrimination as are afforded all citizens of Michigan. The statement was written in response to “backlash” harassment and discrimination against Indians, especially in those communities where strong feelings and opinions exist regarding Indian treaty fishing rights. In the statement, the Commission

directed the Department, then under the direction of Dr. Ronald L. Quincy, and other state agencies to work closely together in long and short term programs to prevent tension and conflict stemming from arguments relating to the Indian fishing issue.⁸

In 2001, the Commission issued an opinion regarding a string of Detroit area deaths involving security guards and customers. The Commission called for voluntary education and training of security guards regarding their legal responsibilities and limits, as well as training in diversity and effective communication.⁹

The third category, which applies only to employment, is a contract compliance program where equal employment opportunities are secured by ensuring that contractors wishing to do business with the state hire minorities. Companies create affirmative action plans on a voluntary basis, and the Commission approves or rejects such plans. As indicated in the Commission's 1977-1978 Annual Report, "The Department believes that the case by case method of providing relief for individuals who feel they



Commission chairman Damon J. Keith (standing, left) at meeting during height of Detroit riot with Gov. George Romney, presidential aide Cyrus Vance and Mayor Jerome Cavanagh. Former Commission co-chairman John Feikens stands in right background. (1967)

are victims of discrimination would not alone bring about equal employment opportunity in the State of Michigan.”¹⁰

The compliance programs recognized the need for affirmative actions as a remedy designed to eliminate discrimination against minorities and women. In 1979 then Commission chairperson Gilberto G. Ibarra said,

*“If a statistical survey shows that minorities and females are not participating in the workforce at all levels, in a reasonable relation to their presence in the population and the labor force, the burden of proof is on the employer to show that this is not the result of discrimination, no matter how inadvertent.”*¹¹

With this perspective in mind, affirmative action was used to facilitate integration and breakdown the illegal barriers to employment for women and minorities.

In many ways the first year of the Commission’s activities set the tone for the future of civil rights in Michigan. Aware of the nationwide problem of racial violence, the Commission in 1964 established a tension control program and provided local communities guidelines on preventing racial conflicts. Since local police departments often bear the brunt of local hostilities as part of their responsibility to curb violence, the Commission stressed



Nearly 450 people came to the Lansing Civic Center for the Michigan Civil Rights Commission’s Leadership Conference in November 1983. Governor James J. Blanchard was the main speaker.

the importance of communication between police officials and the community and the creation of a process to resolve police complaints locally. On at least two occasions during the first year the Commission cooperated with local city officials to curb violence associated with integration efforts. In many of these cases, Blacks were attempting to relocate to all-White neighborhoods.

The efforts to curb integration based violence grew into a general role of monitoring and responding to acts of bias violence and the resulting social unrest. In 1967, both the Commission and Department were active in stemming the tide of violence during the Detroit riots. Staff members were stationed at Detroit police precinct stations and other jails where prisoners were detained. Representatives of the Commission joined with the Detroit Branch NAACP to observe detention facilities on Belle Isle used by the Wayne County Sheriff. Disturbances in Pontiac, Flint, Saginaw, and Grand Rapids, were mitigated by Department staff through alliances with area youths and city officials. Following the riots, the Commission made recommendations for restructuring the city including provisions in areas like housing, education, economics, communications and community involvement.

After realizing the value of assisting local communities in preventing social disorder and what are now called “hate crimes,” the Commission, through the Department, continues to maintain a crisis intervention team. Through ongoing monitoring, technical assistance, and other forms of intervention, the team members respond to conditions throughout the state where tension or violence may arise due to actual, alleged, or perceived unlawful discrimination.¹² According to the 2001 Annual Report, the crisis team has responded to a March 2001 cross burning in Allegan City, racial profiling incidents in several cities, as well as community and school conflicts throughout the state. The Commission continues to embrace the role of preventing tensions from escalation learned during the first year.¹³



1989 Commissioner Benny Napoleon with former legislators Mel Larsen and Daisy Elliott who sponsored the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, Michigan's comprehensive civil rights law.

As one might expect, the Commission also saw challenges to its authority during its first year. In response to complaints the Commission accepted regarding the Detroit Police Department, on December 14, 1964, the Wayne County prosecutor issued an opinion stating among other things that the Commission lacks authority to review the activities and conduct of policing agencies or the decision of the prosecuting attorney in the field of law enforcement and criminal prosecution. The prosecutor even went as far as to tell other law enforcement agencies they need not respond to the inquiries of the MCRC.

In another incident the Greater Detroit Home Owners Council sponsored an ordinance approved on September 12, 1964, designed to maintain discriminatory housing patterns. When the Commission took an interest in the matter, the Council filed an unsuccessful petition to the state Supreme Court seeking an injunction to prevent the Commission from taking any actions to stop the discriminatory ordinance. In both cases the Commission and Michigan's attorney general successfully defended the right of the Commission to enforce the legal protections from acts of discrimination in public service and housing.¹⁴

By 1977 the Commission had ten district offices with staff in every metropolitan area in Michigan with a concentration of minority citizens. The Commission, through the Department under Director Ruth Rasmussen, now enforced the Elliott-Larsen

Civil Rights Act and the Michigan Handicappers Civil Rights Act (later known as the Persons With Disabilities Civil Rights Act) which added sex, age, marital status, height, weight, arrest record, and disability to the four original protected categories in the Constitution. These eleven protected groups were enforced in all areas of Commission jurisdiction: employment, education, housing, public accommodation and public service.¹⁵

Over the years the Commission has had a profound effect on shaping civil rights policy in Michigan, including many court decisions that began with a Commission ruling. The authority of the MCRC to enforce and define civil rights under the Michigan Constitution was upheld in Beech Grove Investment Company v MCRC, 380 Mich 405 (1968). In 1973 a provision in the Fair Housing Act of 1968 allowing cases being argued before the MCRC to be removed to the circuit court was ruled unconstitutional and an unreasonable regulation of Commission procedures. These two rulings helped to define the Commission's authority to enforce civil rights, as well as clarify the Commission's level of autonomy.

In 1980 a court ruled the MCRC has jurisdiction over employment discrimination claims brought by state employees against state agencies. The MCRC's ability to award back-pay, attorney fees and interest in cases when it finds a person's civil rights have been violated was upheld in Michigan Dept. of Civil Rights ex rel Caskey v Horizon Tube Fabricating, Inc, 148 Mich App 633 (1986). Sumner v Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, 427 Mich 505 (1987) provided that consideration of damages is allowed for connected conduct falling outside the period of limitations when the conduct is part of a continuing violation which occurs within the period of limitations. This ruling allowed the Commission to consider discriminatory acts occurring outside the jurisdiction set by time limitations (now 180 days) if those acts were part of violations which continue into the Commission's 180 day time limit.



Commissioner Sondra Berlin (1985-1997), first person with a disability appointed to the commission.

The authority of the Commission was further defined in relation to the court process in Walker v Wolverine Fabricating & Mfg. Co., 425 Mich 586 (1986) which established the circuit court as the appropriate venue to appeal a Commission decision, but clarified that the court is to review the record as decided by the Commission, and without new evidence. In 1992, Department of Civil Rights ex rel Johnson v Silver Dollar Café, 441 Mich 110 (1992) confirmed that while the parties cannot introduce new evidence, the circuit court may

substitute its findings, conclusions, and decision for those of the Commission.

There were other court decisions not originating with a Commission ruling that helped to shape the direction of civil rights in Michigan. In 1971 the court ruled in Pompey v General Motors, 385 Mich 537 (1971) that the MCRC did not have exclusive jurisdiction over an employee's claim of racial discrimination, and the court in 1978 Holmes v Haughton Elevator Co., 404 Mich 36 (1978) confirmed that an individual has direct access to court and is not required to exhaust administrative remedies for civil rights violations. These two rulings mean that a citizen who believes his civil rights have been violated could pursue the alleged discriminating party in court or through the MCRC.

Two rulings in 1986 provided a stricter definition for types of disabilities which are within the Commission's jurisdiction as well as the responsibilities of the employer to accommodate a disability.

The court in Carr v General Motors Corp., 425 Mich 313 (1986) ruled that a disability must be unrelated to the employee's ability to perform a job in order to be covered by the Handicappers' Civil Rights Act. A second 1986 ruling, Rancour v Detroit Edison, 150 Mich App 276 (1986) provided that an employer is not required to place an employee into a new and different job as part of an accommodation to disability.

Further confining disability protections were Chmielewski v Xermac, 457 Mich 593 (1998) and Michalski v Bar-Levav, 463 Mich 723 (2001). In Chmielewski v Xermac, the court ruled that mitigating measures must be considered along with a person's condition in order to determine if the condition substantially limits a major life activity and therefore constitutes a disability. Under this ruling for example, a person claiming disability based on a low degree of hearing must be able to show that even with available hearing assistance devices, the condition would still substantially limit a major life activity. Michalski v Bar-Levav further established that a plaintiff must presently have a characteristic that currently creates a substantial limitation of a major life activity.

Laws regarding sexual harassment also saw their share of refinement with Radtke v Everett, 442 Mich 368 (1993) and Chambers v Trettco, 463 Mich 297 (2000). In Radtke v Everett, the



Commission public session at the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History in Detroit. (2000)

court used the reasonable person standard instead of the reasonable woman standard in order to determine if a hostile environment exists in sexual harassment allegations. A person alleging a hostile work environment must prove that the circumstances as a whole would cause a reasonable person in the plaintiff's position to have perceived a hostile work environment. Further in Chambers v Trettco, the court ruled that if a supervisor or manager is alleged to have created a hostile work environment, the employer is not liable unless he or she receive notice.

In 1993 in response to the increasing demands being placed on the Commission and Department, a new operating theme was created in order to promote teamwork and efficiency within the Department and to expand its presence and services in communities around the state. The Department's new director, Dr. Nanette Lee Reynolds, used the new theme, "People in Partnership for Progress" to signal a more cooperative approach to enforcing civil rights in Michigan, including an increased focus on preventive services.

In the course of the last decade, the Commission has entered partnerships with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Interagency Migrant Resource Committee, National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ), Fair Housing Network and many others in order to complete its mission. Beginning in 1994, the Commission partnered with community and legislative groups, as well as state and local government agencies to create the MCRC Bias Crimes Response Task Force Report Published in 1997. This was the first step to the eventual creation of the Michigan Alliance Against Hate Crimes (MIAAHC). MIAAHC brings together federal state and local law enforcement, civil rights organizations, community and faith based organizations, educators, and anti-violence advocates to establish a coordinated response to statewide crimes of hate and bias. Using the Department's 24-hour emergency hotline established in 2003 and the Crisis Response Team, MDCR is now able to quickly detect and monitor hate crimes and racial violence, while cooperating within

the MIAAHC partnerships to resolve the conflict, help diffuse the tension, and work towards preventing future violence.

As early as 1993, the Department began developing better and more cooperative relationships with local communities and the various human rights committees throughout the state. A partnership with Western Michigan University led to the creation of Civil Rights Health: A Community Based Model. Using this voluntary assessment process, a community can determine its own civil rights health, and identify ways to improve educational, economic, and other social conditions within and around its borders. The pilot for this project was conducted in Muskegon, Midland, and Pontiac, and in March 2003, the Department held a news conference and community forum to discuss the report on the city of Kalamazoo. The Department would like to see this model become the standard for measuring the state of civil rights in various localities, and providing a more concrete list of objectives for area leadership wishing to improve constituent conditions.

As part of the effort to become better connected to the diverse populations of the state, the Department established a multi-cultural liaison program. Under this initiative, in 1996 Dr. Reynolds began appointing MDCR liaisons to the following communities: African American, American Indian, Arab American, Asian American, Latino American, older persons, disability, and youth. Along with providing these communities with Department representation and a direct link for communication, in 2002 the liaisons also began conducting a Building Cultural Competency Workshop. The workshop focuses on the history and protocols of five major Michigan ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Arab American, Asian American, and Latino American. The workshop is presented to various governmental, non-profit, and private organizations wishing to enhance their ability to interact with Michigan's diverse populations.

In order to remain attuned to the needs of residents throughout the state, the Department in 2002 expanded its visibility by appointing liaisons to the communities where the Commission did not have a presence, including: Adrian, Alpena, Ann Arbor, Battle Creek, Benton Harbor, Chippewa County, Holland, Jackson, Mackinac County, Midland, Monroe, Mount Clemens, Mount Pleasant, Muskegon, Pontiac, Port Huron, and Ypsilanti. Through these liaisons the Department works to create and maintain lines of communication to local government and community leaders.

Through these partnerships and feedback from MDCR colleagues and the Michigan community, the Department realized an increasing need to become more customer focused. In 1996, the Department underwent a reengineering initiative, to among other things, reduce average investigation times, incorporate new technology into a more efficient complaint investigation process, and become a more multi-functional team oriented organization. As part of this process, Project 4300 beginning November 1997 was successful in eliminating the Department's 4,300 case backlog. It is this reengineering that put the Department in a position to take full advantage of the more constituent centered approach.

Looking to the Future

As we look to the future we know that some of the most important challenges to issues facing the Commission will be defending and continuing to define the state's civil rights laws as the nation struggles to adjust these laws to meet changing times. Perhaps the most important challenges are the result of the events of September 11, 2001, and the current and continuing wars on terrorism. America is learning to balance civil liberties and rights issues with equally important security issues brought on by terrorist activity. Matters like racial profiling and selective immigration remain troubling topics as our state and nation struggle with safety and constitutional protections.

Changes in civil rights due to terrorism are not the only challenges faced by the Commission however. A changing political and economic climate also faces the Commission. In 1999, for example the Michigan Legislature removed inmates in state and county jails from the protections of Michigan's civil rights statutes. In response, the Commission formed the Civil Rights Legislative Task Force, chaired by then Commission Vice-Chair Gary Torgow, to look at the amendments. The task force, like the Commission, was bipartisan, but included representatives from legal services and disability advocacy organizations as well as, from an interfaith deacon's conference, Governor's office, and the Department of Corrections. The task force unanimously agreed the amendments needed to be reexamined, and the Commission continues to work with members of the executive and legislative branches of government on this issue.¹⁶ While the Commission remains aware, the social, legal and political climate often threaten to further reduce its jurisdiction.

The slowing economy presents the Commission with another challenge. With difficult economic times comes an increase in the pressure placed on civil and human services in general. Complaints of discrimination increase as employers find arbitrary or selective reasons to decrease the workforce in order to match decreased production needs. The employers are then less willing to voluntarily resolve the complaints because those same needs to decrease expenditures leave employers with less flexibility in resolving complaints. As stated in the Commission's annual report for 1991, "There is a relationship between the economy and affirmative hiring; the economy and the spirit of cooperation; and the economy and the backlash from desperate people who have nowhere to turn."¹⁷

The changing state demographics will present more challenges to the Commission. As the minority population grows larger and we see an influx of immigrants, the Commission will have to stay vigilant in making sure that the society is able to embrace the increasing

diversity. Issues like affirmative action remain controversial even as the Supreme Court confirms the benefits of diversity without affirming the use of quotas or percentage points. There will no doubt be other coming legal challenges as universities and businesses attempt to adjust their affirmative action style programs to meet the Supreme Court's example. The use of American Indian mascots is another issue of continuing importance. As our state becomes more diverse, we also become more aware of certain mainstream traditions that may be considered offensive to certain ethnic groups. The Commission will no doubt remain on the forefront of efforts to recognize that traditions that are offensive to one culture, must become offensive to us all.

In regards to the future of MCRC, perhaps a statement by Co-Chairmen Feikens and Keith at the first meeting of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission in 1964 best describes our goal and continuing challenge, "...We conceive that among these civil rights are the obvious rights that each citizen has: The right that each child has to achieve his God-given potential through equal educational programs and facilities; The right that each of us has to obtain employment based on ability; The right that each of us has to choose to eat or stay at the public accommodations of his choice; The right each of us has to live wherever his means permit..."

Forty years later we have certainly made progress, but the journey is far from over. There were obstacles then, and there remain obstacles now. There were supporters and allies then, there remain supporters and allies now. As it was then, the Commission remains dedicated to the struggle for justice and equality.

The Michigan Civil Rights Commission welcomes Attorney General Jennifer Granholm to a monthly Commission Meeting. Pictured from left to right are: Assistant in Charge of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Rob Willis, Director Nanette Lee Reynolds, Michigan Civil Rights Commissioner Valerie P. Simmons, Commissioner



Albert Calille, Attorney General Jennifer Granholm, Commission Vice Chair Evelyn L. Crane, Commission Secretary Francisco J. Villarruel and Commission Chair Richard J. Garcia. (1999)

-
1. Beech Grove Investment Company v Civil Rights Commission of the State of Michigan, 380 Mich 405:157 NW2d 213 (1968).
 2. Cramton, Roger C. The Powers of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission, 68 Mich. L. Rev. 5 (1964)
 3. 1963 Michigan Constitution Article V Section 29
 4. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 1992
 5. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. The Year of the Beginning: 1964 Annual Report. (1965)
 6. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 1983
 7. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Position Statement on The Use of Deadly Force. (1986)
 8. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Position Statement on Native American Treaty Fishing Rights. (1985)
 9. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 2001
 10. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 1977-1978
 11. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 1978-1979
 12. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 2001
 13. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 2001
 14. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. The Year of the Beginning: 1964 Annual Report. (1965)
 15. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 1976-1977
 16. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 2001
 17. Michigan Civil Rights Commission. Annual Report: 1991

Michigan Civil Rights Commissioners Through 2003

1960's

Rev. A.A. Banks, Jr. (1964-1977)
Edward L. Barrera (1969-1974)
Julian A. Cook, Jr., J.D. (1968-1971)
Richard Cross (1964-1965)
John T. Dempsey (1967-1969)
John Feikens, J.D. (1964-1967)
William T. Gossett, J.D. (1964-1966)
George E. Gullen, Jr. (1967-1972)
Damon J. Keith, J.D. (1964-1968)
Kenneth W. Robinson (1964-1967)
Father Theodore E. LaMarre (1964-1981)
Sidney Shevitz (1964-1971)
Martha R. Wylie (1965-1972)
Carole T. Williams (1969-1972)

1970's

Beatrice Banks (1979-1984)
Catherine Blackwell (1973-1984)
Carole Chiamper, J.D. (1975-1981)
Avern Cohn, J.D. (1972-1975)
Sharon Tevis Finch, J.D. (1973-1975)
Hilda Gage, J.D. (1975-1978)
Berry Goodlett (1975-1981)
Paulette LeBost, J.D. (1971-1974)
Paul Habrecht, J.D. (1975-1982)
Gilberto Ibarra (1974-1984)
Dalton A. Roberson, J.D. (1972-1974)
Rev. Dr. Frederick G. Sampson (1977-1983)

1980's

Sondra Berlin (1985-1997)
Beverly Clark, M.A., J.D. (1982-1991)
Eva L. Evans, Ph. D. (1985-1992)
Dorothy Haener (1983-1991)
Michael Hidalgo, J.D. (1984-1991)
Rev. William Holly (1983-1991)
Alan May, J.D. (1981-1985)
Benny Napoleon, J.D. (1984-1991)
Philip Van Dam, J.D. (1982-1991)

1990's

Tim Attalla, J.D. (1991-1998)
Dr. Yahya Mossa Basha (1999-2003)
Evelyn L. Crane, Ed.D. (1994-2002)
Richard J. Garcia, J.D. (1996-2000)
Archie Hayman, J.D. (1991-1994)
Harry G. Hutchison IV, J.D. (1991-1994)
Richard D. Letts (1993-1997)
Arthur J. Lombard, J.D. (1991-1994)
Marie Elena Martell, J.D. (1995-1996)
Laura Reyes Kopack, J.D. (1991-1994)
Father Robert A. Sirico (1994-1997)
Pastor Edgar Vann, Jr. (1991-2000)

Current Commission

Mohammed Abdrabboh, J.D. (2003-present)
Bishop George E. Brown (2000-present)
Albert Calille, J.D. (1998-present)
Dr. Tarun K. Sharma (2001-present)
Valerie P. Simmons, J.D. (1998-present)
Gary Torgow, J.D. (1998-present)
Margaret M. Van Houten, J.D. (2003-present)
Francisco J. Villarruel, J.D. (1994-present)

Michigan Department of Civil Rights - Directors Through 2003

Burton I. Gordin (1964-1970)
Dr. Milton Robinson (1970-1972)
James H. Blair (1972-1975)
Ruth Rasmussen (1975-1982)
Dr. Ronald L. Quincy (1982-1985)
John Roy Castillo (1985-1993)
Dr. Nanette Lee Reynolds (1993-present)

**For More Information on the
Michigan Civil Rights Commission
call
1-800-482-3604**



2003