- 14

D. C. ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FORUM ON POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS IN D. C.

Monday, May 19, 1980

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 o'clock p.m., in the Auditorium, National City Christian Church, Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C., Reverend Ernest Gibson, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

CCR

Meet.

Howard Glickstein, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Courtland Cox, Representing
Mayor Marion Barry

HELEN L. KAPLAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES 232-6600

1	<u>INDEX</u>	Page
2	WELCOME:	
3	Reverend Ernest Gibson .	3
4	REMARKS:	
5	Howard Glickstein, D. C. Advisory Committee	5
6	Courtland Cox, for Mayor Barry	14
7	PERSPECTIVES, ON POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS:	
8	Robert King, 14th Street PAC Houston M. Bigelow, Deputy Chief, MPD	15 21
9	Howard Glickstein, for John Kerr Roland Roebuck, Office of Latino Affairs	27 35
10	Evelyn Blackwell, Black Aged Benny Van Huss, RAP	42 44
11	WORKSHOPS:	
12	THE EFFECT OF THE MEDIA:	
13	Yetta W. Galiber	50
14	Angela Owens Milton Coleman	50 52
15	POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY AND COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY:	
16	Howard A. Glickstein	71
17	Hon. Wilhelmina Rolark Prof. Irving Ferman	72 78
18	Lt. James Gannon Officer Ron Hampton	82 83
19	ENFORCEMENT DECISIONS:	
20	Dr. Paul Phillips Cooke	100
21	Officer Beverly Medlock	103
22	THE ROLE OF THE POLICE:	
23	Helen Fugh Hays Melvin Boozer	113
24	Adjoa Burrow Father Joaquin Bazin	118
25	- adita daguan basan	119
	HELEN L. KAPLAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES 232-6600	

HELEN L. KAPLAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES 232-6600

(7:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We did want all members of the advisory committee to be present, but we'll just have to start without them. I think we need to get this show on the road.

Good evening and welcome. I'm Ernest Gibson, the Chairman of the D. C. Advisory Committee to the U. S. Civil Rights Commission and, before we begin tonight's program on Police-community relations in our city, I want to explain a little bit about our committee and about the Commission on Civil Rights.

The U. S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent Federal agency that studies civil rights issues concerning discrimination based on race, color, natural origin, religion, sex, age or handicap.

Based on such studies, the Commission makes recommendations to the President and Congress, usually in the form of Crimp Reports.

The D. C. Advisory Committee is one of the 51 state committees that advise the Commission on local civil rights problems.

I want to introduce now the other members of the Committee who are here tonight and who have helped organize this event. I ask that you would stand, please,

as I call your names.

Howard Glickstein, Professor of Law, Howard
University Law School and Chairman of the Committee Task
Force on the Administration of Justice.

Ruth Jordan, Writer and consultant.

Dr. Paul Phillips Cooke, Past-president of the District of Columbia Teachers' College and currently active in many other aspects of D. C. affairs.

Yetta Galiber, Executive Director of the Information Center for the Handicapped Individuals, Incorporated. Mrs. Galiber wears many other hats as well.

And Mrs. Helen Hays, Director of the Chinese Cultural Center.

We have organized this forum to serve two purposes. First, we want to add issues of current concern regarding Police-Community Relations.

Secondly, we wish to convey the information, comments and suggestions made here to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, which is currently engaged in writing a report on police practices.

We hope our experience will aid the Commission informulating its findings and recommendations for the President and Congress.

We are going to ask that Mr. Howard Glickstein will give us some insight into the thinking of the Committee's

. 2

Task Force on the Administration of Justice as they set up this forum.

Mr. Glickstein.

MR. GLICKSTEIN: Thank you, Reverend Gibson.

The D. C. Advisory Committee of the U. S.

Commission on Civil Rights conceived of having this

forum tonight because of the feeling of many members -
particularly in the last few months in the District of

Columbia: there appears to be a strain in the police
community relations.

The problem of police-community relations and citizen-police relations has been a problem that has been with us for a long time. It's a problem that's studied over and over again. It is a problem that has received particular attention in the last 15 years.

You probably all have heard and seen the various reports over the years and have discussed this problem — the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and so forth — the Kerner Commission that was appointed by President Johnson over 15 years ago — the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice and Standards, the D. C. President's Commission on Crime — one commission after another continuously returning to the same problem — the problem that we never seem to be able to solve. For some reason, we have been able to figure out how to get to

the moon in a year. We have been able to figure out how to cure polio, but we have not been able to come up with any way of insuring that the interaction between the police and the community involves a minimum amount of friction.

.17

Many persons — many of the commissions I have just identified and other organization citizen groups have, over the years, identified solutions to some of these problems; identified approaches that should be taken to solve some of these problems and many of these recommendations have been adopted.

I think, if you look back at the reports that I have just mentioned -- and, in the materials you were given, there is a summary of those reports, you will find that a lot of these recommendations that people thought at one time were the cure; would solve those problems have been adopted, particularly, by the District of Columbia Police Department.

Despite the fact that these recommendations that once seemed to everybody to be the cure have been adopted, we still seem to be having problems. Now, why aren't these various remedies that have been proposed and have been adopted — why aren't they proving to be effective?

What else needs to be done?

The type of complaints you hear from the police and from citizens and from citizen groups seems to sound somewhat familiar -- if not very familiar -- to what was heard years ago. The police complained that they are not given adequate cooperation, that they are treated as enemies, with hostility, instead of as allies.

The sex segment of the public complains about police tactics, about police rudeness, about the excessive use of force by the police.

There are segments of the public that complain that crime is not being adequately handled; that there is inadequate police protection; that there are not enough police on the streets.

Other segments of the community claim that there are excessive policemen; that there are too many police on the streets; that the police act like an occupation force.

Some people claim that the fear of crime makes them prisoners in their own homes. They are being denied one element of freedom and security by the failure of the community to adequately deal with crime.

They also suggest that there might also be a bit less due process; that it might be desirable for there to be a little bit less dur process if that is going to result in greater security.

ß

On the other hand, there are people that complain that the police are insensitive and the courts are insensitive to some due process issues and that we need more due processes; that what is needed are greater curbs on police powers and greater limits on what the police can do.

These seem to be perennial issues. They seem to be issues that groups twenty years ago have discussed. I am reminded of the time that Dr. Kenneth Clark, the noted psychologist, appears before the Kerner Commission to testify about some of the riots that were incurred in that period, and he said it all seemed like Alice-in-Wonderland to him; that it was the same problem that this Kerner Commission was considering in 1965; that the Commission that had studied the riots in Chicago in 1919 had considered.

And Dr. Clark said: it's a revolving door -the same problems, the same discussion, the same proposals
and nothing seems to happen. And that, perhaps, is part
of the problem in this area. And, for that reason, our
committee thought it would be very desirable to conduct
this forum tonight to hear from representatives of the
community and the community groups and of the government
to talk about these issues and to see, as Revenerd Gibson
mention, if we can evolve from all of this some recommendations

that might be passed on to the Congress and to the Government of the District of Columbia, so I hope that our group tonight will benefit from some of the remarks of the people we have in the audience and perhaps this Alice-in-Wonderland situation that we are always talking about -- same issues and never seeming to solve them -- perhaps we can move down the road towards some solutions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Glickstein.

Now, I want to introduce to you Mr. Courtland Cox, Director of the City's Minority Business Opportunity Commission. Mr. Cox is here representing the Mayor of the City, who is unable to be with us.

One reason we invited Mayor Barry is, besides from the obvious being one of the high offices of the Cty -- is his history of activism in the Sixties which we thought would give him a unique perspective on this subject of police-community relations.

Courtland Cox has a similar life history as an earlier member of the student non-violent coordinating committee. We look forward to hearing from him.

Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: I think that I would like to start my remarks at the point that Reverend Gibson left off because I think both the Mayor, Marion Barry, and myself

have seen the question of police-community relationships from both sides of the fence; that, for over fifty -- I guess some close to twenty years, we were involved in trying to deal with the questions of injustice in the United States.

And, after some -- I guess about two years or I guess 18 months now, we have been involved in the question of running a city which includes the question of running a police department.

I think the title of tonight's forum, "Police-Community Relations", is very revealing because, if we look at it, the question that most comes to my mind is: which community?

Because we are not talking about police in isolation versus "the" community in totality but, I think, when we examine the discussion, we are looking at police relations versus segments of the community.

And I think it's clear that, to be honest, the police persons — they are not only police "men"; there are police "women" these days — have a most difficult role in any society because they are not acting as individuals, but they are acting as the front line of the law and the attitudes of the overall community.

So, therefore, when they act, they are mirroring those things that the dominant community wants to see

enforced. And, while they are the most visible and the focal point of the discussion, I think, for us to understand the whole question of relationships between the police and segments of the community, we have to examine the overall attitudes of the community itself.

Now, what do I mean by that? In 1960, when I first came here to Washington, D. C., "the" overall community had laws which the Mayor, myself, along with hundreds and thousands of others, thought were unjust. But the police had to uphold those laws.

For example, I could not go on 14th Street up on Park Row to that drugstore and sit down at a lunch counter because, if I did, the police would take me out.

I could not move into Clifton Terrace in 1960 because it was reserved for Whites. If I did, the police would take me out.

I remember: even Black policement couldn't ride in police cars in 1960 so that what you had in that situation was "the" police defending the attitudes and views of "the" community against a segment of the community. And that continued and continued until we have in Miami today, and over the past two days, hit across the nation.

So that what you have is the police being the "shock troops", the most obvious segment reflecting the views and attitudes of "the" society -- "the" community

against a segment of the community.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, that problem was eliminated, not because the police were taught to act better toward that segment of the community; it was the problem between the Black community and the police. It was not eliminated because we had some community relations courses but the problem was eliminated in the final analysis because the Black community was allowed into "the" community and became "a" group -- part of "the" group that made the laws -- part of the group that was involved in the construction of the community as opposed to the distruction of the community, so I think that, when you look at what happened over the past 20 years, at least on the question of the racial side, I think that we see acts, incidents -- the lessening of incidents between the police in the Black community, not because the police and the cojmunity had come to some accommodation but because that segment of society -- the Black community and the total segment, the total community, had come into some greater harmony so that the police who, in the final analysis, have to reflect the attitudes and the laws of the power structure did not have that responsibility to carry out any more.

Then, you say: well, why are having at this particular time, at this historical moment, a recurrence of police-community kinds of problems?

:

And, if we begin to look at what we begin to talk about, we are not having the police-community problems with the same segment of the soceity as we used to; and that we are having the problems more in particular sections of the community, such as 14th Street, or with particular sectors of the community, such as the Black Youth. And, again, there are underlying reasons within the society that have to look at.

And I think, when we begin to look at it, we have to begin to look at the economic situations and the economic pressures that exist in the society that the police then have to begin to deal with.

And we have to begin to look at the community as a whole and begin to look at the laws and the attitudes that we ask them to uphold and reflect.

I think that police-community relations are only a part of the discussion. Because the police are the people who meet that section of the community first and, therefore, their attitudes in the community can make a great deal of difference in terms of the way -- whether they view themselves as being beseiged or view themselves as an occupying army or they view themselves as protecting the community.

That can make a significant difference. The attitudes of the policemen with the young people they are

serving, as an example, or serving as oppressive force could make a tremendous difference.

But I think that is only 10% of the problem -maybe 20% of the problem. I think, in the final analysis
if this city and this administration and all the administrations across the country are not able to include economically
the young people and those who are underemployed and unemployed within the community and within the society -- that
I think the police have a fritening job because, in the
final analysis, those who don't have those things that they
see others have will try to get them.

And the attitude of the society is -- will be to prevent those who don't have from getting it. And I think that, in discussion of police-community relations, while we have to look at the attitude of the police as one factor, I think we also have to bring into the equasion those kinds of things that are ging on in society -- economic and otherwise, that make the job of the police person difficult because there are a number of other social and economic and political pressures that are working in the community that crease hostility between the police and segments of the community.

I'll leave it there, and thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Cox.

We will now turn to our panel and get their perspectives on police-community relations. Our committee felt that we needed the benefit of several different perspectives to get an accurate picture of the police-community situation today.

Our first speaker will be Mr. Robert King.

Mr. King is the community relations director of the 14th Street PAC, the 14th Street Project Area Committee. He will give us a few views from the neighborhood.

MR. KING: Thank you, Mr. Gibson.

I think the best way to describe the youth of the 14th Street Project is to indicate it's an extremely hostile, extremely tense -- and there is an epidemic of drugs in the 14th Street Project and fear is the common thread that links everyone together.

I say: fear is the common thread that links everyone todether. The police department is in a state of fear for their lives; there are some good citizens who are afraid to go out and some who are afraid to come in.

I say the epidemic of drugs is a very serious problem in the 14th Street Project. In 1978, there were eight cases of overdosing reported in the City; since January of this year, there has been 44.

So not only has drugs found its way into the City but obviously in the 14th Street Harlem. Shortly after the Mayor announced its War on Crime, the 14th Street Project Area Committee saw fit to establish an anticrime coalition which consists of community organizations, blocs and churches and concerned citizens.

Of course, the area which we have established our prime efforts is on South Beech Street, North of Spring Road, Fast of 11th and West of 16th Street. Of course, the Northern end of our Harlem has the highest home ownership. In the southern end, we have the most deteriorated housing. The population is approximately 30,000.

The average income is about \$8,000. Thirty-one per cent of the households receive some form of public assistance, and it's probably the most diverse community or area in the city in terms of its ethnic mix.

Of course, the initial thrust of the anti-crime coordinating committee was to request from the police department more foot patrol. Of course, we met with the third and fourth district because those are the two police districts that have jurisdiction over that area.

I can honestly say: today, we have met with some success from both Deputy Chiefs of the Third District and of the Fourth District in terms of expanding our footpatrol beat.

Of course, this has not come as a result of the first beck and call. We were trying to make a clear distinction between the patrolman, and the scout.

It is our position that we realize the most important man on the beat is the foot patrolman. None of us can hardly think that someone would make a drug transaction in the presence of an officer who is walking the beat.

So we have had some success with both the Third and Fourth District in dealing with that situation. We have convened a meeting with members of the Criminal Justice group, including Chief Judge Paul Hautrix (phonetic).

We got a commitment from him and that order has been circulated among the judges and has sort of been stringing along. Those individuals who are repeaters in certain blocks will be asked by the court to refrain from returning to their blocks until such time as their cases have been disposed of.

The commitment on the part of the anti-crime coalition to the U. S. Attorney to the courts -- are we prepared to go down, once we've seen the names of repeaters that have been arrested in the 14th Street Harlem, to testify in the courts and hope that that would have some added impact on the sentences that the judge would hand down?

In the past three or four weeks, we have been

equally disturbed about certain situations in the 14th Street Harlem.

We have been moving about, trying to identify some target area, namely -- 14th Street was, by the grace of God, was that you moved through last summer in terms of not moving on the situation that was already established by the young people right there on the main strip of the 14th -- at 14th and Irving where approximately five- to ten thousand (10,000) youth were gathered and they gather there every Friday, Saturday and Sunday, playing music until 4:00 or 5:00 o'clock in the morning.

of course, the citizens wanted the police department to move in last year. We decided that we didn't think that would be healthy. We saw it as a potential powder keg and very dangerous and quite explosive.

They sat down in a series of meetings with the police department, looking for some alternatives for the young folks to express some of their anxieties. We have been extremely fortunate to come up with a site, come up with the support of the recreation department who helped supervise the activities near the -- in the 14th Street Harlem.

We are moving down towards the W Street area, utilizing the support of the leaders, trying to be of assistance in identifying other problem areas.

It has been our position that, in the past, we respond to situations after they explode. We are trying to deal with some preventive things this summer. We had had substantial numbers of youth come into the office saying what they are going to be doing this summer.

We truly believe that, if somebody is going to do something, they would not come in and telegraph their move. We think it's an honest plea for help.

We have not estimated that concern with the "gun" to move and sit down with the young folks in trying to identify, as I said earlier, some other alternatives so we can begin to move with our young people in the 14th Street Harlem.

I need not mention to you, according to the Urban League: they estimate that the unemployment rate among young folks was about 60%; summer jobs are down about 33% which means approximately 20,000 youths may not be available for summer employment.

According to statistics of 1979, crime was up about 11%. Half of the crimes that are committed in the District of Columbia are committed by young folks between the ages of 15 to 24 and the unemployment rate is mostly here again with that age group.

In terms of moving forward in trying to identify some other positive steps, we had begun to touch bases with

1 . 2 . 3 . 4 . the churches. We have circulated flyers into the community. One of things that we discovered is that the police department is very limited in terms of what they can do in terms of making arrests. We found that a lot of our citizens got caught up in spitting on the sidewalk and jaywalking.

It seems, at this particular time, that is the only thing they are going to lock somebody up for, other than probable cause. That means, if somebody throws trash on the sidewalk, spits or jaywalks.

You know the difficulty establishing probable cause when there is a drug transaction. Of course, the community was up-in-arms about that, so we began to circulate flyers to inform the community to walk into the churches—to take a few minutes to walk in on Sunday to see the tools in which the police have to operate in terms of what's on the books and if there are some laws that are on the hooks that are not being enforced at this particular time, but we are trying desperately to educate the community; we are trying to wake up the "silent majority".

One of the things we find in our community:

we've got a lot of folks in there and, when you see articles
in the paper where people are condoning situations in the

14th Street Harlem -- as a matter of fact, in the City:
they do not represent the majority of the folks who live

here.

I think it's incumbent upon all of us to begin to move with our neighbors to be the eyes and ears and watchdogs of our community and to come out and take a stand.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. King.

(Remarks off the record concerning car parked illegally.)

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Deputy Chief Houston M.

Bigelow of the Metropolitan Police Department is our next speaker. Deputy Chief Bigelow is in charge of the Community Relations Division and has been asked to address the Police Perspective, on behalf of Chief Bertram Jefferson.

CHIEF BIGELOW: Thank you, Chairman Gibson and good evening, everyone.

As you have heard the prior speakers talk about the different jobs the police department have, I couldn't agree any more. As you see, we are the only agency in the City that is open 24 hours a day. I can't think of anything, in the absence of the proper agency that we do not do. We are call on to do everything.

We are the most visible agency in the City.

-

Sometimes, we are called on to do things that, as Mr. Cox said, that goes against the grain of the young public or, when there's a law involved, we have to enforce it.

As I move about the City, I often get this question: what is the state of police and community relations?

Whatever answer, if I would give you -- whatever answer I should give you, rather, would not satisfy
all of you. And, if I were to listen to each one of your
complaints, you would all probably have a different one,
but what I can tell you about the state of the police and
community relations: overall, it is good.

We still have some isolated cases that we are dealing with. Our complaints are no longer physical in nature. They are now somewhat of verbal abuse, isolated cases, and we do have those.

I will not say we are saying to you: we are perfect; we are not, but the mere fact we are out here is that we still want to learn and improve ourselves. Most people that I talk to and most people that attend meetings like we are here for tonight are really not the people that we ought to be talking to.

We only can communicate sometimes -- I say

"oftentimes" -- with those people that need the communications under somewhat adverse conditions and, needless to say,

those are not the ideal types of confrontations that you want, but citizens I talked to are talking about: from the early Sixties, we had a lot of problems; they are talking about the demonstrations of the early Seventies — confrontations with the various groups and those are the things that they remember most and the community involvement.

But we are having difficulty here with trying 'to let the public know that these types of dialogues taking place like what we are doing here tonight -- if you ask us: what are we doing now?, we are more engaged in educational type of exchange.

People got very crime conscious after the days of the demonstrations and confrontations in the street and the community relations, for the most part, visited all of the organized groups in the City.

We talked about involvement with the community

-- how the community can work with the police department

and maybe be better. Periodically, we are drawn back to

some of those days that we don't like to get back to

through isolated acts of police officers and I can only -
the most recent one that we had some disturbance -- as well

as Mr. King knows -- during the recent killing of Officer

Snyder on 14th Street, of course.

Subsequently, the shooting of Mr. Griffin. Now,

• • •

those types of cases -- we don't have that very often.

The community did not understand everything that happened there.

In some cases, I was told -- I have no reason to doubt it -- that police officers over-reacted. It was a very emotional kind of thing, but, aside from that, we have no met with any physical force of any great gravity that I can recall.

As I said, it's more or less verbal abuse and isolated cases.

As I said, again, the people that we would like to talk to usually don't come to these meetings and this is where I believe we can work together in that particular light.

During the Seventies, when there was a lot of funding around, like LEAA and, of course, the National Conference on Christians and Jews, we were able to work with the socalled "grass roots" organizations in the neighborhood but, as time changes, we are not experiencing a different kind of clientele in the City.

People are moving out; other people are moving in and, just to be very truthful with you, the police department has responded to, more or less, the demand of the community.

I don't know of any way that that can be changed

J

and, through responding to the demands of the community,

I'm sure that some of the people at the bottom rung of the
ladder sometimes get the shorter end of the attention of
the police department.

Some of them feel like they are being "policed" too much. Other people feel that we do not respond to certain neighborhoods as readily as we do other neighborhoods.

Tonight, maybe before we leave here, we can resolve some of these complaints like that, and I would really like to hear from the general public out there. We are open to the question for anyone that wants to come in and review our records.

We have clear-cut outlines on investigating our complaints. Our system for filing complaints is open to the public. You can walk in any of our police facilities and ask for the form. You can write it down in your own words and own handwriting as to what happened and, of course, we'll investigate it and keep you informed of the disposition of it.

Then, of course, if you are not satisfied with the disposition of it, we'll try to resolve that also. I guess what I'm saying to you is: again, I'll restate what I said at the beginning. Those of you who go back a few years will probably have to agree with me that the overall

*police-community relations here is good and those of you that still lives here in the City and work with us will also agree that we are not without some problems. Still have some.

And, then, finally, I think you'll agree with me that this department is open for working out our problems. I don't know of any reason that we would not be open to any questions.

I work with various groups around the city.

We had advisories to the different commanders throughout
the Southern District. They nave ongoing meetings with
the representatives of the community on a monthly basis.

If need be, they are open for call for emergency meetings.

The Chief of Police is open for a monthly meeting for his
advisory group.

We have, on that advisory group, membership from every segment of the community. There are no, really, "qualifications" for getting on that other than just wanting to be involved in police-community relations and the advisory to the Chief.

So, again, I am pleased to be here and I will try to answer any questions that are directed to me tonight.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN BIGSON: Thank you, Mr. Bigelow.

Now, our next speaker was to have been Mr.

John Carr but, unfortunately, he fractured his knee and is unable to be with us tonight, so we have asked that Mr. Howard Glickstein take a few minutes and address the subject of protecting civil rights while enforcing the law.

Mr. Glickstein.

MR. BLICKSTEIN: I was asked to do this about an hour ago and I almost feel a little insulted. I almost feel that I was asked to do this because I'm a teacher and everybody thinks that a teacher can just get up without any preparation and perform.

But those of you who are teachers know that that's not the case and it generally involves an enormous amount of time, so I hope you will bear with me that I am relying very heavily on my recollection of some of these points and on some of the consultations I've had with members of the Civil Rights Commission's general counsel staff that is here tonight.

The topic is a rather complicated topic that Mr. Karr was supposed to talk about tonight where the various remedies that citiz ens have -- if police engage in misconduct and violate their civil rights.

Now, the trouble with remedies of that sort -- the trouble with any sort of legal remedy is that you have

it after something has happened to you. It's something that occurs after the fact and it has a limited impact on changing the conditions that you'd like to see changed except that it is supposed to act as a deterrent. Most of the remedies that we have today are not all that effective. There are three general areas in which action can be taken to proceed against police misconduct.

There are remedies on state level. There are proceedings that you can bring in state courts and under -- I believe under the District of Columbia statutes.

There are federal statutes that we have -statutes that go back to the post-Civil War era. And,
in both of these two instances I just talked about, these
are criminal prosecutions.

In addition to that, any deprivation of civilirights could also result in a civil suit where the individual brings a law suit against the person who has deprived him of his civil rights, seeking damages.

And the criminal prosecution, as you know: it's the government that brings the proceeding against the person.

A state prosecution, we have just experienced a few days ago in Florida. That was a prosecution under the Florida laws against, I believe, four or five policemen who were accused of beating up and killing a black citizen

1 of

of Dade County.

They were prosecuted under Florida laws dealing with -- it probably was a manslaughter charge, I suspect, against them. Also possibilities of assault charges and murder charges.

One problem you have in state prosecutions, as you would in federal prosecutions is that, in a criminal case, there is a jury. And, in many, many instances, juries are very sympathetic to the police. They are very sympathetic for a variety of reasons.

In some instances, the victim is not a particularly reputable person and the juries tend to sympathize with the policeman under those circumstances.

In some instances, juries don't like to believe that policemen would engage in misconduct. In some instances, it's a very close call and people don't like to be Monday-morning quarterbacks and try to guess what they would have done under those circumstances so it is often very, very difficult to get a conviction before a jury.

During the early 1960's and during the height of the Civil Rights movement, there were many offenses committed -- in the South, particularly, by Southern sheriffs and other law enforcement officials -- that could have been prosecuted under the federal laws.

0

But the Justice Department, in those days, felt that the likelihood of convicting anybody before a Southern jury was so small that it did not pay to waste the resources of the Justice Department bringing criminal prosecutions when they could bring a civil suit to ensure that people voted, and that might have a greater impact than a criminal case they might lose.

In addition, some of the state statues under which some of these suits can be brought are rather technical and the problems of proof are rather great.

Now, as I said, there are also federal statutes but, as you know, in our complicated system of federal-state relations, most criminal acts are state offenses and not federal offenses.

There is not such a crime -- a federal crime as "murder". It has to be in connection with kidnapping, for example. If you take somebody from one state to another.

The distinction between federal crimes and state crimes is very much related to the federal-state system of government we have but, on the federal level, there are a couple of post-Civil War statutes -- criminal statutes -- that penalize people for depriving others of their civil rights -- not a murder statute. It's a deprivation of civil rights.

One statute punishes a conspiracy to violate civil rights and, very often, it's difficult to prove there has been a conspiracy. The penalty is not all that severe; it's ten years and a \$10,000 fine.

If you remember: in the mid-Sixties, three young people were killed by police and private citizens in Philadelphia, Mississippi, and they were prosecuted under this federal statute.

The maximum penalty was ten years in prison or a \$10,000 fine. In fact, I think, at that time, it was even lower. I think it has been raised since that prosecution.

So it's very difficult to use that statute and it hasn't been used that often. Another federal criminal statute makes it a crime for a person acting under color of law -- which are generally policemen or public officials -- to deprive persons of their civil rights.

Again, the Supreme Court, over the years, has made it very difficult to enforce that statute. When a policeman, for example, is prosecuted for depriving someone under the statutes of their civil rights, one question that has to be put to the jury is: did the policeman realize that he or she was depriving someone of their civil rights under federal law or did he just think he was beating him up?

I mean that's the sort of question you have to ask the jury. Was it the intent of the policeman or policewoman to deprive this person of a constitutional right and, again, it makes it very, very difficult to prosecute under this statute.

Also, the penalty is rather small. In this case, it's a misdemeanor. The penalty is even smaller.

As you might have heard on the radio tonight, the Attorney General is in Florida right now trying to decide whether the three policemen that were found "not guilty" the other day should be prosecuted under federal law.

Prior to the present administration, it has generally been the policy of the Justice Department that, if individuals who deprive persons of civil rights were prosecuted under state law and were found "not guilty", the federal government would not prosecute them.

I suspect what will happen in Florida is: in a very short time, the individuals that were found "not guilty" the other day will be indicted under federal law and will be prosecuted under the statute that I've mentioned to you and you will be able to follow, in the newspapers, how difficult it is to win a case like that, even if you have a sympathetic jury.

One other remedy that you have is the civil

· 13

`18 `

.

.

remedy. You don't have to worrry about -- you do have a jury in a civil case. That's true, too. You do have a jury but sometimes juries in civil cases tend to be somewhat more generous because they are not putting somebody in jail but you generally have a jury in a civil case.

Again, the law here has not been terribly favorable. Back in the early Sixties, the Supreme Court held that, if a policeman was sued under this civil statute, you could not hold the policeman's employer, the city, responsible. It was just the policeman himself that you could sue:

So, if you got a million-dollar damage against a policeman -- I'm not up-to-date on what policemen get paid today, but I doubt very much that a policeman could write out a check for a million dollars.

In most instances, most citizens are not able to respond to damages of that sort. If you are suing a government official, your best source of recovery is if you can hold the government responsible and collect from the Treasury.

But, as I said, back in the early 1960's, the Supreme Court held that, under the federal statute that we have, you could not sue the municipality. You could only sue the individual. Fortunately, about two years ago, the Supreme Court reversed that decision and said that you

now can sue a municipality as well as the individual official that deprived someone of his civil rights.

A case two years ago came to certain requirements that would make that difficult. A few weeks ago, the Supreme Court, in another decision, seemed to come down with a ruling that would make it somewhat easier now to sue a municipality.

So, at least in terms of collecting civil damages, there seems to be a remedy. In any event, whether or not you have these remedies -- and they are important, they do serve as a deterrent, and I think that they should be utilized.

at the beginning, they are after-the-fact situations.

Right now, for example, we could take an analogy. We could probably sue the Hooker Chemical Company that polluted the Love Canal and recover lots of money in damages from them but, in the meantime, many, many people have been infected with cancer as a result of what that company did.

And we would be better off if we had some system that prevented those things from happening rather than going in afterwards and trying to do something about the damage that has been done. And that's really the challenge here tonight.

We have criminal laws. They should be improved. They should be stronger. They should be utilized. But the goal is to come up with remedies and solutions to ensure that our public servants are sufficiently sensitive to civil rights and that it's as much a part of their job to protect civil rights as to carry out other of their functions that we don't have to invoke these criminal or civil penalties.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Glickstein.

Our next speakers will address the special needs of language -- minority groups, hispanic and Chinese -- and the needs of the elderly and handicapped.

First, Mr. Roland Roebuck from the Mayor's

Office of Latino Affairs and, then, Miss Evelyn Blackwell,
who is a Victim Assistance Counsellor at the National

Center for the Black Aged.

Mr. Roebuck and, then, Miss Blackwell.

MR. ROEBUCK: Thank you for this opportunity.

A significant portion of our citizens have special needs which, unless there is a special accommodation with the police, create problems for both the citizen and the police.

The special needs are those of citizens with language barriers -- Hispanics, Chinese, and certain types of

3

handicapped citizens -- the deaf, the mentally retarded, and the elderly.

I will share with you issues of particular concern to Hispanics, Chinese, and the Handicapped. In the interest of time, I have been asked to share the issues of the handicapped citizens and Chinese as they have been reported to me.

During the workshops and at the final general session, a person from each of these special groups will answer questions. I will be followed by Mrs. Evelyn Black-well (indicating) who will share with you issues concerning the elderly.

There are two issues which underly relations between all of the citizens with special needs and the police. The first is the perception which the police have of an individual when contact is made.

For example, if there is a few citizens -let's call them straight citizens -- and the police finds
out that they are either gay or lesbian, there are certain
perceptions and mechanisms that change the attitude of the
police, thus affecting the treatment of the person. Not
all of our special needs are immediately obvious on sight.
How does a police officer know when a person is deaf?

How does an officer know if a citizen can speak English? Perception of the police towards the citizens is very, very important.

The second basic underlying issue is communication. This theme is common to all these special needs thearing impairment, a language which the police do not understand and mental retardation all require other than the standard English for communication.

I will now address the various community segments: The Deaf.

The most obvious issue concerning relations between police and deaf people is that a hearing impairment
is not obvious. When a police officer speaks to a deaf person without any signal or sign indicating hearing impairment, the police officer may indeed misconstrue lack of
response, confusing it with a negative response.

The citizen's lack of ability to respond in intelligible means to an officer prevents the citizen from
even sharing the fact of his or her impairment. The lack
of skills on the part of the police to communicate with deaf
people, when they even know a citizen is deaf, compounds
the problem further.

Unless adequate training is provided for police to deal with deaf people, the officer is most likely to be insensitive to the citizen. Lack of ability to communicate, combined with the lack of sensitivity, results in awkward, often unjust treatment of deaf citizens by police, however good the officer's intentions may be.

Specifically, a deaf person -- this is an example: a deaf person stopped in his car by the police was reaching for his identification card. The policeman misconstrued this as reaching for a weapon and the deaf person was shot.

There is a teletype machine in only one district office, which makes it impossible for a deaf person to make his or her allowed phone call from any of the other police districts.

Handcuffs prohibit a deaf arrestee from using signs or from writing messages in order to communicate. A police station or court room without interpreters for the deaf made it impossible for a deaf person to know what is happening to his life, even when represented by an attorney. Police need significant training to develop communications skills, to develop sensitivity, and to provide facilities by which deaf people can communicate.

The Mentally Retarded. Police do not see retarded citizens as a major problem. They are not to the police.

But, to the retarded person, the police can be a major problem.

If you are the one who cannot communicate and tell where your home is, why you are lost, why you couldn't read the "senoritas" sign that looked like the men's room, who it was who just hurt or threatened you --- you, then,

become the problem.

It is a bigger one if your inability to talk, walk or look like an average citizen makes the police assume you are drunk, on drugs, dangerous, or just too inadequate to be on the street alone and, therefore, must be jailed, if only for your own good, until they find a friend or relative.

Police perception of a citizen is crucial.

Understanding the citizen may be -- no -- understanding the citizen they are contacting is crucial; sensitivity to the needs of the mentally retarded citizen is a must, if the citizens are to receive the proper treatment and attention the police intend to provide.

Mentally retarded are generally capable of far more normalized existence than is usually accredited to them.

Law enforcement officials need to understand this, and means to identify retarded people must be provided in order for police to recognize the mentally retarded in their public environment.

Another category of persons deserves mention to avoid confusion is the developmentally disabled. These persons are victims of physical disabilities such as cerebral palsy.

Their physical behavior is often misunderstood by the police and they can be treated as drunk or incompetent by untrained police, although they are mentally competent

in every aspect.

The Chinese. The Chinese in our community have a severe language difficulty, and there exists among these citizens some cultural barriers as well.

The Chinese, culturally do not trust any official in uniform. A uniform leads them to believe that the official will perform services well only if the official gets paid; something on the side. Uniformed officials are believed to serve only the Mandarins, or the upper class and not the commoner.

Beyond this cultural barrier is the language barrier. Many Chinese in the District feel "why call a cop when you can't talk to him?"

There are no open hostilities reported in the Chinese community toward he police, but a feeling is reported that there is a serious lack of responsive service by the police to the problems in Chinatown, and that the police presence is far too small in that neighborhood.

There are reported instances of young people being harrassed by other young people from other communities and races, and of old people having purses and shopping bags snatched or stolen from them on the street. It is felt that greater police presence would reduce these problems.

The Latino community and the Police. The Latino

community in Washington sees the police figure as one of oppression and abuse. Many Latinos judge the police by their own cultural interpretation which means that a police officer is an extension of a repressive government.

The Latino community seldom complains because of the language barrier; because of a lack of appropriate and expeditious response from the police and because many Latinos lack proper resident status, thus avoiding exposure.

Understanding the fear that many Latinos have towards the police, we can further state that setting up of bilingual community posts are not sufficient. The services targeted toward the community are not enough. You need to further recruit bilingual-bicultural police who can overcome the language and perception barriers.

You can call the police department right now and find that a bilingual dispatcher is not on duty, thus frustrating the desparate caller.

Monolingual policemen -- those who speak one language, need to learn another language for the purpose of shattering the negative perception wall. I am not saying the bilingual police will not abuse the citizen, but lack of communication will lead to frustration on both parts.

There is not much accountability for cases re-

they cannot find their case reports when they ask.

A large majority of Latinos are here due to political. Those in the World Bank, embassies and other established institutions, do not suffer the same problems; they are insulated based on diplomatic immunity and the fact that they speak English and live in affluent neighborhoods.

Learning the language and becoming familiar with the Latino community will solve many problems, thus reducing the levels of excessive violence and over-reaction.

Latinos are here for a dream which is daily shattered due to an insensitivity -- due to an insensitive attitude toward them.

At this time, I would like to introduce Miss Blackwell.

(Applause:)

MS. BLACKWELL: Good evening, everyone. My name is Evelyn Blackwell. I am a Victim Assistance Counsellor. And what I do: I counsel senior citizens who have been victimized.

My topic is called Anti-victimization for the Elderly. Now, working with the police department -- and I'm going to give credit where credit is due -- the Third District police department and the Fifth District Police Department have cooperated with us fully.

When I go for the police department reports, I

don't have any trouble; when I call, you always have a few rotten apples in every barrel; we have a few who don't cooperate.

I have problems with the Seventh District. I have problems with all the other districts as far as helping our senior citizens and listening to their complaints. They have a tendency to fear because "we are old and we don't know what we are talking about" when we say we were robbed of this, or whatever.

I had a case where the lady is 91 years old. She called the police department. This was Southeast. She had been robbed once before; he was very rude; he told her she was a nuisance and he didn't believe her.

Now, a 91-year-old person -- it doesn't mean that she doesn't know what she is talking about. What needs to be done, I think, is -- we need all over the Western World -- more respect for senior citizens.

People need to remember: If you don't die young, you're going to die old.

(Applause.)

MS. BLACKWELL: And I'd like to tell you some of the things we do in the Elderly Anti-victimization Program. We have what we call Escort Service. We have Transportation Service. We have Lock-installation Service; Educational seminars.

0

3

Those are relative measures and they are measures which would come in after the fact. And all I'm asking is that, when the police department -- and civilians as well -- talk to all of us, the Senior Citizens, they do give us the respect that we so fully deserve.

I thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Thank you so much.

Miss Blackwell and Brother Roebuck, thank you so very much.

Our next speaker was to be Mr. Roach Brown, but he could not be with us and, so, Mr. Benny Van Huss has been asked to speak. He is a senior resident of this area and the President of RAP, Incorporated.

MR. VAN HUSS: No -- "resident".

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: "Resident", all right.

Mr. Van Huss.

MR. VAN HUSS: Good evening.

I think that needs to be corrected. I'm not the President of RAP, Incorporated. I'm just one of the residents there.

I entered RAP, Incorporated approximately two years ago and, at that time, I was addicted to both methodon and heroin and RAP just served as a vehicle to help me redirect my energies and my life at this point.

·6

RAP, Incorporated, for those who don't know, is a 24-hour residential treatment program here in Adams-Morgan area. It's located at 1731 Bullock Street, North-west.

The approximate time, or length of time, that it takes to complete the program is approximately two years. In fact, this July, we will be celebrating our tenth anniversary.

Presently, at RAP, we have approximately 78 residents. Of those 78 residents, 55% of those residents are stipulated, which means that, as a condition of their probation, they are asked to enter and complete the program so, naturally, quite a few of our residents have had contact with the police in Washington.

There have been numerous examples that I have heard from our residents of both police harrassment, undue process and so forth.

The recent 14th Street Corridor crack-down was one recent example of harrassment where numerous persons were stopped for not having identification or for jaywalking across the street.

But what does this really do? Nothing. As long as there are drugs in the street, drug traffic would just gravitate to another area. Drugs is not a problem of location but of availability and social conditions that would

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

make a numbing stupor more satisfying than the realities of day-to-day life.

During the late Sixties, drugs were actually used as a weapon to quiet the rising tide of the masses of people here in this country. I grew up in a quiet Northeast area of Washington, D. C. and, throughout my neighborhood, drugs was never really a problem but, in 1968 and '69, there was a mass influx of heroin that reached every segment of our communities and many of the persons that are addicted to drugs -- at least, here in Washington who never recovered from that influx ten or twelve years ago.

I graduated from Highschool at Coolidge High, 1968, one of the so-called "better" schools in one of the so-called "better" neighborhoods here in Washington, and yet, today, my graduating class has far more of its members who are addicted to drugs and in prison than working in any of the professional fields of which they had the potential to be in.

So the question, as far as I see it, is: whose interest is here that the police will actually protect? The problems in our community will never be solved by attacking the symptoms. You much attack the core. as the influx of drugs will never be affected by attacking the lower-rung drug user, community-police relations will

never improve as long as the police serves primarily as an arm of the state to protect and preserve the property, the rights and the interests of those that rule this country.

Our police forces do not protect the masses of people here in the City. The recent outbreak in Miami stems from an incident in which a black, working-class brother was brutally beaten by four police officers. The officers were acquitted.

Now, could you imagine these same officers being acquitted if the man they killed had been a son or brother of the DuPonts or the Rockefellers? No way. There can be no qualitative improve in police-community relationships here in Washington or in the country until the police force is responsive to, and serves the needs and the interests of, the community.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Van Huss.

At this time, we have scheduled workshops. Our original plan was to break up into individual workshops.

Those plans have been changed and we will, instead of breaking up into individual workshops, have each moderator -- workshop moderator -- to conduct his or her workshop with the total group.

We will make one other change and that is: we will move the Media Workshop into the first place on the list so that we can utilize the expertise of some of our media personnel who are here. So we will have the workshops and the plenary session in this order:

First: The Effect of the Media, Moderator, Yetta W. Galiber.

Then, Enforcement Dedisions, Moderator, Dr. Paul:
Phillips Cooke.

Police Accountability and Community Responsibility, Howard A. Glickstein.

The Role of the Police, Helen Fugh Hays, Moderator. Youth and the Police, Ruth Jordan, Moderator.

So, we will ask if the moderators will come forth in this order and conduct their workshops with the total group: Yetta W. Galiber, Paul Phillips Cooke, Howard A. Blickstein, Helen Fugh Hays and Ruth Jordan -- in that order, without further announcements.

(Discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: As always, when you change plans, you run into problems unanticipated. As you try to accommodate some important persons, you cause problems for other important persons.

So, then, we will still try and the workshop, Mrs. Rolark, that you are a part of is which one?

That's the

MS. ROLARK: You have me down in workshop number 1 3 and I have a commitment that I made and I have to go. 2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: That's the Role of the Police 3 in the --4 MS. ROLARK: Police Accountability. 5 third one you mentioned. 6 (Discussion off the record.) 7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: All right. We have, again, 8 changed the order of the workshop and this is the order: 9 The Effect of the Media, Yetta W. Galiber. 10 Police Accountability and Community Responsibility, 11 Howard A. Glickstein. 12 Third, Enforcement Decisions, Dr. Paul Phillips 13 Cooke. 14 Fourth, the Role of the Police, Helen Fugh Hays. 15 16 Come forth, Ms. Galiber. MR. DARDEN: May I have your attention, please? 17 We are about to begin the workshop. I would like to ask 18 the resource persons for the Media workshop to please sit 19 in the first row. 20 The moderator for the first workshop will be Mrs. 21 Yetta Galiber. The two resource persons who will be here 22 will introduce themselves as they come up, but I can tell 23 you they are Angela Owens from News Center 4 and Milton 24 Coleman from the Washington Post. They will come to the 25

podium and make a brief statement.

question them.

what this is all about.

And, now, I will turn the podium over to Ms.

Galiber.

MS. GALIBER: Good evening. We want this to be

a very meaningful forum workshop and so we feel that it's

important for there to be input from the community. That's

Afterward, you will have an opportunity to

Ms. Owens and Mr. Coleman are here. And I would ask them if they would like to make a statement before we get into a discussion.

If you look on your sheet, the two questions that we would like to address are: Do media portrayals help or hinder policy-community relations? and How could media coverage be improved?

Thank about those issues and, certainly, we'll address other issues.

At this time, I'll ask Miss Angela Owens if she would like to make a statement.

MS. OWENS: Good evening, everyone. Because we do want to have time for quite a bit of discussion, I really don't have a very long statement to make. I just want to throw out a couple of things that have come to me in the years that I've covered the District.

5 6

8

7

9 10

11

12

13

14 15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, as I am sure you are all aware, the conditions pointed out in the current Commission report of 1968 that deal with the need for improved police-community relationships -- I think those needs still exist. I don't think there's been very much change, particularly in the eyes of the community.

With recent events in the city and in the surrounding areas, there has been a lot of concern because people still say to me: there seems to be several codes of law -- maybe three: one for the rich, one for the poor and one for the police officers.

They are concerned that people out of uniform seem to have few rights -- seem not to have the same rights -- don't get the same consideration as police officers. doesn't have to be the case.

We don't see that it is the case, but that is the perception. That is what people say to me in the Street. We don't have large numbers of people here tonight, but I hope that we will be hearing from you about -- not only what you perceive but what people in the streets tell you as well. The young man who spoke from RAP, Incorporated, I think, expressed a concern that I hear a great deal. He said that the man who was killed in Miami -- had that man been the son of someone rich; had he had money; had he not been Black, he didn't believe that those police officers would

have been acquitted. That is perception.

Three codes: one for the rich, one for the poor and another for police officers.

I would like to hear from you at this point about that if, Yetta, you are ready to open it up at this point.

MS. GALIBER: I was going to let Mr. Coleman have a few remarks.

MS. OWENS: All right.

Milton.

MR. COLEMAN: Good evening, my name is Milton Coleman and I'm the City Editor of the Washington Post and I'm, first of all, very glad to be here tonight to talk with you and to meet with you and to hear your views.

There are two questions that have been posed.

The first is the role of the media in police-community relations and the second is: Can the media's role, in any kind of way, be improved?

I think, on the second point, the answer to that has to be a resounding "yes". By no means is the Washington Post satisfied with its coverage of the District of Columbia.

By no means am I, as City Editor, satisfied with our coverage of the District of Columbia and I would be glad to answer all of the questions you have -- all of the

. 12

criticisms you have.

My only caviat is: I have been City Editor for approximately 72 hours and, before that, I was assistant city editor for about 72 days, but I will take any kinds of queries that you have on that.

On the first question: What role can the news media play in police-community relations? -- I think it's apparent, from people who spoke on the panel, that there are obviously two sides to that question. Chief Bigelow from the police department said that he thought that the police-community relations overall were pretty good. The succession of speakers thereafter seems to suggest to me very strongly that that was perhaps not the case, all of which says that there are apparently two sides to that story.

And we would like to feel, in the Washington Post that our job is to cover both sides of that story. It is not -- and I think this often leads to misperceptions -- it is not the role of the news media to reinforce the role of the police department.

That is not the way that the Constitution of the United States in the First Amendment stipulated -Freedom of the Press. It is our role to be as objective as possible -- to give as complete and accurate a story and certainly, by no means, to make ourselves an extension of Mr.

1

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bigelow's -- of Chief Begelow's public relations arm for the Police Department or to make ourselves an extension of police enforcement of the law. That's not our job.

By the same token, it is not our job to, in any kind of way, be irresponsible, to report inaccurately, to report without some degree of understanding and some degree of analysis of interpretation.

And I would hope that we would not err on that side either. That is the only thing I would like to say, because I am really most anxious to get whatever kinds of questions you have and answer them as fully as I can.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. GALIBER: Thank you very much. We appreciate those comments and I would to now open the floor for discussion and we want very much for you to participate fully in this discussion tonight.

(Remarks off the record.)

MS. GALIBER: I'm wondering if we have a microphone that we can move into the audience.

MS. BLACKWELL: I want to direct my question to the Editor, Mr. Coleman.

MR. COLEMAN: Yes, Ma'am?

MS. BLACKWELL: Mr. Coleman, in your opening statement, you said that you didn't want us to ask questions on either side, but as citizens of the City.

I have been reading the Post paper for -- let me tell my age -- for a good while. And the editorial is also slanted, and they always make the minorities -- well, just look bad. How do you account for that?

MR. COLEMAN: Are you speaking specifically, ma'am, of the editorial page?

MS. BLACKWELL: Yes.

MR. COLEMAN: All right. The editorial page of the newspaper is something that is not under my jurisdiction. The editorial -- all the editorials and all the stuff on the page opposite the editorial page is handled by an entirely separate staff from the top on down.

That's one part of the operation. The News operation is the part that I'm involved in and we have very little input into what they say. The reason we try to do that is to keep the newspaper's policy separate from our coverage of the news because, oftentimes, on many issues, the newspaper has its own vested interest.

For example, the Washington Post editorializes in opposition -- I'm sorry -- in favor of changes in the Workmen's Compensation Law. And it's very obvious why they posted that. It's got a whole lot of workers who are claiming compensation and it's representing the obvious interest of itself as a business in the City. We have tried

1

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to keep separate from that our coverage of the City Council's deliberations and the vote on the Workmen's Compensation bill.

So I am responsible only on the news side, and I don't have any input on the editorial side although, if you want to know someone to talk to, I would be glad -- after this panel is over -- to tell you whom you should call because one of the things that does not happen -- especially for minority communities -- and this gets into your question that, very often, Black people, Latinos, Asian-Americans, poor people do not write letters to the editor; do not call; do not scream and yell every time they feel wronged and some of us feel: if that process were used more often, then perhaps the editorial writers could be taught to feel the brunt of those people's frustrations, just as I'm certain they feel the brunt of the big wheel's protest whenever something is written against the big wheels' protest Whenever somehing is written against the big wheels.

MS. OWENS: If I may just follow up a bit on what Milton has said as concerns radio and television stations, you all know by this time, that we live and die by ratings. During ratings periods, you certainly notice that you have more series on the air.

We might even have more stories involving sex and violence, if you will, during ratings times because it's

felt that gets the viewers.

We don't get any response from the community -very little response from Black people generally, and
poor people, about what we put on. If you are offended
by what we do, we don't hear it.

Generally, the community west of Harlem lets us know exactly what they want and how they are feeling, so a good part of what goes on the air, really, is up to you: It might not happen at the planning process but, if you complain after you see something on the air, it certainly will affect what goes on the next time.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There has been some marvelous groups in terms of their movement across the city since the early Sixties that have attacked both radio and TV and has been largely responsible for some form of affirmative action plan.

We realize the fact that the people have control over what we see on TV are not the Black folks or other minorities in policy-making decisions. Further, when it comes time for ascertainment, some folks have been hand-picked to participate in that process and, when it comes time for organizational effort to participate in that process, somebody in Congress have died a natural death, so I have to take issue with that, because folks have been fighting the TV and radio for the past 15 or 20 years.

It's not the same process.

MS. OWENS: Some jobs have been saved and so forth but, on a consistent day-to-day basis, it doesn't happen.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Consistent because even

Black folks aside don't participate in the decision-making

process, so, at some level, we don't even know when we come

in to meet with some of the folks there because they don't

invite you to the meeting.

MS. OWENS: That's very true, but I do know what comes into the news room and I do know how decisions are made there.

when it comes time for ascertainment, we've been to the top to fight for some of the jobs. We sit in those meetings and raise potato chips to try to have some impact on what our folks see on that tube.

They don't invite you up there.

MS. OWENS: May I ask you if you've seen a difference based on that type -- those meetings?

you look at statistics, it involves pretty much of the gains they've made in the early Sixties. And that's why people have launched again across the city — they have substantially marvelous groups across the city that are

-13

on a daily basis -- ascertainment time has been putting on pressure.

I think all times -- and I appreciate you coming up here tonight. I think this is what you will have to do on a regular basis. A lot of times, you show up when your job is in jeopardy and the community behind you with picket signs and all that stuff, but I think you need to come on a regular basis and continue that educational process.

I think you need to give us some information.

MS. OWENS: I think that's very true and I think you'll find that that happens. And I don't know whether or not anyone has picketed for a job since the days of the WTOP matter, but let us move on.

(Disorder in the audience.)

MS. GALIBER: Would the speakers identify themselves, please?

MR. HAMPTON: My name is Robert Hampton. My question is: we talked about this incident that just occurred in Miami, Florida with the police officers and Kelly, the black citizen.

And my question is: doesn't the media sometimes perpetuate those types of incidents and cause even more problems because they fail to deal or show each side of the incident or to bring issues out, say, if we have a

.

" crisis like that in the community?

MS. OWENS: I think that, when you have a situation like Miami, or we can look at what happened in '68 and how it was covered here -- look how it's covered across the country -- you see that conflagration makes good television. The fire is burning, the people running, the people getting hurt makes good television.

People are going to sit and watch that. Reporters don't have to work hard; the station doesn't have to work very hard for ratings. They've got the viewers on something like that.

And so the pictures you see will be the exciting ones. The information that you are given will be maybe not much more than the death toll on the day news shows.

When you get into the specials — and I believe CBS is going to put on one tonight, you will get a broader picture, generally, I think. Remember that a news show has only so many minutes. The managers feel as though they've got to spread that time; they've got to cover the Metropolitan area.

So you are really not going to get that much information in your daily news show. And I think everyone ought to know by this time that, if you want details, you have to read the newspapers and the news magazines. Television is little more than a headline service.

MR. HAMPTON: Maybe I wasn't very clear, but I'm a police officer and a black police officer, all right? And I feel the responsibility to deal with some of the issues that affect the Black community in the police department, and I'm going to deal with them very effectively from my standpoint, but do Blacks in the media, when they see inequities that exist like that because the media failed to tell both sides of the story and, in effect, heighten the crisis, do they — do you or Milton ever feel any reason to deal with the issue from a black perspective that they seem to forget about totally?

MS. OWENS: That's a difficult question to answer. It's an individual sort of thing. It changes from newsroom to newsroom. Black reporters — any reporter has very little to do with what he has assigned. We are on a general assignment basis.

Milton will be able to -- because you are making assignments. In television, we come in in the morning; we are handed a story. Yes, we have the responsibility to tell both sides, but remember: everyone has his biases and what one reporter sees as telling both sides might not be what you believe to be both sides of the story. It might be slanted to you.

Someone else in the newsroom might do it completely in a different fashion and I have to tell you that there's

very little time for direction -- at least, in our newsroom.

We have very many managers who are caught up in practically everything but looking at what goes on in the city on a day-to-day basis and really sticking with the reporters during the day.

You are told to go out and do your story. You come back and you are edited and they read your script and, if it's gramatically all right and if nothing to the contrary has come over the wires, then it goes.

And, sometimes, if you don't have their point of view, you might get questioned but, as long as you are able to defend what you say, generally, you know, they just let it go.

MR. COLEMAN: I think I am in -- as of the rast 72 hours, I am in a position to ask that question a let better.

First of all, I think you will find a great many black people in the media do make a very hard push to fight the good fight very often as reporters, or even — you'd be surprised — as news aides, photographers — to try to make sure that the newspapers' representations of the issues as they, in fact, affect the black community is done with a certain degree of understanding.

As the City Editor, I -- in very many respects, the buck stops right here. And, to the degree that I'm the

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

City Editor and to the degree that I can say "no, you can't do that" -- which is one reason why I'm glad I'm City Editor, one reason why I was glad to work for the first black City Editor and one reason why I hope the coverage is going to be better, and I do seriously hope, if at any time any of you have any problems about anything we do --I mean you should call me.

You can reach me at the Post. I'm the only Milton Coleman in the Washington, D. C. phone book and you should call me. We may not always agree -- I mean because every two black people don't agree, but you should call me and you should keep me honest; you should get on my case and do all of that because, otherwise, if you're black, ain't no need in having nobody black as the City Editor.

MR. GALIBER: Let me just say that I've gotten the signal that we have three more minutes for this section of the workshop and so I would like to try to get as many questions in as possible.

I would also like to ask if you would be able to stay with us a while because some other questions might come up.

> MR. COLEMAN: Sure.

MS. GALIBER: All right.

MR. KAMINS: I'm Larry Kamins, formerly coordinator of the Police Awareness Alliance of the Gay Activist.

22

23

24

First, I want to make an observation and then I have two specific questions.

One observation is that, when I talk about police-community relations, it's true that we talk about verbal abuse and we talk about physical harrassment, but Deputy Chief Bigelow is absolutely correct that that is not the majority of the problem.

The absolute majority of the problem from my community is police inaction — officers coming to the scene and, once they understand that the victim is gay, ceasing to take any kind of action, losing reports, or clearly indicating to the victim that they don't wish to act.

Now, when it comes to the media, we see kind of -- several things at work here. One is that the police department is a very statistic-oriented organization. If they don't have 15 numbered reports and 15 numbered complaints to go with them, they don't act. They do not act on perceptions. They do not act on the basis of the community feeling.

I would like to know what you think the media can do to see to it that what is out there, even though it's not formal written complaints in the department, can be communicated, because the department does respond to stories in the media.

--

MR. COLEMAN: We have not, to my understanding, had that -- I think the Post has covered -- I've heard very little complaining about our coverage. It is not the job of the Washington Post to advance the cause of any community, per se.

It is our job to talk about what is true, and I think that, if you look in our coverage of the gay community -- which has, by and large, been political, although it has gotten into some other issues, we have done things in the absence of statistics; when we did this big front-page story on gay voting strength, we caught a lot of heck and they said: well, how do you know that? Do you have a whole map of the city saying "the gays own this precinct; they own that one? How do you know it?

It was based largely on our being able to verify that information independently of any kind of statistics or any kind of written rule book, so I think we are obliged to do that, but we are also obliged to do it with a certain degree of responsibility, so that just not any person can come on in and say, you know, like: I represent the gay community and I say it's this, and you've got to print that.

MR. KAMINS: Okay, thank you.

One second question.

MS. GALIBER: No, we will have to move on to the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

next person. We will have to move on. I only have three minutes, and I think I've got to be fair.

MR. KAMINS: Well, we can do this in closed police session.

MR. COLEMAN: We are in favor of opening everything up. I can tell you right now: Larry has been to a police chiefs' advisory commission that the police said is open for everyone.

MS. GALIBER: Would you go ahead and identify yourself, please?

MR. LOUDERBAUGH: Tom Louderbaugh. While ago, when they said briefly if it was the Duponts or Rockefellers or anything like that, they would not have done what they did down in Miami and I mean the Viet-Nam situation, it is true the Blacks and the poor and the Latinos and all those type of people were on the front lines a lot more than the Whites, and I don't know any rich people that are, you know, living down in the Love Canal and Three Mile Island.

Do you feel, Angela and Mr. Coleman, that the media is exposing the injustice of the disparity between the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots in the written media as well as the verbal media?

MS. OWENS: I know that we are not on television. The injustices suffered by the minorities and poor people are not the kind that are assigned these days. I mean it's just not in vogue.

I mean they are not the kinds of stories that are assigned these days. The people that are making the assignments are very aware that we have to cover a wide range of topics and they want to satisfy our viewers. When it comes to doing features, when it comes to some of these, they are just not willing to put in the time or the money or the effort at this point.

I just want to point out -- why don't you answer that, Milton?

MR. COLEMAN: My answer to that question is very simple. I think we are doing — when we are asked how we are disposing of all the wrongs and injustices, if I can transpose the question and ask: are we doing a balanced job of reporting without giving too much weight to the rich and too little weight to the poor?

I mean I think we are doing all right and that don't mean we're doing great. I don't think we are doing terrible but let me just say, in a constructive sense, one of the ways that it can be improved is that there's a lot of stuff that goes on in the community, quite frankly, that we just don't know about.

And we don't have the greatest eyes and ears around and what I ask is that people call in and tell us about that, because you'd be surprised at how many news

stories really come in over the telephone, so just please call us.

MS. GALIBER: Is that the end of our three

3

minutes? One more question.

5

6

MR. ROSE: My name is Michael Rose and I want to address my question to -- I didn't hear your name, but -

7

MR. COLEMAN: Coleman, Milton Coleman.

8

9

Chief Bigelow. I got the feeling that, when he was on the

MR. ROSE: I want to address a question around

10

stage there, he was saying that the citizens and community

11

relationship is sort of like a complacent thing -- like he

12

was satisfied with the way the police and the community

13

were relating and also to the elderly lady here that spoke

14

about minorities -- how they were depicted on the news

15

media -- and you, in turn, said that your department had

16

no input in helping resolve the editorial page -- that you

17

don't have anything to do with that, right?

18

MR. COLEMAN: That's right.

19

people call in to, like, the Washington Post and complain

MR. ROSE: Okay. I want to know how, then, if

20

about different areas, you know, as far as city things, if

2122

your department isn't in, then, how would the community be

23

aware of things and would the Washington Post print some

24

of the things -- maybe the complaints they got?

25

MR. COLEMAN: Did everyone hear the question?

The question was simply: if the news department, as I said, has no input over the editorial page, what good is it if people call in and would we print it?

It would not, if you called the news department. If you called the City desk, 334-7300, it would not get any of the complaints over to the editorial page.

If you call the editorial page people, it might get some input on their thinking. If you called us about it, it might get us to do a story and, if it was a good story, I think we would write it.

And I can't think of all the incidents so far but, in several cases, the editorial page is going in one direction and often people are complaining that we are going in another.

I guess the biggest one that comes to mind is: if you have ever heard the Mayor discussing the media, he'll tell you that the editorial page has been very friendly to him and he thinks the news columns are very much against him.

We don't have to be going the same way. We don't have to be going -- we don't want to be going the same way. If people call us and we can determine it's a good story, we will go after it.

MR. GALIBER: What constitutes a good story?

MR. COLEMAN: Her question is: what constitutes a good story?

It has reader interest, It's something we know we can write. A lot of stories are allegations. Somebody said this happened or that happened and, if we can't pin it down to print it in a way we believe it is actually true, we can't write it.

We try to write stories that have a certain degree of interest. It doesn't have to be a real broad appeal.

It may be just kind of a unique appeal, but I would encourage people to call us and it would get into the paper in that kind of a way.

Does that answer your question?

MR. ROSE: Somewhat. Yes.

MS. GALIBER: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. OWENS: I would just like to remind you, as Milton has said: we depend upon telephone calls. We have to work with the police department as well as the community and, frequently, in talking with the community people, it seems as if, once a man puts on a uniform, he becomes someone apart. He is still a human being with the same kinds of feelings.

He hurts the same way. He bleeds the same way. Community people hurt the same way; they bleed the same way

but, somehow, a barrier seems to be drawn up when the man puts on the uniform and community people frequently say they find it difficult to get beyond once that man has on the "blue", so I don't know how much dialogue people who are in the streets, say, feel that they can have with the police officers.

As an example, some of the comments that were made about the officer killed at 14th and U -- they had he had harrassed them and he -- they didn't like the man, I guess, because of some of the ways he had treated them. We just have to talk.

I don't know whether any of them tried to talk to him; whether or not he tried to talk with them but I just wanted to throw out that, in television, we depend on both community and police officers, and we have to get along with both. We couldn't exist without you.

(Applause.)

MR. DARDEN: Thank you very much. The next workshop — the next topic that we are going to cover on your program is listed as Police Accountability and Community Responsibility. The moderator for that workshop would be an advisory committee member, Professor Howard Glickstein. He will introduce the resource persons for this workshop.

MR. GLICKSTEIN: The workshop now is on police accountability and community responsibility, so the general

questions deal with: how should complaints against policemen be dealt with; should they be dealt with through law
suits, as I spoke about earlier this evening, or are police
-- other sort of mechanisms appropriate?

I'll introduce the speakers in order.

Our first speaker is a Council member.

Wilhelmina Rolark has been waiting very patiently. She has other engagements and she has extended her stay here tonight beyond what she intended to. I am particularly pleased to introduce her this evening, and I have the good fortune of knowing her daughter.

MS. ROLARK: Good evening, everyone. Yes, I really am very happy to participate with you this evening. I'm just sorry, as I guess you are, too, that we do not have a broader representation of the actually impacted citizens in these types of cases.

I'm always interested in the victims of these incidents, be they incidents of police harrassment, or incidents of police brutality because, as Mr. Glickstein indicated, this workshop deals with police accountability and, many years ago, 1970 to be exact, when I was a member of the first human rights commission because the council had been reorganized into a commission, I was made chairman of the committee on public safety and conducted what I believe still remains as the first, you know, city-wide set of

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hearings on police brutality and police harrassment from an official standpoint.

And those statistics proved to me something that, as an attorney and as a concerned citizen, I had always believed that a lot of the tension that exists between the police and the community exists because the community persons have no vehicle whereby they can lodge their complaints against police and hope to get a decent reaction to the same.

This idea of police judging police is just horrendous, in my opinion. It turns people off. It makes people believe there is no equity in the situation -- that not only have you been beaten up or harrassed or kicked around or treated unfairly but then you've got to come right back to that same source to lodge a -- quote --"complaint" -- unquote -- agsirt them, hoping to get some kind of equitable treatment.

And no matter, Chief Bigelow, how much you may say that you are doing this and you are doing the other -and I do commend you; I think that much more is being done now than has been done in the past and I do believe that, with a black chief in a predominantly black City, we do have a much more sensitive department because, in the old days, when it was not that way -- and you see some of these things really go on a Black-White line.

You had much more tension. I know that. And I think the fact that you have black management areas in areas that are historically areas of high police tension that is between the police and the community, like in my district where recently Chief Keller for which I am very happy — a man who is not only black, but lives up there in the area — and that means a lot.

Historically, in the past, we had non-minority in control of the police department and, for the most part, they were non-resident. So you had like a foreign army coming in, you know, controlling us in this most important area.

So, of course, you had piled on the fact that you didn't have a vehicle by which you could lodge a complaint the fact that you were blocked out by negative participation.

I made a commitment when I got on the Council and now I've carried it out -- that there would be one area I would move in. Very recently, last year, I introduced a bill, 3-214, called the Human Rights Act Amendment of 1980 -- of 1979.

It has thence been amended to read 1980. That bill was a bill that represented some of the suggestions and recommendations that we had made as a result of the hearings that we held on the Human Rights Commission — that the

. 12

Human Rights Commission itself reconstituted a body to hear complaints of these police brutality and police harrassment complaints because it is, in fact, a civilian body that did not only do that but police -- training -- human relations training be instituted because a lot of the incidents that do occur, occur, I believe, because the police have actually not been properly trained in the handling of this and, Chief Bigelow, that has been a long-time commitment of mine -- that we do need to institute -- re-institute that training that we have -- just right after the riot. We need to go back to that now.

Some way or another, even though we have racially a different-constituted department, we still have that problem of a little guff between the police and the community based on the fact that sometimes, once you put that uniform on, you simply don't understand people any more like you understood them in the first place.

Well, this bill would mandate intensive human relations training at all levels of command within the department in addition to constituting the Human Rights Commission — a body to which these complaints could be lodged.

In January of this year -- and I think most of you are familiar with this, I introduced Bill 3-247. It is co-sponsored by four of the Council members -- called the

Civilian Complaint Review Board Act of 1980. This was a bill introduced at the request of the Mayor. It supposedly would show objective investigation and review of citizens' allegations of misconduct by regular or special police officers.

It would be comprised of a board that would do
the investigation with six members and a chairman. The
board would be appointed from a variety of sources -- one
member from the policemen's union; two by the Council -that is, the City Council; one by the Chief of Police from
the Rights of the Police Department and two would be appointed
by the Mayor.

That would include the appointment of the Chairman and the terms would be for three years. This Board would make recommendation to the Chief of Police about disciplinary actions that should be taken when officers have been complained about by civilians, and it would assure that all of the residents of the District of Columbia would have access to complaint forms and information about the investigatory process.

Both bills would assure that they would be wide and open to add to the complaint of the gentleman in the back there, you know, who spoke about closed processes, because I agree with him on that.

Part, also, of the problem is that the citizens not have been harrassed or brutalized but, then, whatever is being done about that now is done in a highly secretive fashion and just to cavalierly say that all you have to do is go up and inquire about what happened to your case is not as simple as it seems.

But, if either one of these systems, or if a combination of them, without full hearings on both bills -- the bills are now before both committees, the Committee on Judiciary and the Committee on the Public Service and Consumer Affairs which I chair.

Councilmember Clark chairs the committee on the Judiciary and, hopefully, some type of merger -- good merger, if you please -- of the two bills will come out and, hopefully, will survive the process and become law and, if all that happens, perhaps some of this tension will be alleviated.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. GLICKSTEIN: Our next speaker is Professor Irving Ferman of the Howard Law School. Professor Ferman is an authority on police-community review boards. He headed the police-community review board we had in the District of Columbia from 1965 to '73, and I think he will be able to share with us tonight some of his experiences on

that occasion.

Mr. Ferman.

MR. FERMAN: Thank you very much.

First, I would like to express my support of your bill, Ms. Rolark. I would like, however, to review the work of our review board from '65-'73 so that so much of our discussion can have some historical antecedents.

First, let me say, at the outset, that we resigned in '73 in protest of the lack of reform we had recommended to the Mayor. We were constituted as a board by executive order in 1965. We had five members of the board. Complaints were filed only in the District so it meant that a citizen had to go down to the District Building and file a complaint in affidavit form.

ment to the internal security division for investigation.

And, at times, it took almost a minimum of one year before the investigation was completed and turned over to us. We instituted a preliminary proceeding — an ex parte proceeding with the complainant in order to check and be satisfied that the investigative findings had some credibility and then we either dismissed the complaint or ordered a hearing.

Now, our basic observation, after functioning this way for five years, was: first, the process was too slow; secondly, we had some misgivings about the police

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

 $\mathfrak{Z}3$

24

25

investigating complaints against policemen as a police department.

That's not easy to remedy. Thirdly, we felt that the complaints forms should be widely circulated and the complainant should have a hearing within a reasonable period of time -- two, three -- at least a month or two or three weeks.

A confrontation here -- a kind of "sifting-out", process. Now, we had also recommended -- we had recommeded that the widespread availability of complaint forms with a kind of sifting process -- almost with -- before the investigation -- confrontation with a policeman and the complainant and we felt the experience indicated in other cities -- that we could eliminate the spurious complaints and also in a number of situations, a good number of situations, we could receive a result which might involve a letter of reprimand or some kind of letter be put into the jacket of the policeman and that would resolve the complaint.

We made recommendations along those lines. also made recommendations very similar to your bill -- that is, we wanted to add a member of the police department -hopefully, Community Relations, to our board -- to bring into play the policemen's point of view in our deliberations.

We never received a reply to our report, urging what we considered to be reforms so, in 1973, with the exception of one member, we all turned in our resignations.

Now, nothing has happened since. Let me say this: in response to what I consider to be propoganda by the police Benevolent Association or the police unions attacking the concept of a civilian complaint review board, the attack is made on two grounds: one, mainly, that the police has to function as an autonomous group — as an automonous agency.

That concept has never been part of our system.

Dating back to the Eighteenth Century, it is traditional for all our agencies to be subject to checks in order to achieve balance. That's part of the American system. That's true in the Army. That's true in the military forces and, indeed, it is implicitly true in the organization of the police department because every significant police department is controlled by a civilian head.

So, if a police chief cannot live within civilian controlling and civilian checks, I think he has an obligation to resign.

Secondly, I feel very keenly -- well, let me
put it more precisely: I think the police unions and police
organizations have made a mistake -- a drastic mistake in

fighting civilian-police review boards from the late Fifties through the early Sixties because it has meant the filing of civ-l suits against police and the city government.

It has also meant a rush or an increase in investigations and Mr. Glickstein, in FBI investigations, he alluded to in the statutes against the police -- which is much more harmful against the policeman than to have citizens trained who would understand the police to sit and listen to complaints and then make a recommendation to the police department.

And I will never understand, for the life of me, why criticism has been lodged by police unions and police benevolent associations against a civilian complaining of due process because what a policeman is facing now is far more drastic.

If they had cooperated, we could have achieved an effective civilian-police complaint process. I also would like to add another fact. The complainant process is not, and should not be, the total mechanism in achieving police reform.

We should not view again the civilian complaint review process as "the" mechanism that will achieve the kind of reform in police practices and police-community relations that we hope for.

And we need -- as Ms. Rolark indicated, we need the kind of training suggested by the Human Relations Commission, and I would like to see, based upon my experience -- and I think that Ms. Rolark's bill is responsive to our experiences, that we restore the civilian complaint review board and I would hope that the police would see now, after the experience in the last ten years, that this is the way to go for the benefit of effective police-community relations.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. GLICKSTEIN: We have two more panelists and then the previous two speakers, as well as the next two, will be prepared to answer your questions.

The next speaker is Lt. James Gannon, from the Field Inspections Division of the Metropolitan Police Department.

LT. GANNON: How do you do? I wasn't prepared to make any specific presentations other than to point out that, in your blue folders, there are outlines on the complaint procedure, which I am part of on the department -- the flow of the complaint and a little explanation of how the process works.

Basically, that is the area that I would be able to respond to. Thank you.

MR. GLICKSTEIN: Our next speaker is Officer Ron
.
Hampton of the District of Columbia Afro-American Police
Officers' Association.

(Applause.)

MR. HAMPSON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and I want to thank the Commission for the opportunity to come before you today and speaking.

I was just going over some of the questions that the panel was supposed to deal with -- how are the police held responsible for the actions of the police department?

And I would submit to you that police are not held responsible.

Certain police officers are held responsible for their actions, but most police officers aren't held responsible for their actions — by the courts — probably because the police department is the one that submits or goes to the courts that have police prosecutors so, if the police department don't want their police officers prosecuted, then they're not going to submit the necessary requirements to the courts to have their police officers prosecuted, but citizens — some citizens hold their police officers responsible.

The citizens that came together tonight that are interested in whether or not -- the types of treatment the folks in their community are receiving -- they don't hold

their police department responsible because the police department don't listen to what they have to say. Their views fall on deaf ears when it comes to the police department.

And I'd like to respond a little more to some of the things that the gentlemen before the lieutenant talked about.

I represent an organization of black police officers in this city and we belong to an organization of some 30,000 black police officers across the Nation and we support the civilian review board concept because we do our job and we have nothing to fear about somebody looking over our shoulders.

(Applause.)

MR. HAMPTON: Why the unions and such disagree with the concept of police review board is because, if we look back in history, police departments in the United States were established in the 1800's along the Barbary Coast for the sole purpose of controlling certain sectors of society.

That's what the police department in this city deals with -- controlling the Black and the poor of this city, so the police union wouldn't come out and say: well, we're going to condone the process where the people on the lower end of the spectrum can have a vehicle like Ms. Rolark

1 t 2 t 3 4 c

talked about to have their things come in and talk about their complaints and talk about -- on the same level as folks on this end of the spectrum can come into the police department or any other department and have their complaints listened to.

Some time ago, the Washington Post -- and Mr.

Coleman works for it -- brought up some articles about the citizens of this city who have filed complaints against police officers and they won their cases in court, so I went through the process of going back -- researching to find out: who were these people who won these cases in court -- civil cases in court -- to win this money against the city.

And the city has a long record of losing cases in court, you know, but all the folks that received this monetary gain of settlement are folks that have access to the criminal justice system and I'm talking about people that already have money and they can go out and get good lawyers, you know, so they don't have no problem about -- (Applause.)

MR. HAMPTON: They don't have no problem in terms of access to the criminal justice system but none of those folks are the people who are here and the folks on 14th Street and the folks in Clifton Terrace and the folks in Ms. Rolark's ward in Southeast.

Those folks don't have money, so they don't have no access. Their abuse still fall on deaf ears, so they don't win money from the City, 'cause they can't even take the city to court to start off with so we need a vehicle to air our complaints to talk to -- to talk about police beating on us.

So, like I said at first, we endorse the civilian review board process because it's needed.

And, then, again, I speak about -- I'd like to speak about a subject that's dear to me and that's about police beating up on black folks and I'm a black police officer and I have even witnessed police officers beating up on people.

And, then -- and go back a little further to give you some reason why I'm talking about this, because I asked Miss Owens and Mr. Coleman if blacks in the media felt as though they had a sense of responsibility to the types of things that they noticed were missing in the media that should be there.

So, myself, as a black police officer, when I see things missing in the police department that shouldn't be there or that's there that shouldn't be there, I do something about it.

I reported a police officer. And, every time I see one, I'm going to report them. And they know it. So

it gets down to: they don't do it in front of me and some other brothers I work with in our police association — they don't do it in front of them because they're going to report them.

And I'm serious -- that it's not about y'all putting the pressure on the police department to change the police department. If there was some more black police officers on this police department that wouldn't stand for it, then, we wouldn't have it to start off with.

(Applause.)

MR. GLICKSTEIN: Now, there's about five or ten minutes for questions.

MR. LOUDERBAUGH: My name is Thomas Louderbaugh.

I'm a former co-coordinator of the Police Awareness Alliance
of the Gay Activist Alliance.

I agree heartily with Councilwoman Rolark. I agree that we need independent civilian police on the review board.

And I am proud to say the Gay Activist Alliance one year ago submitted the -- to the Mayor's office a proposal for a civilian complaint review board, similar to Councilwoman Rolark's.

I am also in total agreement with Mr. Glickstein in his comments that prevative actions are much more valuable

than remedial actions.

In fact, litigation for most of us in the district is a useless means of getting any kind of cure. The question in enforcement for all of us is not how to frighten our police officers into perhaps being better police officers. Most of them don't need that.

The question is how to improve enforcement by opening up the police department to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The police department is, from my experience, closed. Deputy Chief Bigelow claims that the Chiefs' Advisory Council is open to the citizens. I wish that were true. It, indeed, is not true.

Chief Jefferson himself has told me so. And, when I wished to attend a meeting, he said that I was not allowed to do so; it was a closed meeting.

Furthermore, the people allowed to attend that meeting were only citizens appointed by the Chief of Police to advise him, I fear, in ways he wished to be advised.

When the Gay Activist Alliance attempted to get a citizen from the Gay community in the district on that Council, we found that the Chief of Police refused to appoint a representative and, in fact, we had to request the Mayor's office to put pressure on the Chief of Police

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to even hear a request.

The question that I would, therefore, ask, first of all, is: how do we improve enforcement in other ways than litigation and demonstrations in other remedial actions if, indeed, we find the police department closed to us and the Chief of Police wishes not to hear us on his Advisory Council and, in fact, wishes not to meet with us, and often has met with us only because the Mayor has told him to do so.

May I ask: How do we get some kind of response? MR. GLICKSTEIN: Would one of the members of our panel --

CHIEF BIGELOW: Can I just clarify something? MR. GLICKSTEIN: Certainly. You've been mentioned a few times.

CHIEF BIGELOW: Just a point of clarification. don't recall saying that it was open to the general public. I recall saying that representation of all segments of the community are on the Chiefs' Advisory Council and I believe there is a representative from your group on that Advisory Council, is that right?

MR. LOUDERBAUGH: Yes, there is, but only because the Mayor's office decided it was better to push the Chief into making that agreement than it was to having us make

more trouble.

I would also like to ask another quick question and that is that, if I understand Form -99, it's an informal complaint form or it is ignored as a formal complaint. The only formal complaint is made through the Mayor's office -- not through the Chief's office and, therefore, any PD-99 trial can be ignored entirely by the police department if it so desires, is that not true?

MR. HAMPTON: The PD-99 -- I believe the PD-99 reads "Informal Citizen Complaint" or something like that, with the terms of it being -- in making a complaint, you can use it as it is used as a legal document, right?

And you don't really have to have a PD-99. You could just write it out on your own -- you know, on a piece of paper yourself but you can really make a verbal complaint against a police officer over the telephone, so you don't have to use the PD-99 system, you know, but that's something that the police department sets up and I have to agree with you that the PD-99 system don't work.

MR. GANNON: The PD-99 is a form. It's a recommended type of form that I believe the national committees in the past have recommended that there be an informal report and, by orders of the department, they ought not to be ignored. As a matter of fact, there's a very strict accounting system for all -99's. They all have to be

answered.

What might be very, very serious or what might appear to be very frivolous, they are all answered. And the response is returned to all citizens that make them -- those '99's.

MR. HAMPTON: I'm glad he said that because what I want to tell you is: the other day, I was in the police station, coming into the door of the police station going "upstairs and the gentleman came from outside and he was in an irate condition and he wanted to make a complaint against a police officer.

So, when he talked to the police officer at the front desk, he asked him for a PD-99 so he could make a complaint against a police officer and, if what the lieutenant says and what the assistant says is true, then the PD-99 should have been on the front desk and all he should have done is just walk up, pick it up and write out his complaint and give it to the officer and then they would have dealt with it, right?

Well, what do you think happened? It's not multiple choice. You don't have but one answer. The officer
didn't never give him a PD-99. The first thing he done
was ask him why he wanted it.

So, the individual -- he ended up leaving the station more irate than he came in there because they never dealt with the service that they were supposed to render.

They're supposed to give him the form. They're not supposed to question him. So that's why I say it don't work because I've seen too many times where they don't even get it to start off and then, if they do get it, some official come from the back room and comes up there and talks to them about: why you want to — they take the complaint but, in the process of taking the complaint, they tell them — well, they give them excuses like: well, the police officer had a bad day, so would you please excuse him because he has a lot of things to do?

So he might have just been upset and we all get upset. But, then, even on the back of the thing, what's noted about it, the complaint — they make a complaint, but all you had to do in the police department was an action had to be taken so you can put on the back of the complaint "Officer So-and-So warned the Council" and that was it. That don't do nothing for you, the person who was — you was beaten or verbally abused. That don't do nothing for you, but, see, that's an action. That's the system.

(Applause.)

MS. OWENS: What about the level of fear? Have you found that there is a lot of fear if they have to leave the station without making it? Do they then fear some kind of reprisals if several people come out to talk to them and try to discourage them not to file?

0

MR. HAMPTON: Well, I don't believe so much the present type of fear thing. It's just like you mentioned something about putting on a uniform and we tend to thing there's something different about that person in the uniform, right?

The uniform has a tendency to be oppressive to our folks because we see it as an arm of that oppression — the oppressor part, you know, so that's what — it don't . have to be but one and then you see one in a white shirt who is, you know, and he comes and hits you and gets you with a bunch of questions when you want to make a complaint and, it seems like: every way you turn, he turn you the other way, so you end up very frustrated so you just walk off and don't make a complaint no way, so it don't have to be three or four of them jump down on you.

The only time three or four of them would jump down on you is if the incident when you have someone from the, say, criminal community — you know, the actual person who might have committed a crime but then he got beat, too, and, see, he didn't deserve to get beat so then three or four of the officers come up — you know, three or four officials come out and then they start, you know, pressing him and, you know, saying all types of things to him in terms of: he didn't really have no reason to make the complaint because he committed a crime, so they just started

using that as leverage, so that's a fear tactic in a sense.

MR. GLICKSTEIN: We have one more question before we conclude this panel.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question but my question, first of all, is not a question.

Having dealt with the police department for a long time as a criminal, it makes me feel real good to sit here now and just listen to this as a productive citizen of society.

It's nice to see two policemen that's not on the wave length. He's not on the same wave length with him. They are really not together, so we can't hold him accountable.

You understand what I'm saying? Joe is saying on his side and he's going to say his side, so then we know we're in trouble when the police department is together.

Listening to Councilwoman Rolark, I agree with what's she saying — the police need some training. They should institute that training, but I also think she should take it a step further because the City Council people need some retraining, too, because they have forgot that they was once a street activist and they are the first to say: call the police.

So I'm just sitting here and just listening to

what he said -- why you don't train the police and they say: we ain't got nowhere we can take out complaints. We should be able to take out complaints to eight wards -- to our City Council people who ran on platforms of saying how compassionate they were and how concerned they were for the little person.

I can understand what Mr. -- Officer Hampton was saying about the Big People -- the Big Hustlers -- and I mean Hustlers -- those people in Cleveland Park. They ain't going to get beat up when they go down there, man, and they ain't going to get the monetary value as opposed to a lady who's going in there with a public defender.

So, tonight -- and just listening -- and, of course, I don't have an eighth-grade education and I can't speak too articulate -- you understand what I mean, but I know what the PD-99 -- I can't get a PD-99 if I go in there but let me break the law; they get so many papers in there and I don't know where those papers come from, but they must be stacked on top of the PD-99's.

(Applause.)

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I believe that you have in them offices -- I believe that you have books on the wall -- I might be wrong, but I think that you have all the police laws from Alabama in one book; all the laws from Tennessee in one book and all the laws from Washington in one book and

.

I believe, when there's a riot, you say: Get the Alabama book! Jones. 'Cause I just don't understand how so many white police can get to Southeast to jump on people when all these black folks are there.

You know, these type things just don't rationalize to me. Now, we are cutting police and I know we are going to have to have new police because the police we've got now can't speak Vietnamese so we're going to get some more police that can understand what them people are saying or these people are going to get up and the man is going to say "Ung-jung-jung!" so we gotta get some more police.

So, in reference to -- speaking again as an old, hard, disadvantaged criminal -- that's what I am -- an old, disadvantaged criminal, I do know that the bottom line is that we need police officers. I know we gotta have them.

And I know that's -- there is some black police
that are three times rougher than some black police. I
understand that but, until we as people, can get our City
Council people accountable -- until we get our mayor accountable; until City Council people get together and see that
the City Council don't know ANC -- they are scared of
ANC, so, you know, it's just a sad, frigtening thing. In
fact, a review board -- I think everybody should have a

review board.

They had a thing one time when I was a street activist -- see, I just came here from Mississippi -- they was riding around in police cars and monitor police, so they used to call me a "Tom" because I wouldn't ride in a police car -- some way, they was going to make sure that they get me, so I wouldn't get in no police car, so my rationale was a lot different from you professional type people.

I think the way you get killed quick is two things: that's a dog that chase cars and a nigger that fights policemen, so I ain't gonna fight no policeman. I ain't going to fight none. I'm gonna respect them to the highest.

I think Chief Bigelow is a good man and I do believe that and, in fact, I'm having a union man on my show Sunday -- one of the policemen.

I am also a TV whatever-you-call-me, because

I'm not like the rest of the blacks on television -- the

rest of the blacks on television and I -- we don't get

along and they understand why we don't get along, because

I'm not going to set up there and say what they say up there

every night because I know Bruce Johnson is a dirty, TV

black man I even seen when it comes to dealing with black

people.

I would tell him that and bust him in his mouth if he was going to refute it and I would say to those others that sat up there and say that TV just take the minute things that don't make no headlines.

I shouldn't say it. When they do a series on disadvantaged people on TV, how can that be minute? I understand she has to have a job. I understand I have to have a job, but I would be delightful with you if I can't speak here like I speak at home -- then, I don't need to be here.

And I think this man here needs to be commended because he's in a world of trouble. He shouldn't have even sat on the board. They didn't have any Serpico standards. I just wanted to get that off my chest.

Again, to you, Miss Rolark, I think you are a very fine person. You are one of the hottest wards in Ward 8 but, before we start cleaning up the police department, clean up the City Council. Get them accountable and let them remember that they came from the street, too.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. ROLARK: Well, of course, Mr. Beam, in his colorful way, has really given us the real issue and I must say that I agree: charity always begins at home. I agree with that and you know that there's some of us on the

Council who never agree with a lot of public -- call-inthe-guards; we'll have a public hearing and all the rest.

But, at Council, like any other body -- it is diverse. And
you have diverse views on it and I hope that none of you
out here believe that every one of us on there is like everybody else on there because that's not the case.

And I think that there is a segment on the Council who wishes very much to do something about this problem. 'We are in there to soon find out how the total council feels after they have finished marking up this bill which in some respects is a very radical type of bill because it intends to have some civilian review of police action. I still feel that's necessary.

This is long overdue and I think, when we do get it, we can avert what's happening in Miami because we would have put in place a peaceful vehicle to deal with this type of tension.

I think it's necessary.

(Applause.)

MR. GLICKSTEIN: We have another panel.

MR.KAMINS: I would like to raise a concern that has not come up here. It's a very simple concern and I'll make it short and sweet. It is this: as we discussed a great deal how to file and how to complain against an individual officer, what we have not discussed

is how you complain against the department policy or how you complain against subtle department policy. I work with a community that very definitely feels subtleties. We are discriminated against like black people are discriminated against for several reasons and how do you file a complaint against the system and how do you make those kind of changes?

That hasn't been dealt with. I'm very sorry you don't wish me to speak.

MR. GLICKSTEIN: The answer to that is: you do that through the political process. You do that through the Mayor; you do that through your elected officials, the ones that can influence policy.

Mr. Darden is about to file something against me.

MR. DARDEN: I'm sorry to be stepping up here this way but we do have three other areas that we are trying to cover tonight. We had scheduled the session to be over at 10:15 and perhaps we might be able to keep that schedule.

The next area we'd like to cover is listed on your program as Enforcement Decisions. Our moderator from the Advisory Committee is Dr. Paul Phillips Cooke and he will introduce the resource persons.

MR. COOKE: Thank you, Mr. Darden, and ladies

1 and gentlemen.

Enforcement Decision -- the title of this
workshop -- might be Enforcement Issues just as well
because people are divided with respect to when do police
officers enforce the law? What laws they do not enforce.
Well, we heard Bob King this evening in one of the earlier
perspectives say that 14th and Irving Street -- young
people in that neighborhood on 14th Street had extremely
loud stereo maybe as early as 4:00 in the morning and
there was a question before Police officers as to whether
they would enforce the law or not. It was a matter of
discretion.

We are concerned, then, with this short fifteenminute segment as to what is policy in the Metropolitan

Police Department with respect to enforcement -- enforcement of the laws of the District of Columbia.

When is there discretion? Ladies and gentlemen, the staff has suggested at first I call for order. Can I get some of those small meetings to halt and to ask persons to sit for these few minutes?

We have only one resource person -- not four speakers this time, so we may be short.

May I ask you to be in order? Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Again, now, the enforcement decision -- the

;

÷

2

decision of the police officers to enforce the law -- does he make a distinction between enforcing the law in the Southeast and, as has often been mentioned, Spring Valley, Chevy Chase and so on?

Now, one other aspect of enforcement. That deals with the weapon -- the use of deadly force in enforcement of law and so, again, the question is two-fold: one, what is policy of the Metropolitan police Department? two, 'What is discretion?

We've gone back into history briefly. We have observed a mayor in his activity. As I remember, when the mayor came to the Teacher's College at which I worked many a year and his role then was a part of a police community board, advisory to the Third Police District, I do remember mentioning the Third police district for two reasons — one because our resource person, Officer Beverly Medlock comes from the Third Police District but also because of the experience of the Mayor ten years ago which included his service as an advisory member of the police board in a police district.

Now, this was shortly after the city had been re-districted away from the precincts into the Third and Fourth Police Districts. That was actually the District of Columbia Teachers' College that was covered by the Third Folice District but, just across the street, the Fourth

1 -..2

3

5

6

7

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Police District and we had as many as 400 officers in the college in 1970 for training.

I don't know whether I can use Councilwoman Rolark's term of Human Relations -- whether our training program at the college then, ten years ago, was Community Relations but, whatever it was, the television was used and I think of Angela Owens because constantly police officers could monitor themselves on the television in the classroom as they saw themselves talk to each injured persons to see how their manner was in speaking and whether, indeed, they did suggest at times verbal abuse, whether they meant it or not.

But, at any rate, this issue is enforced. choices -- first of all, policy with respect to enforcement and the choices that police officers have

I'm going to ask Officer Beverly Medlock of the Third Police District to say a word as she sees fact and Officer Medlock has assignments with respect discretion. to gambling in the street and down-at-the-station work.

Officer.

OFFICER MEDLOCK: Thank you.

My name is Officer Beverly Medlock, assigned to the Third District. As far as enforcement procedures are concerned, all fines are to be enforced and all the rest are to be enforced but we also have selective enforcement which

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

· 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

means that, because the community has input into problem areas such as 14th Street and drug areas, prostitution, selective traffic enforcement and a variety of other things and also what comes into play with this is the police discretion.

And this varies with the individual officer. working at the station in the District, I take a lot of telephone calls and complaints from the citizens, saying that an officer did not do something right or he did what he was supposed to do but they didn't like it because he didn't use proper discretion.

So I'll take some questions now if anyone has any particular problem areas.

MR. KAMINS: My name is Larry Kamins of Gay Activist Alliance again. I want to ask a question that doesn't necessarily relate to specifically the officer's discretion on the scene with a particular crime, but the whole system of what I would call discrimination by "lost report".

Now, as we know, the police department will target a particular area for needed work. Say that there has been a series of rapes or a series of robberies based on reports; the department will send teams in to work certain things -- usually, casually clothed.

However, the department, which is incredibly

21 22

23

24

statistic-oriented -- if it does not have the written reports in -

3

1

DR. COOKE: Your question, now, sir, to the officer.

4

MR. KAMINS: That's what I'm doing now, thank you.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the officer on the scene has, as I understand it, incredible discretion as to whether to file the ' report, one and, secondly, how to file the report, two. For instance, we have a situation -- in Southeast where four women were attacked by six men with crow bars. officer in question, knowing the women were lesbians, filed a report of damaged property because a car was hit.

We have cases like this where the officer has a discretion to downgrade the crime or no crime at all is reported.

Based on the statistics, we do not get officers going into the area to deal with the matter, so we see multiple processing -- addition, it's my understanding -and you may correct me if I'm wrong -- that reports of there are robbers outside the establishment but, merchants: without formal written reports, they do not get responded to and reports to church groups --

DR. COOKE: Do you want an answer to a specific question or are you simply getting into the record your

complaints -- which may be a reasonable thing for you to do but what this workshop was set up for you to do was to put your questions so that many of us could gain from the answer.

MR. KAMINS: Can you not gain from the information?

DR. COOKE: The intent was for you to put it to the resource person and then, after they had been exhausted, then other means could be used.

OFFICER MEDLOCK: I think I know what you are talking about -- the crimes that should be reported that are not reported in the discretion of the officer -- that he might make this some other thing that can be settled between the people that are involved.

MR.KAMINS: No, I mean crimes where the officers

-- I don't believe that nothing happens -- crimes where

people fear the officer and, therefore, don't want to, say,

file a formal report.

An officer comes to the scene. Somebody is lying there bleeding. And the officer says: Will you prosecute and the citizen says: no. No report. No police action. No statistics.

OFFICER MEDLOCK: Let me ask you: when you see such situations, what do you do about it? If you see the officer doing this, do you make a complaint; would you bring

it to the attention of his officials?

MR. KAMINS: If I were personally there, yes,
I would. But the question is that the officer is thoroughly aware that a crime has taken place. The officer also
knows that's it's a crime that didn't go into the computer.
No overall department action.

Is not this inappropriate for the officer to let the thing drop out of the system?

DR. COOKE: Let me see if I can phrase this question. Do you, as an officer, have a responsibility, he says, to report that: here is a person who is bleeding, who has been struck and is bleeding and is on the ground; do you have a responsibility to report that if there is no one there to prosecute?

OFFICER MEDLOCK: The police department does not -- at certain times, does not need someone to say that they need someone to prosecute. A crime is a crime; if it meets the criterion of a particular crime, it should be reported.

Now, people who don't make the report because they fear the individual officer -- then, no one ever knows about it -- I would say that it's up to that person or someone who knows about it to make this information known.

MR. KAMINS: Okay. The question is if they downgrade the report, what can be done to get the report --

DR. COOKE: Let me get you quiet in the back of the auditorium so this gentleman can be heard, the reporter can hear the question and the speaker can respond. A little quieter in the back of the auditorium, please.

Go ahead, sir. Put your question.

MR. KAMINS: Okay.

In a simple situation -- 9th Street Northwest -
18 people getting mugged. When you query the computer, you
get three reports of muggings and that's it -- for any number
of reasons and some of us feel, at times, it is discrimination
on the officer's part.

The merchants in the area know there is a problem and report it to the people and the officers; the churches in the area know there's a problem; they report it to the officers they deal. The community groups in the area know it's a problem; they report it to the officers.

I dealt with this in the Gay community. The police department's official reponse is: no report; no crime wave.

How can that be altered?

DR. COOKE: I think, again, the question is: are you required, officer, to report when someone has told you that --

MR. KAMINS: I'm sorry. That was not the question. The question was: it's a question of enforcement and somehow

or other the statistics on which these actions are based by the police --

DR. COOKE: It's not reported. That's your point. See, all you are saying is: the officer is not reporting the muggings that have been reported to him and, therefore, the statistics are not going to show it.

MR. KAMINS: Okay. In addition, you have a very real situation in certain -- shall we say? -- deprived communities or oppressed communities where they are afraid to report crimes where the crimes as are reported by merchants but not by particular victims and, in those cases where these people have legitimate fears or not, you may have a crime wave by -- without report from the victim. Will the department respond to the reports of the merchants, the church groups and the community?

DR. COOKE: You want an answer to that and we'll turn to another question, Officer Medlock?

OFFICER MEDLOCK: It is the police officer's responsibility to report each crime as reported to him and those crimes that don't need the approval of the complainant for prosecution — they are also to be reported. Each time an officer reports to a run, he has to give a disposition of that run as to what is happening.

All this information is recorded and he's given a complaint number and it is kept on tape.

Now, in the instances where things that happen don't meet the criteria of a crime, then, they are often not reported.

Now, if an individual person feels that it should be, that person should take the responsibility of seeing someone in higher authority to make sure that this is being done.

MR. KAMINS: Okay, thank you.

DR. COOKE: Another question.

MR. HAHN: My name is Albert Hahn and I'm a member of the Chiefs' Advisory Council. I just heard about this meeting tonight from my director, Miss Terry Thornhill and I'm also Chairman of the Board of an LEAA-sponsored program that deals in crime prevention that is known as the Sixth District Citizens' Crime Prevention Project, Incorporated.

Now, my reason for appearing before you is that I know, in Officer Medlock's case, that she cannot answer all these questions because -- for the simple reason that I have been involved with the Chiefs' Advisory Council since the year of its beginning in 1970 when they drew up the police-citizens' advisory council structure.

Within that structure, all of the things that
we are asking Officer Medlock that are a part of Council
action — all these councils are set up in the seven police

districts. There are seven police districts. There were not seven at first. There were only six at first. And I was Chairman of the district that they split — which was the sixth district and they made the seventh district, which is Anacostia.

But, within that advisory council, they have all of the definites. Whenever there is a complaint against the police officer -- when a citizen has a complaint against a police officer -- when a citizen feels that in any way they have been mistreated, those advisory council officers who are elected by the citizens within the Northeast District -- they can start all the proceedings that is necessary to bring about a corrective action.

I just hope that any future conference that the police department would be a part of the police-community relationship. They certainly should not overlook these advisory councils because they are the ones that are the watchdog over the police in regards to their treatment in regards to the misconduct of the police officer -- whether it's against another officer or whether it's against a civilian.

Now, these are the things I think Officer Medlock has been talking about -- how the enforcement is made by the police officer. You know, you are doing your job.

I say to all of you, including the police: go to

your police advisory council. That's the way we go.

DR. COOKE: Thank you, Mr. Hahn.

Is there a final question? We'd like to end this workshop and turn to another one.

(No response.)

DR. COOKE: If there is no question, thank you very much. Shall we close out this workshop.

MR. HAMPTON: My name is Ronald Hampton and my question is: when it comes down to enforcement of certain types of crimes, are the police to mark certain crimes down and certain crimes, say, like drug traffic on 14th Street, do you feel that we don't play a whole mess of games of enforcing or trying to get rid of the type of crime that exists in that area — more of a containment type of game — keeping it in the area where we know where it's at, but you want to go find it?

OFFICER MEDLOCK: Personally, I feel it's more of a containment game because everybody knows that making a drug case at 14th Street is the hardest thing in the world to do so they are reduced to writing tickets for jaywalking or spitting or throwing trash, which isn't really what the problem is.

DR. COOKE: Does that answer your question?

MR. HAMPTON: Yes, sir, thank you.

DR. COOKE: All right. Thank you very much,

Officer and thank you for this workshop.

(Applause.)

MR. DARDEN: Thank you, Dr. Cooke.

We have two other areas that we'd like to cover tonight. The next one is the role of the Police -- the advisory committee moderator will be Miss Helen Fugh Hays.

MS. JORDAN: I wonder if it would be possible, due to the lateness of the hour, to combine these two panels so that they resource person who is on the Youth panel here would also be involved and could talk about that.

MS. HAYS: We could run the two together? That would be wonderful, because we are running short of time.

First of all, let me introduce the resource person in the Role of the Police, Melvin Boozer, Professor of Sociology and then Father Joaquin Bazin, Shrine of the Sacred Heart; Lt Charles Bason -- he is not here; Adjoa Burrow, D. C. Alliance Against Racism and Political Repression.

The purpose of this workshop -- the Role of the Police is to examine the role of the police in the community in law enforcement and other police activities in the communities.

As presented by both members of the community and the police --

MR. DARDEN: If you are interested in combining

10

11

-12

13 14

> 15 16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

them, then I will also bring on the moderator for the Youth and Police workshop, the moderator of the Commission, Ruth Jordan.

MS. JORDAN: I would just like to invite the other resource people and combine the two aspects together -- the impact on the youth community and I would introduce Lt. Douglas from the 1st District Youth Services and Mr. Carver Leach, who is the director of the Roving Leader Program which is part of the D. C. Department of Recreation.

I'm sorry -- and Audrey Winston Winston -- she may have stepped out.

Helen, I turn it back over to

Would you come up, please?

PROF. BOOZER:

I'll make a very brief statement I am the President of the Gay Activist Alliance. First of

all, I want to express my gratitude for being asked to say anything at all because I gather that my presence here today is arminimum -- that is, the federal Civil Rights is not mandated to protect the civil rights of gay people. Only in the City of Washington locally are there laws which protect the rights of gay people and there are people sitting here now looking at me thinking I perhaps come from Mars and wondering why I am standing here and wondering what I have to do with anything that's going on.

I want to clear up a very simple problem.

. _2

· 3

Ü

. 12

- 21

not need any special treatment from the police. Our problem is that we get lots of special treatment from the police and that's what we're trying to get rid of.

Somehow, some police officers, when they begin to think that we are gay, are — somehow, they cannot relate to us the way they relate to other people and that's because, when they come to the police department and put on uniforms, they don't stop having the attitudes that people in the society have.

There are people who use words that are not used in front of me but, as soon as they walk out of this room, they say "this faggot" said this, that and the other thing. They don't stop having these attitudes when they put the uniforms on.

So we know, in the gay community, that one of the things that affects the policemen's role is this concept of who the citizens are and what his role is toward them in the sense of how he is trained.

Policemen are not adequately trained in the sense of understanding the gay people as being just people because those attitudes are very often unaffected and, when we approach them on the streets, we sometimes have too much police service.

They want to do more for us than we want, or they don't want to do things when we need them. The solution, I

think, lies not in simply training because someone made the statement that the police officers enforce the laws of the community.

That's not true. Blice officers enforce the laws the police department wants enforced, those laws that the political climate dictates be enforced and we understand we don't get any action out of the police department unttil we go to the Mayor. They understand, then. That's all they understand.

I must say, before I stop talking, I am very grateful that there are police officers like Officer Hampton. I hope he keeps his job because, if there were more like him, I wouldn't be standing here saying these things. I hope he makes a career of the police department. I hope it's possible for a person like that to have a career.

So the final thing I want to say is: I think the police problems as we experience them -- now, we are just standing in line like every other group in the country has had to stand in lines.

The Constitution got written because the people who wrote the Constitution didn't understand they applied to all the people they were talking about. They wrote it but they didn't quite see it, and we are just saying that we are one of those people, too; that we have the same rights that everybody else has and we come and we talk and we have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to keep doing that until people realize we aren't going anywhere.

Second, I want to promise you one thing -- that the people who sponsored this program tonight -- the time will come, and I think it will come in my time where the law will be amended and it will include sexual orientation because we have suffered the same problems as women and Blacks and all other minorities have suffered in the past, so I think the solution to the problem is political activism.

I think we have to press upon the City Council and upon the elected officials to get action out of the police department because I think civil authority is supreme.

Now, we are reaching, I think, in this City and across the country where police officers at particular levels at particular levels begin to think that they are not amenable to civil processes and that is a very dangerous thing.

(Applause:)

MS. HAYS: Well, let me just throw out a couple of questions.

What are the responsibilities in dealing with the police in reporting crimes in serving as witnesses, jurors, what-not, and what is the effect of community

sperception and demands in defining the role of the police?

MR. BURROW: My name is Adjoa Burrow and I'm representing, tonight, the D. C. Alliance Against Racism and Political Repression. The D. C. Alliance feels that the role of the police in any community is to be responsive to the needs of the citizens.

The police are the servants of the people. Many times, in our society, in fact, it is not even many times, but usually -- the police, as a body, controls the citizens as opposed to --

(Disorder in the audience.)

MR. BURROW: What happens in most of our communities in the United States, if not all of our communities, is that the police are defining the role of the citizen as opposed to the citizen defining the role of the police.

We, in the D. C. Alliance are opposed to that.

We feel that the citizen should be the one to define what

it is that the police should do and what are the things that

the police should be responsive to.

In that regard, there is kind of an overlap between this workshop and one of the previous workshops that dealt with the accountability of the police to the citizens.

. 9

. 10 . 11

We, in the D. C. Area Alliance, do support citizen review boards where the citizens actually have some authority. One of the problems that we have found in citizen review boards, across the country, is that review boards do one thing: they recommend to the same authority that we are criticizing. They recommend to the police chief.

We feel that the citizen review board should have some authority, some final say in decisions, as opposed to again dealing with that body that we are all saying has not been responsive to the needs of the citizens.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HAYS: Father, would you like to comment on this?

FATHER BAZIN: I think that the officer who spoke earlier gave, I think, what would be the ideal in terms of police enforcement. The problem that we have is that, in the perception of many individuals, there was a study done by the Urban League, SOS '78 or '79 -- I forget which -- which was a repeat of a study that had been made a couple of years before.

It was surprising that, in a study of such a large number of individuals -- high percentages of individuals that lived in this section in my parrish -- that

. 12

faced crime against their person.

And it especially affected -- I was noticing -- the elderly and the helpless and, over and over again, the question comes in: how do we get more protection? A survey was taken and they found out that what the people wanted was more protection.

In 1970, I took a survey which -- apparently, that was the year for taking a lot of surveys -- '70 and '71 -- and one of the things that surprised me was the need that the large percentage -- the feeling that they wanted more police protection.

And I -- the kind of growing up I had -- I always wondered about that, you know -- just really what they wanted. And today on 14th Street -- 14th and Irving are a number of really fine officers -- Officer Sylvester, Officer Moss -- others who work in and out of there in terms of just walking the street.

Individuals -- officers like that, despite all the problems that do exist, make a very real difference. How one enforces the crime that one actually sees when you walk around that section -- you know where the drugs are being picked up -- the kids know.

You can pinpoint the time. The question that always comes to my mind is: why is it so difficult to make a drug bust? Does this mean the laws are wrong or

does this mean we have decided that, in certain sections or on certain streets — that we will, for containment purposes, allow it there so it doesn't spread anywhere else?

Well, that's fine if you live somewhere else, but I don't live somewhere else. I live there, where it's happening. The back of our alley: a man was shot to death.

The side of the church, another person was shot. He didn't die.

Across the street, a man was knifed. A rape occurs between the church and the rectory. A rape on the other side. And that was one week last year, just about this time of the year.

That was the worst week we had had, but the whole question then comes: how do we get — the problem that most people have is: how do we get about getting more people to enforce the crime against the person and not have to deal with the individual in terms of spitting or throwing trash because that's what they seem to be producing.

And they had a big roundup -- and Bob King mentioned that -- and this is a big problem we are facing in our community.

Thank you very much.

MS. JORDAN: It's really appropriate to include Youth under there and I would like to ask the two speakers, if they would, to address themselves to the kind of complaints we get at the Advisory Committee by young people—particularly young, black males who say they are the targets of special practices by the police—that they are "scare arrests" for crimes that don't really exist, but just to throw a scare into them, they are being dragged to the station.

We get complaints not only -- you'll be interested in knowing -- from poor neighborhoods, but from Ward 3 -- from kids who say that, if they look a certain way or if they dress a certain way, their parties are subject to a certain kind of law enforcement that other parties are not subject to.

Children who say, if they are even on school assignment during the day, wandering, using public trans-portation, evidence of being on school assignment — that they are treated differently than adults are being treated and that children who dress a certain way or look a certain way or behave a certain way get a certain kind of attention and I wonder if both in the Youth program and in the Police program with youth — whether you address these problems, whether you have conversations with them.

Mr. Leach, would you please come up?

MR. LEACH: I'm just going to say three basic things. One is the lack of communication. Two is the lack of training on both parts. And, three, it's a lack of trust.

I'm not going to get into a long speel but what I would like to have you do right now is give me four minutes -- just four minutes.

I'd like everybody to stand up and get themselves a partner. Just stand up now. Get a partner right quick.

Now, what I would like you to do -- does everyone have a partner?

PROF. BOOZER: I don't.

MR. LEACH: You got me, chief.

I want you to look at your partner's feet. Do not smile. I want you to introduce yourself. Okay. But do not smile.

(Audience complying.)

MR. LEACH: All right. This time, I want you to look at your partner's waist and shake your partner's hand, but don't do it in a firm shake but just a loose shake.

(Audience complying.)

MR. LEACH: This time, I want you to look at your partner's eyes. Look him directly in the eyes but, as you introduce yourselves, I want you to act as if your

lover or your favorite person came to the door and you'd rather be with them than this person here. Do that.

(Audience complying.)

MR. LEACH: This time, I want you to look at your partner; I want you to shake his hand; I want you to look directly in his eyes or her eyes; I want you to start talking about the weather or whatever, but I want you to really keep that contact going. Go ahead.

(Audience complying.)

MR. LEACH: This time -- thank you. This time,

I want you to be acting like you're walking down the

street and you haven't seen this person in ten years. I

want you to greet him -- go ahead -- or her.

(Audience complying.)

MR. LEACH: All right, now, turn around back-to-back. One person be "A"; the other person be "B".

Okay, you picked "A" and "B". Now, this time, I want you to talk for 15 seconds -- "A!s"; "B's", you cannot answer. You cannot answer. And, then, I'm going to say: change, and then the "B's" will do it. Okay, go.

(Audience complying.)

MR. LEACH: All right. Stop.

That was only for 15 seconds. "B's" go.

(Audience complying.)

MR. LEACH: All right. Both of you turn around,

face-to-face and, at the same time -- at the same time, both of you talk to each other.

(Audience complying.)

MR. LEACH: All right, you may sit down.

Okay, let's go through the first process that we went through. The first process that we went through is communication. Several things happened. If you notice, the room came alive.

The room came alive when we started talking about it and shaking each other's hand and looking in people's eyes.

One thing in communication, as far as the police and youth are concerned, the youth are grit on you -- you know, everybody knows what "grit" is on you. They would "grit" if they feel you are doing them wrong. So what happens to a police officer many times is, when they "grit" with those guys, they've got to let them know they are in charge, the same way Mama does or Daddy does or your friend does.

And, when he has a pistol on his hip and the kid "grits", he's going to let him know: looky, if you don't do right, you're going to get it up, side your head. So the kid says: I don't give a damn; hit me up side my head and go on and do what you want to do.

What we have to start doing is getting more

know that he does have something going -- also, getting to know that person a little bit more.

Now, the thing that we did before, at the end, was -- I said: act as though you hadn't met this person in ten years. Some people pushed away; some people shook hands; some people hugged.

Touch means a whole lot to me and these youth.

And, whether you realize it or not, police officers are
just as sensitive to wanting people to like them as youth
are sensitive to wanting to be liked.

And what happens is that the image that maybe youth have is that the police officer has a gun and doesn't smile and doesn't give a damn, the officer, many times, believing because he is in a certain neighborhood in the area that he's got to carry an image.

What we have to do is -- people in this work -- is to bring both of them together; to let the youth know he has a process he can go through.

The last exercise we went through -- we're back-to-back. We only talked for 15 seconds. Many people couldn't even find anything to say in 15 seconds but I notice that people who aren't even supposed to be talking find a lot to say.

When I had you turn around and face each other

13

14: . 15

16

-17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

and talk face-to-face, everybody found it very difficult to talk while another person was talking because they couldn't listen, but you've been doing it right in and out.

I'm not going to make a big thing about it, but what I'm saying is: we've got to listen; we've got to have trust and we've got to communicate.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)=

MS. JORDAN: Now, you know why the Roving Leader Program is one of the best programs. Officer Leach is a tough act to follow:

OFFICER DOUGLAS: I'm Officer Fred Douglas, the First District Youth Services, and, first of all, to thank Mr. Leach because I think everything that body has been trying to say here tonight -- he did it in about five minutes -- what we were all trying to get around and talk about -- community relations, citizens relationship and those two relationships together -- the police and the community.

I work strictly with juveniles . I've been working with First District Youth Services now for five years and I have ten years on the police force.

What Ms. Jordan was talking about earlier reference to the children being brought in -- that is

harrassment. I see it every day.

There's a lot of things that we try to do. Let's get back to Mr. Leach for a second. You talk about the gun on your hip when you are trying to talk to these juveniles. Well, in our office, we don't wear guns. When we deal with juveniles, that's the first thing we take off as soon as we --

Well, let me give you a little background as to what we do -- First District Youth Services or any youth services office in the precinct. We are basically there to process juvenile arrests. That's our number one aspect. We try to process all arrests that come into the precinct.

Number two: we are the old-fashioned truency officer when school is in session. We do a little of that. Basically, whenever a juvenile comes in contact with the police, we somehow get on the scene and try to evaluate and make a determination of whether John goes to court or we can do some kind of paperwork at the precinct that might curtail that.

Most of the time, if it's not a serious crime and is a misdemeanor and it's the child's first time, we release him to his parent with a warning and hope that it won't happen again -- that it's enough.

There's a lot of things I could tell you, but we do so many things. Maybe the best thing for me to do is

to allow you to ask me more questions in reference to juveniles and how they are processed.

Does anyone have any questions?

MR. DARDEN: I have a general question. You might not be able to answer it. Do you think that the number of juveniles involved in violent crimes has increased, you know, recently and, if so, do you see that as a direct result of the conomic crisis that we are all in?

OFFICER DOUGLAS: As far as --

MR. LEACH: Repeat the question.

OFFICER DOUGLAS: The young man's question is: have I noticed that there has been an increase in violent crimes and, if so, would be possibly be due to the fact of the economic situation that most people are in now?

There has been an increase in violent crimes in juvenile statistics. A lot of times, you can't always go by statistics because, in what we are talking about earlier, some statistics on some cases aren't reported but, from my own knowledge of the First District -- which is the only real statistics I can give you, there has been an increase. The biggest increase is mainly in larceny -- shoplifting or breaking into cars and burglaries. There has been a very big increase in burglaries.

In fact, there -- well, in the First District -- I'm going to use that as a general concensus that it's all

in the D. C. area.

MR. DARDEN: Okay. When I say "violent crimes", I mean doing harm to another person. I guess what I'm trying to get at is whether the youth today have a shorter fuse, in other words, and are more likely to, you know, hurt you if you confront them in the street in any kind of situation.

OFFICER DOUGLAS: Okay. Violent crimes are basically robberies and crimes that have victims, so you are talking about robberies and assaults. Any time somebody is going to get hurt. So, yes, there have been.

If you refer to your packages, in the part of the format in there, you'll see some of the statistics on crime and the breakdown as far as juveniles and you can see where it has risen very highly.

FATHER BAZIN: Officer, actually, it has increased to this point. You can make a living predicting where crime will go down by just seeing the age index. Do you know what the age index is going to be; just follow the trend.

You can predict a crime decrease or a crime increase -- very, very carefully -- very easily, rather.

MS. BLACKWELL: I have a recommendation when it comes to children. I have a recommendation now and I hope somebody will listen and put it into effect. I have had

occasions where nine-year-old children -- 10, 11 and 12 -who have opened the pocketbook and everything -- and here is
what I would recommend -- that the citizens -- victims
whose pocketbook was stolen -- whatever the amount of
money that he took, he should be made to work after
school or in the morning -- even Saturdays and Sundays -- to
pay for that money that he got in his hot little hand. What
do you think?

OFFICER DOUGLAS: Well, that's a good idea but, you see, that comes under the court systems and, right now, there aren't too many courts that believe in restitution.

Normally, if a crime is committed -
MS. BLACKWELL: But, even this panel here -
couldn't it make that kind of a recommendation?

OFFICER DOUGLAS: Okay, then, probably what you would have to do is go to the City Council.

MS. BLACKWELL: Oh-h-h-h!

MS. GALIBER: I just want to say there are restitution programs being implemented in the City. Inner Voices has a restitution program and I think it is being picked up by the courts and it's an excellent idea and this would be an excellent recommendation and it is definitely a good idea.

MR. STEINBACHER: My name is Dave Steinbacher and

I'm from Virginia.

I just wanted to know: are the school systems making your job easier or tougher? I mean: do you feel that the schools are showing the kids how to get jobs and keep them off the streets and showing them how to increase their self-worth and their self-concept and this type of thing and is there any statistics showing that, in the summertime, there's more crime than during the school year and weekends -- more than during the week, and this type of thing? Are the schools, you know, helping?

OFFICER DOUGLAS: Okay, the first part of your question — it's kind of hard to say what schools — some schools, yes, they do have good programs for the juveniles and, as far as crime going up in the summertime, it does, because there are more juveniles out of school. They don't have anything to do; there aren't too many recreation programs and the ones that we do have are over-crowded, so that they do get into more crime.

A lot of time, it's peer contact -- a group -- kids hanging in one group and they decide they want to do something. It's more mischievious, playfulness that sometimes turns into crimes.

MS. JORDAN: Let me remind you there were two panels here, so, if people have questions of both, just to speed it up --

Z

MR. LOUDERBAUGH: I'm Thomas Louderbaugh, former Police Awareness Alliance of the Gay Activist

Alliance. I'm sorry to report this but, in all my experience, in most cases, if we look upon the police officer as an enemy, I've had a number of gay people tell me: if they were mugged, if they were robbed -- whatever, they would not report the crime to a police officer. They considered the treatment they would get from the police 'officer would be probably even worse than they got from the

approach; that, in fact, police officers, by and large, will be helpful, courteous, kind and useful. They refuse to believe it.

criminal and it's better to just write it off as a bad loss.

I tried to explain to these people that that is not a good

In fact, the only source that they will believe is the police department itself. We, in the Gay Activist Alliance, have attempted for approximately two years now to convince the police chief in Washington, D. C. to issue a public anti-discrimination statement for us as he has for other groups.

He will not do so and my question, therefore, to the panel, or to the police officer, is: how can we communicate to gay people that they are full citizens; that the police department will treat them as full citizens if we cannot get such a statement from the Chief of Police; if

we cannot get the word out through the regular general media?

If the Washington Post won't print it, as far as most people are concerned, it is not true. That leaves us with the problem that exists and the question: how do we solve it?

PROF. BOOZER: I can't really answer the question.

It's one I'd like to ask, perhaps. I would like to make a, comment, however. There is already ample precedent in which the police officers have made statements on behalf of minority groups.

A most recent example is the statement by the police chief on behalf of aliens in which he stated -- in which he made it crystal clear that he wanted police officers to treat aliens like other people because they were police officers and they still are police officers and, when they come across somebody who is not a citizen and doesn't speak the language well, and he gets treated pretty poorly -- somehow, the police chief doesn't understand that there are police officers who deal with gay people in exactly the same way.

Somehow, the police chief doesn't believe that what he does with one group he has to do for another and, somehow, it always gets brought back to us that we are asking for special treatment.

So there is a clear lack of communication there but I am sure what you do about it. We have sat in meetings with the police chief, with lots of people; we have sat in meetings with few people; we have tried everything except sign language, but nothing seems to work.

MR. BAINES: My name is Dave Baines from RAP,
Incorporated. I would like to ask Officer Douglas a question because, you know, one of the major problems that I see happening in the city revolves around the drug abuse for a lot of the young people here in Washington and I'm sure that it applies across the country.

But, speaking just here in Washington, I think that the abuse at this point is getting atrocious. It's not always heroin, but the level of marijuana smoked on buses and you walk down the street, and anywhere you go -- our program attended something at Anacostia Park -- which there were thousands of young people there -- I mean you could hardly go and mix with anybody that wasn't smoking marijuana in some form.

But I guess what frightens me -- the question I
want to ask you about is, as it relates to this Angel

Dust that is now being smoked by the young people, because
I don't think they are at all aware of the frightening
kind of results that this drug can have on people and I
know quite a few instances at St. Elizabeth's Hospital where

cases are coming in and being diagnosed as schizophrenia or something, or some type of neurosis which the young people have actually smoked this chemical.

Presently, we have a small segment of youth that come into our facility at RAP and, more and more frequently, we come into contact with young persons who have become mentally disoriented through the use of this particular drug.

So my question to you is: how does your office see this problem and what, if anything, are you attempting to do about it?

OFFICER DOUGLAS: Okay. As far as our office, we really don't get involved on too many drug cases, okay? The normal procedure is not the treatment; it's the conviction.

What should be done is that these children should be made more aware through the school system, if possible. Right now, the way things are going with the police department, it's hard. We don't have the manpower. I'm not trying to take up for the police department by any means, but you have to see the point that they don't have the manpower and the capabilities to get out here and go around and just have open seminars or have movies and films. They try to. They have an Officer Friendly program that tries to get involved in it at times, but they can only do so much.

Now, where I come in at Youth Services, if a child comes in and he's arrested because he has some type of a marijuana or Angel Dust or some kind of amphetimine in his possession, that's when I come in.

And what I try to do then is either get him into some kind of drug program or we try to -- we have different ways and means we try to do other than try to go right through the court system.

It's a little more involved. It's not the program that it should be but, right now, the police department doesn't have a great drug abuse program.

MR. LEACH: I'd like to make a comment on that.

It's even deeper than that. They have heroin that you can smoke and, as you can imagine, some of these youth are getting hooked on that.

That's going to be something else. They have to live by the tracks and all that kind of stuff now. The only thing I can say is that, usually, in groups, everybody tries to say what somebody else isn't doing. The only way we can deal with this is that we have to support each other.

We have to support the police in their efforts. We have to support the schools in their efforts. We have to support all those agencies that are trying to help and work with the youth.

I'm going to be calling on you because you've been through the system, and I want to bring some of those youths that know it all -- that say: I'm not going to get that way, so you can say: Hey, I've been that way. And you can rap to them.

It's just like a parent. Many times, as parents, sometimes, we can't say anything to our own youth. In fact, sometimes, you want to bust them in the head, but that's not the way to deal with it.

What you might have to do -- it might be a cousin or a brother or somebody else that might be able to say something to them to get them off of it but what we have to do right now is to realize that any particular agency doesn't have all the answers, admit we don't have all the answers and ask for help.

MS. JORDAN: I want to thank all the panelists and everybody who stayed to the end.

The record that has been assembled here will be studied and discussed by the Advisory Commission and we will -- I think, from this, what we know is that we have to do more work in this area.

And I think what we will also do is report back to the full Commission, the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, with the information because, as we know by what is happening in Florida, the relationships between the police and the

community are vital to all of our well-being.

So we are going to go over the record that is being made here tonight carefully and study what you have

.

all said here tonight.

I want to thank you for coming and for your patience and for your participation.

Goodnight.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at

9 10

10:25 p.m.)

* * * *

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

This is to certify that the attached proceedings in the aforecaptioned matter were held on May 19, 1980 and that this is a true and accurate record thereof and that this is the original transcript thereof.

Meal R. GROSS

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005