## **CERTIFIED COPY**

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

RACIAL AND ETHNIC TENSIONS IN AMERICAN COMMUNITIES:

POVERTY, INEQUALITY AND DISCRIMINATION

LOS ANGELES MINI-HEARING

(CONTINUATION)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1996

NEVILL & SWINEHART, INC.
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
215 North Marengo Avenue, Suite 201
Pasadena, California 91101
(818) 584-9966 (800) 748-6336
REPORTED BY:
LYNN ZINK, CSR NO. 9466, RPR

FILE NO. 41793

1	
2	
3	
4	UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
5	RACIAL AND ETHNIC TENSIONS IN AMERICAN COMMUNITIES:
6	POVERTY, INEQUALITY AND DISCRIMINATION
7	LOS ANGELES MINI-HEARING
8	(CONTINUATION)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Transcript of Proceedings taken on
14	behalf of the U.S. Commission on Civil
15	Rights at U.C.L.A. School of Law,
16	405 Hilgard Avenue, Stauffer Courtroom,
17	Los Angeles, California, commencing at
18	3:00 p.m., on Wednesday, November 13,
19	1996 before Lynn Zink, CSR No. 9466, RPR.
20	
21	•
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
4	
5	CRUZ REYNOSO, Vice Chairperson
6	CARL A. ANDERSON, Commissioner
7	EDWARD A. HAILES, JR., Deputy General Counsel
8	
9	
LO	
Ll	·
L2	
L3	··
L <b>4</b>	
15	
L6	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	•

1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1996
2	3:00 p.m.
3	* * *
4	MR. REYNOSO: Good afternoon. I'd like to call this
5	meeting to order. My name is Cruz Reynoso. I'm Vice Chair
6	of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. With me is
7	Commissioner Anderson. He will introduce himself a little
8	bit later on.
9	I'd like to indicate, first of all, that this
10	is a hearing of the United States Commission on Civil Rights
11	and that we are calling it to order as a continuance of a
12	previous hearing that we had.
13	I would like to have the reporter and we
14	have only one reporter here come forward and be sworn.
15	(Whereupon the reporter was duly sworn.)
16	MR. REYNOSO: Generally we ask, but I see nobody here
17	that needs an interpreter through signing. I take it that
18	that's true. The record may show that I can see everybody
19	who's in the room.
20	I'd like to welcome those of you who are here
21	to this public hearing of the Commission in Los Angeles. As
22	I indicated earlier, in fact, we are reconvening this
23	hearing to hear the testimony of Chief Oliver Thompson.
24	Chief Thompson was subpoenaed to testify before
25	the Commission on September 12, 1996 as a scheduled

participant in a public hearing on a panel entitled "Update of Christopher Commission and Kolts Commission Reforms:

Racial and Gender Bias in the Los Angeles Police

Department." The Commission requested his testimony in part as part of our multiyear project on Racial and Ethnic

Tensions in American Communities: Poverty, Inequality and Discrimination.

Pursuant to that multiyear project, we've had several hearings throughout the country, including two now here in Los Angeles and one in New York that I attended and one before I joined the Commission in Chicago, and several others. We hope to have one more hearing before we finish our study in this area.

At that time Chief Thompson failed to appear to testify on that panel. The Commission then agreed, without objection, to ask the U.S. Attorney to proceed to consider enforcing the subpoena issued to Chief Thompson according to statute. Both the U.S. Marshal and the U.S. Attorney made efforts to produce Chief Thompson during the hearings in September but to no avail.

Following ensuing discussions, including the Commission's General Counsel, U.S. Attorney, and Chief Thompson, the witness agreed to comply with the subpoena by testifying before the subcommittee of the Commission today.

The subcommittee consists of Commissioner Carl

Anderson, as I indicated before, who is seated to my right, and yours truly as Vice Chair. I would like to indicate that my full-time job is teaching law here at the law school, and I'd like to thank the law school for making this available to us. We've saved some taxpayers dollars in providing for the use so we can have this hearing.

I would like to have Commissioner Anderson introduce himself and his capacity, perhaps, beyond being a commissioner.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, thank you. My name is Carl Anderson, and I'm Dean of Graduate School of Theology in the Washington, D.C. area, John Paul, II Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family.

MR. REYNOSO: Very good. In addition, we have with us from Washington the Deputy General Counsel Mr. Edward A. Hailes, Jr. who will be doing the initial questioning.

As I indicated privately, in addition to the scheduled witness, there will be an opportunity for concerned individuals to testify in what we call an open session after the scheduled testimony. Ms. Deborah Reed who is an attorney advisor in the Commission's Office of General Counsel will be available at the appropriate time to assist anyone interested in delivering sworn testimony during the open session.

We are scheduled and have been scheduled to

begin at 3:00 o'clock, and I'm advised by the staff that probably the testimony will take 45 minutes. It may take less; it may take more. And then we will call for the open session at 4:00 p.m. If folk appear at that time, we will hear anybody who comes before us. If folk do not appear, then I think we will simply close the session at that time.

I would now like to call on the Vice Chair to read the rules that the Commission has adopted for a public hearing such as this.

Commissioner Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much. Our procedures require that we provide a brief summary of the rules that govern the Commission's hearings, and I will do that now.

These are brief summaries of the major provisions and, therefore, the rules themselves should be consulted for fuller understanding. And there are staff members present who will be able to answer questions if you have a question during the course of the hearing.

The Commission is empowered by statute to hold hearings and act at such times and places as it deems advisable. The hearing is open to all, and the public is invited and urged to attend.

All witnesses within the Commission's jurisdiction have been subpoenaed as is our process. Everyone who testifies or submits data or evidence is

entitled to obtain a copy of the transcript on payment of costs.

In addition, within 60 days after the close of the hearing, a person may ask the Commission to correct errors in the transcript of his or her testimony. And such requests will be granted only to make the transcript conform to testimony as presented at the hearing.

If the Commission determines that any witness testimony tends to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, that person or his or her counsel may submit written questions which, in the discretion of the Commission, may be put to the witness. Such person also has a right to request that witnesses be subpoensed on his or her behalf.

All witnesses have the right to submit statements prepared by themself or others for inclusion in the record, provided that they are submitted within the time required by Commissions rules.

Any person who has not been subpoensed may be permitted, at the discretion of the Commission, to submit a written statement in this public hearing. Such statement will be reviewed by the members of the Commission and made a part of the record.

Witnesses at Commission hearings are protected by Title 18 U.S. Code Sections 1505, 1512, and 1513, which make it a crime to threaten, intimidate or injure witnesses

on account of their attendance at government proceedings. The Commission should be immediately informed of any allegations arising or related to possible intimidation of witnesses. I emphasize, we consider this to be a very serious matter, and we will do all in our power to protect witnesses who appear at the hearing.

Copies of the rules which govern this hearing may be obtained from a member of the Commission staff upon request. And the scheduled witness appearing during the course of this hearing has already been supplied a copy, I understand.

Finally, I would point out that these rules were drafted with the intent of ensuring that the Commission hearings be conducted in a fair and impartial manner. In many cases the Commission has gone significantly beyond Congressional requirements in providing safeguards for witnesses and other persons. We have done that in the belief that usable facts can be developed best in an atmosphere of calm and objectivity. We trust that such an atmosphere will prevail at this hearing.

I would stress, however, that with respect to the conduct of every person, all orders by the Vice Chairperson must be obeyed. And failure by any person to obey an order by him, as chairman of the hearing, or any commissioner presiding in his absence, will result in the

1.0

1	exclusion of the individual from the hearing room and
2	criminal prosecution by the U.S. Attorney, when required.
3	And as I've noted earlier, this hearing will be
4	open to the public.
5	MR. REYNOSO: Very good. Thank you very much. Who
6	else will be presiding besides you, Mr. Anderson?
7	With that, Counsel, will you please call the
8	witness.
9	MR. HAILES: Chief Oliver Thompson.
10	MR. REYNOSO: Would you please stand and be sworn
11	first. Raise your right hand.
12	Do you swear or affirm that you will testify
13	truthfully to the best of your ability?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.
15	MR. REYNOSO: Please be seated. Thank you so much.
16	Please proceed.
17	
18	EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. HAILES:
20	Q Will you please state your full name and your
21	present occupation for the record.
22	A Oliver Maurice Thompson, Chief of Police, City
23	of Inglewood, California.
24	Q And do you have an open-end statement you would
25	like to give, no more than five minutes, at this time?
1	

Α No. 1 You are the past president of the National 2 Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives; is that 3 correct? 4 Δ Yes. I am. 5 And when did you serve in that capacity? 6 July of '95 to June of '96. 7 Ά And will you please describe the issues that 0 8 NOBLEE addresses that disproportionately affect the 9 10 African-American community. NOBLEE came into existence in 1976 whereby 11 Α 12 approximately 15 to 20 African-Americans, predominantly 13 male, were called together, in I believe it was Atlantic 14 City, to discuss urban violence and black-on-black crime. 15 This was during the time of the law enforcement assistance administration being in existence, and there was 16 17 a small grant that came out of that. And a small 18 publication was put together in the area of black-on-black crime. 19 20 NOBLEE, over its 20 years of existence, have looked into urban violence and urban crime. We've looked at 21 22 racism, institutional racism. We've looked at upper 23 mobility for African Americans within the criminal justice 24 system, predominantly in law enforcement -- state, local,

25

and federal.

And we've looked at the exchange of information 1 to ensure that all persons who find themselves within those 2 ranks, be it at line level, supervisorial, middle 3 4 management, or command level will have all the information necessary so if they desire to be upwardly mobile, they can 5 6 be. In the course of addressing some of those 0 issues as an officer, and I understand -- let me just ask 8 this question. You also served in other official capacities 9 10 with NOBLEE in years before 1995. Yes. 11 Α 12 What were those positions and the times? you recall? 13 I would say chief cook and bottle washer at the 14 15 local level and chapter, secretary, vice-president, president, regional vice-president, national vice-president, 16 17 and then president. 18 0 In those several capacities, did there come a 19 time that you became aware of issues that directly related 20 to African-American females and upward mobility 21 opportunities in law enforcement capacities? 22 Oh, sure. Α 23 What were those issues that you --24 Α I started out in law enforcement 31 years ago 25 in Riverside, California, a young guy out of South Central

Los Angeles via Tulsa, Oklahoma. And I remember a lot of the travails that I had myself at the age of 23 starting out in law enforcement down in Riverside.

And the only difference, I believe, between a male and a female doing this job is that, as a male, even though of a different ethnicity, you're a man against -- in dealing with other men. But when you bring a woman into this, the men are going to rise up, generally, and they're going to say that women can't do this job. I never believed that because I believe if I can do the job, anybody can do the job.

And so it was in Riverside when it really, as far as I was concerned, really began to hit home. And it wasn't because of African-American women. It was because of white women, their lack of acceptance. And then as a few black females began to look at Riverside County Sheriff and Riverside Police Department, about coming on board, that it really begin to hit home, the pervasive, institutional racism and sexism that we find in this business.

And it's still predominant today. It hasn't changed, and probably will be several generations before it will -- you'll see the monumental changes that are necessary.

Q What, if any, recommendations has NOBLEE made to attempt to bring a more speedy resolution to some of

those claims of institutional racism and gender bias?

Well, primarily I think working at both the local, state, and federal levels, ensuring that all of our members, male and female, be they associate members below the rank of -- let's say in the federal lot of GS13, GS14, or if you're at a local state level below the rank of lieutenant, you're an associate member -- trying to ensure that those associate members readily qualified become members through promotional processes, through assessment centers, through passing on information; making sure that tests are put together the way they should be, that any institutional bias that might be prevalent is diminished; making sure that everybody gets all the information that's necessary to pass those, both written as well as performance processes, when you go through an assessment center.

And then also to ensure that formal education -- that our members understand the great need for formal education, be it at the associate level, bachelor at graduate level, to ensure that they recognize that this job is totally in his responsibility.

Q Now, the Christopher Commission and I believe NOBLEE had supported the concept of community policing.

A Yes.

Q How do you define on a pragmatic basis that term "community policing"? What does it entail?

A Community policing is a philosophy. It's not a program. Programs, like Chief Williams would say with L.A.P.D., whom I've known for better than 20-some years, remembering his rise from Philadelphia Police Department -- programs come and go. Philosophies don't.

It must be the philosophy of the persons of the head of the organization, the department head. And when you take its component terms, community policing, you're not saying policing policing. You're saying community policing which says as a lead in is that the community must take charge of the policing services that they have within their midst.

Police officers are public servants. They are not an entity unto themself. As such, they are there to serve the public, which means that they must be understanding what the public wants, and they must give the public what they want and be responsive to their needs. So again, it's a philosophy. And that philosophy must be driven home by the department head.

NOBLEE, over the last three years, has been going throughout this country teaching the basic tenets of the community policing. I'm one of the lead instructors in that area. I just came back from Philadelphia last week, and we're out preaching the tenets of community policing as a philosophy, the program aspects of it, and then also the

community partnerships that must come out of it. Because a police must act in consort and in a partnership with the public to ensure that we do the job they want us to do, not the job we want to do.

Q Can you give some concrete examples of how

Q Can you give some concrete examples of how minority communities benefit from that philosophy?

Well, I think the primary way is to do away with the credibility and the trust gap. I think out here in Los Angeles there's a tremendous trust gap between law enforcement and the general populace. Even though persons would say that really there isn't, there is. There's a tremendous trust gap because I think that a number of minorities, black and brown, have had problems with the police.

I myself, being reared for the latter part of my high school years in Los Angeles, I had my problems with L.A.P.D. It was probably the reason I didn't get on L.A.P.D. I had to go out into the suburbs and get a job.

But there's a distrust factor; there's this discrepancy factor; there's this "will I be treated correctly." And then when you bring up and come move fast-forward in 1991 and you see what you saw on television -- and no matter how many times it was played, that's a fact. That is not an aberration. Your eyes are not lying to you. Rodney King had a tremendous disservice

that was done to him.

And when you got all of that -- and the police many times do not live where they police. They are a combat army that comes in, and they take care of business, and then they go back to the so-called safer suburbs -- when you have all of that, minorities are definitely -- and people of color are definitely going to have a problem with how they look upon policing services.

So this philosophy in a program aspect of community policing is so important to cut into that and enhance that trust, enhance that credibility. Because you get to know the person and know they're human and things like that.

Q Well, to follow up, and I see that during your interview with Commission staff you indicated that, quote, "cultural diversity issues are almost synonymous with community-based policing in the sense that police-community relations are involved." Can you explain that?

A Oh, yes. You have to have a police force that mirrors the population that they serve. Otherwise, you're not going to get, I think, a real intense flavor of what policing is all about.

By coming from South Central Los Angeles, I understand, that at that time as being reared, what a lot of the problems were in that particular community. I wasn't

community, and I went to school there.

As such, I knew a lot of the problems there. I knew a lot of the people. They knew my first name. They knew me; I knew them. They knew where I lived; I knew where they lived. And so you could cut right through, as you might say, cut to the chase to ensure that you can resolve issues and situations.

The diversity issue is so important because it is not so simple today to just say it's a black or a brown or a white or an Asian. There are the many cultures within that come from all over. And with that diversity in its richness, it's not a melting pot. But the riches that you have there, I think, makes for a much better policing service.

And that policing service is not just about incarceration, but it's prevention, intervention and incarceration. But so many times so much effort is put toward incarceration, and there's forgetting of the first parts, which are prevention and intervention.

Q Well, I just have one further question, and it's prompted by what I would consider to be a rich resume of experience in the issue of labor/management issues in the law enforcement area. And I would just like for you to tell us, for the record, what approaches promote cooperative

atmosphere between police unions and police management?

A That's kind of interesting to ask me that. My union just took a vote of no confidence against me.

Q I was unaware of that. That's not why I asked the question.

A Yeah, the primary thing is recognizing that there are labor issues and there are the management issues that must be dealt with. And one cannot lord it over the other. There must be meet and confer in good faith. There must be collaboration and cooperation.

And the thing of it is that, you know, I really get -- what really gets to me is a community does not hire a police association president, secretary/treasurer, Sergeant at Arms, our police officers do. Now, after one becomes a police officer, then they begin to vie for those positions after they've been there for a goodly period of time.

And what happens is that people forget why you came into this job. You didn't come in to be a union rep.

You should have come in to follow the tenets of the code of ethics and to protect and serve that community and be responsive to its needs.

What happens many times, though, is that the union philosophy and direction takes hold in this adversarial process. And instead of being concerned about the communities, there's more concern for the union than for

i the community they serve.

It doesn't have to be adversarial, but it is in many instances. What you'll see here in Southern

California, and probably in California in general, mirrors

what you find in places across this country, with F.O.T. and things like that. Doesn't have to be, but it is.

MR. HAILES: Vice Chairperson, I have no further questions.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Q Okay. Well, thank you for appearing before us today. I think one of the reasons that your testimony can be so helpful to us is your long experience in law enforcement and your experience with NOBLEE and the fact that we have not had many witnesses with your experience testifying before us, either in this hearing in terms of Los Angeles or in the other hearings we've had in New York and Chicago and other places.

We have, or at least I have, been told in discussions with other chiefs of police that criticism that they receive about community policing is that it is not the most efficient use of police resources. That instead of being involved in the investigation of crime and the apprehension of criminals, they're out doing sort of

community projects.

How do you respond to that?

A Hogwash. The chief doesn't know what he's talking about. It's a very efficient use because you're talking about bringing the community in to help you resolve, not your problem, but their problems. And you're working together in cooperation and collaboration toward resolving the community's issues.

These are not your issues. You're just hired as a public servant to assist them in doing their thing.

Way back when, everybody was a part of a police department, male and female. But what happened is that it became a paid profession. And so people who didn't want to do that paid profession did something else.

Over time what has occurred is that people have shoved all of America's problems, I believe, social and otherwise, onto the police because, as the kids would say, we're 24-7. We're the most visible arm of government. And other people have shied away, become apathetic, and have allowed themselves to become intimidated by people in the community -- the gang members, the drug dealers.

Well, when you bring that community in and you're willing to sit down with them and you respect that community, that they have sense and intelligence and they got smarts and they know how to eradicate problems within

~ ~

1 | their community, you're going to be much more richer for it.

Now, I understand what those chiefs are saying.
But I say hogwash because they really don't want to give up
their power. And there's tremendous power in the police
being the persons who say "I know it. You just stand back
and let us do our job, and we can do it better than you
can." And I will tell any chief to their face or
commissioner that you will have a much easier job if you
bring the community in and work with them in resolving
issues. I have to say hogwash.

Q So you don't find, as you allocate resources in your department, that community policing affects the allocation of resources so that sufficient resources are not allocated where they're needed --

A No.

Q -- in your judgment?

A No. And the reason I say that is that if we hadn't received the money from President Clinton, we would have still done what we're doing now.

We have eight lead officers out of 160 officers. We have eight lead officers in a town ten square miles, six and a half livable square miles of livable area, you would say. And we have these eight lead officers, and they are providing the service that I want them to provide -- problem identification, problem resolution, and

working intensely with the community.

Q What kind of things does an officer learn through community policing in terms of listening to the community in terms of what they want done as opposed to beginning to understand who lives here and who operates this business and that kind of thing in terms of the priorities of issues of what needs to be done? What do they learn from that?

A I think the primary thing the officer should learn is that instead of them taking the lead, they work to develop leaders within their beat area. We've got four beat areas in Inglewood. They work to develop leaders within those beat areas, and they work in consort.

And after a while they are stepping to the rear and letting those developed leaders move to the forefront and in resolving the community issues and pretty much coming to law enforcement and saying can you help us with the resources.

See, I believe community policing is just a small part of a larger turn of community-oriented governing, not just policing but community-oriented governing. And so instead of us taking the lead, that the people in that community take the lead to resolve their issues.

Q Several decades ago we heard a lot of talk about winning the hearts and minds of communities. Now, I

don't ask you to respond in terms of Inglewood, but just in general. Do you think that in American communities there is that sufficient alienation that we really need an intense program to win the hearts and minds of the community behind the law enforcement effort?

You talked about community policing in terms of credibility and trust gap, overcoming that gap. Do you think that's a narrow gap or really wide gap?

A It's a narrow gap in some areas, and in some areas it's very wide. It's a chasm. But I think it's growing because each and every day you're finding out that law enforcement at some level, be it local, state, or federal, is doing something that people are saying, wait a minute.

And you know what I find so interesting, sir, is that in the past, it pretty much was people of color, black and brown, Asian. And now it's Caucasians who are saying -- they're saying, "Wait a minute. I'm beginning to have some problems with how our police are doing their job."

And this is from traveling over this country in the last three years in a whole bunch of little cities and medium and large cities. A lot of people are beginning to wonder really what law enforcement is doing and how they're going about doing their job.

And for sure in Southern California. I mean,

we've been bombarded with this problem for about the last 10 to 15 years. I won't say it's the hearts and minds -- I think wins the hearts and minds. I think it's a matter of really reestablishing who the officer is and what the officer is all about.

Assuming for a moment that part of this is the way the officer is doing his job that is out of whack -- could be the citizen's perception is out of whack -- but assuming for a minute that part of it is the officer's conduct, what would you say gives rise to that conduct?

Is it racism? Is it police culture? Is it the lack of training? Is it too much stress? How would you describe why there is this divergence between public expectation of what should be done and the reality or the perception of what's going on?

A Lack of leadership at the top of police agencies across this country. When you see something that you know is wrong and you've been trained like a majority, I would think, of most police leaders across this country, and you fail to stand up and say that's wrong, and I'm not going to be concerned about the liability cost for my jurisdiction. We're going to right the wrong. And people know of themselves that it's wrong and saying if I can see it's wrong, and I think I'm a reasonably intelligent person, why can't you Mr. or Ms. Police Leader see that that is

wrong and be willing to step up and be counted. Lack of leadership.

Because, see, if you have a proper leadership, then all these other things you've talked about fall into place. Comes back to leaders. It comes back to leaders standing up in 1991. Stands up to leaders in Houston standing up with some of the issues that were occurring down there.

Things that are occurring at the federal level and the state level and things like that, standing up and being counted and saying that's wrong and we're going to do something about it instead of saying, well, okay. It will go away. Blind eye, apathy of walking away and things like that. Lack of leadership.

Q How important is monitoring complaints against officers, being able to track that?

A Oh, I think it's huge. You have to do that to make sure that the officers are responding correctly. 31 years, I'm here to tell you, if you don't have a monitoring system, if you aren't investigating religiously citizen complaints, not to hang an officer, but to ensure that your department is doing things the correct way, it can cause a demise of an organization. Oh, yes, it's greatly needed --computerization in that particular area.

Then also I think another part of that is --

your mentioning stress, is a training module that needs to 1 be generated, established, that after a particular period of 2 time that officers go through maybe, you might say, a 3 debriefing of stress over time and to show them a different 4 5 way. The streets of urban American and many other 6 places, suburbia, also have become some real strong battle 7 grounds out there. Officers are not immune to what they see 8 over time. 9 Do you have confidence in the integrity of the 10 0 complaint process for your department? 11 Oh, yes. Oh, yes. The young man with me, he's 12 one of the investigators, a sergeant. I have sergeants in 13 And any complaint that comes in, I tell them 14 that unit. 15 their job while working directly for me is to ensure that we investigate that to the fullest. 16 17 And we're not going in there -- the charge isn't going in there with any kind of preconceived notion. 18 19 You're going in there with a neutral mind to ensure you get 20 all sides, and then we'll make the appropriate decision. 21 Q It's hard to ask you about other departments, 22 but would you say that, generally, citizens ought to have 23 confidence in that complaint process, or do you think it 24 varies significantly from community to community?

It varies significantly from community to

25

Α

community. But I think what needs to occur is that the citizens have to, when they know that a complaint should be generated and they receive a response back, they don't just accept that response, but check a little further.

1.4

I say to people make contact with your chief, with your sheriff or your commissioner, personally. They all have a phone, phone number. Give them a call. Go sit down with them and talk to them about that complaint after it's been resolved. And to make sure they understand that you take this seriously. This isn't just something that you just want to have looked into. Take that seriously.

Q I don't want to monopolize this. I just have two more questions, and one would be how you see community policing affecting the question or the problem of black-on-black crime.

A It can have an effect, but that's something that the black community's going to have to deal with. The churches, the schools, the little moms and pops who are in the community, the elders, the mothers of the church, the deaconess, as I was reared back in the south -- they're going to have to come to grips with that. You can't put that off on the police.

We've got some social issues that we're going to have to take and be cognizant of, and we're going to have to really decide which way we're going to go as an ethnicity

in this country.

With all the things that we see across this country, with the turning back of affirmative action, Proposition 209, California immigration reform, welfare reform, I think the black community's going to have to sit down at some point in their life and going to have to have some town hall meetings and stuff like that and really begin to come to grips with those things that affect our community, our village, and take the bull by the horns. And we can't put it off into community policing.

Q Well, then let me just ask you finally, what would you like to see this Commission recommend in terms of initiatives or reforms that might lessen racial tensions particularly as between police and community?

A I think for the police, a strong recommendation on leadership, leadership training. Just because a person becomes a police chief doesn't mean that they are the appropriate leader. Some people have just got it by default. Making sure there's appropriate leadership training. Making sure that --

Q Can I ask you where the leadership training ought to begin?

A First day the officer walks in. That's when you start making leaders, when the person's a follower. And you're beginning to identify those things and those officers

who are better attuned, moving up the organization and running an organization, first line, supervisors, management and command staff, that type of thing.

I think on top of that also is making sure that -- officers may not live in the community that they police, but they have a real strong understanding about what that community's about, and they're willing to take on the community concerns.

I think in communities that have different languages, that it should be a requirement that the officer at least begin to have an understanding of that language because if you understand the language, the culture, you're probably going to have much more affinity toward what that community's all about.

Then I think also is that there needs to be real examination of our officers after a particular time period. I look for officers who are caring, concerned, compassionate, responsible, and accountable -- those five things that come out of our code of ethics.

And after a particular period of time, five years or as the commission recommended, the Christopher Commission talking about us having a psychological reexamination to see if this person still should remain in this business or something else because this business is getting tougher and tougher.

Those are the kind of things that I think that you ought to really be looking at. And then really examine through an evaluation process, not anecdotally, but a real examination process, of what community policing is all about from its philosophy as well as its program points.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Thanks very much.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. REYNOSO:

Q Chief, I very much appreciate your thoughtful responses to the questioners thus far. I have a few follow-up questions on that.

Let me tell you preliminarily that since the Commission was established in 1957, perhaps the most single consistent area of review by the Commission has been police-community relations. And the Commission was established in the 1950's; so these issues obviously have been of a constant certain to this Commission.

I must say that until the last two or three years, when I've been receiving a great many phone calls on issues pertaining to civil rights and immigration, the calls that I receive most often, in terms of civil rights violation, had to do with police.

And so it continues clearly in the modern era to be of great concern in the relationship of community to

police and particularly, of course, of people of color to the police. So I just -- I'd like to follow up on some of the Commissioner Anderson's questions.

Why is it that here we are in 1996 and we continue to see many of the same problems that we saw when the Commission was first established -- a sense that there's a division between the police and the folk that they serve, particularly when the folk that they serve are members of racial or ethnic linguistic minorities?

There's something -- you know, there must be something practically institutional, if you will. And incidentally, it's interesting that it's not always a matter of simply a predominantly white police force not understanding the minority community. The Commission issued a report in Washington D.C. where presumably most of the officers are African Americans, and there was a problem there with the Latino community.

So it's, as you had indicated earlier, a lack of sort of understanding. But we see this year by year.

And it seems to me there's got to be something institutional about it to have the same problems recur decade after decade. You must have given this a lot of thought, both before you became an officer and in the 31 years since you've been an officer.

A No, I didn't give it any thought prior to

coming into this business. The thing I was trying to do is stay away from the cops in South Central Los Angeles. I came strictly because I had a wife and a couple kids, and I needed a job.

But it was then after I came in and some of the tenets that I learned under Dr. King, that if you are going to really look at institutions and change institutions, the best way to do them is from the inside out rather than from the outside in. And I came in as -- I'm a U.S.C. grad; so to be on U.C.L.A. on this campus is a little bit too much for me. But --

Q Save you some mileage to come here rather than go to S.C.

A It was really an eye-opener because what happens is that after you get inside, that culture can change the most jaded and the most optimistic person. It can change you to a point that it really does become us versus them if you allow it to happen.

- Q Okay. But what culture --
- A The police culture.
- Q What in the police culture formulates the third -- it seems to me, in everything I've read, that "us versus them," which is exactly the opposite of what you were testifying earlier needs to be the relationship --

A Sure.

Q -- as you said, the relationship ought to be one of the police being servants and through community policing, knowing who they need to serve.

And yet many writers, as you know, indeed point to that culture of -- some call it the bunker mentality of us versus them. And we see that quite often. Actually, we see it in Los Angeles when there's a sense that the present chief is not, quote, supporting his troops, end quote, well enough.

There's sort of a sense, you get particularly from the police person's union, that the chief is not being supportive enough of them because he's supporting the public. And somehow there seems to be that division. How does that come about? And I take it that's been around for some time.

A It comes about really -- really subtlety. It comes about because of a strong military discipline as a part of it. A real negative. 90 some percent of the officers are responding to negative situations.

Like a guy said in Philadelphia last week, he said, "No one calls me to their house to say 'I just wanted to tell you we're having a great day. Everything is going great.' He says, "Nobody does that." He says, "They call us out on problems."

And I think any profession where all you do is

. 5

deal day after day after day with negative situations, it's going to turn you from this starry-eyed person to a negative individual against "those people" and instead of realizing it's not like this.

Q Then institutionally how can a police force prevent these negative situations becoming so overwhelming that -- for example, a police officer who goes out is obviously also looking out for his or her safety and, two, very often sort of expecting the worst, because they so often run into the worst.

And yet when they run into individuals who are not predisposed to do the worst, there's a misunderstanding very often, and you end up with a good citizen who's never had problems with the police maybe being arrested or being pushed around a little bit. And then you have even a further breakdown of the relationship between that really superb citizen, in terms of never having problems with the police, and his or her feeling that the police is not out there to protect his or her interest.

So should there be something institutionally, I guess, is my question, once having analyzed that this is a problem in terms of how a young recruit goes from having a real sense of service to after a while viewing his fellow citizens suspiciously or expecting the worst, what should be done? Or what do you folks do in your department?

A What we try to do and what we preach is more communication, more information. And if something happens, is that you will tell the citizen in full scope and breath as to what has occurred, why it occurred, and what you did and what you didn't do.

Q I don't recall the details, but a few years ago here in Los Angeles, and just for a very short time, there was a very active -- they call them community relations unit. And one of the things they did was to go out to talk to groups.

And I remember reading a newspaper report by an officer saying something like the following: "Gee, it's such a pleasure to go out and talk to a group that's supportive of what we're doing, interested in what we're doing, and considers what we're doing important."

(A brief interruption.)

Q BY MR. REYNOSO: I remember thinking to myself if more officers had that sort of encounter so that not every encounter or 99 percent of the encounters would be negative, maybe that -- if that could be institutionalized in the experience of every officer, not just the community relations officers, I thought maybe that might be something that could be effectively used to try to get away from whatever you folks have analyzed as the step by steps by which an officer after five or ten years ends up with a "we

versus us" mentality rather than "I'm hear to serve" .
mentality.

A Sure. That can occur. But you don't call the police out just on the positives. It's overwhelmingly negative. You call us only when you have a problem. You don't call us at any other time. And what happens is that it takes a lot of the "attaboys" to do away from the, ah, you know, whatever's.

And if a person is predisposed to believe that this neighborhood or this community is going to do a certain thing, then that's what the person is going to believe.

See, there's one thing that's left out of this equation that really -- and I guess we'll go back to the recommendation to you, sir, is really and an emphasis on education, formal education for police officers across this country.

A greater majority of officers today are only working the job, and they do not avail themselves of formal education on a college campus, which is one of the things that's so interesting about Inglewood. Is that that city, sergeant and above, will pay 100 percent of tuition and books for anyone who wants to go to any public institutions, including U.C.L.A., and 80 percent tuition and books if a person wants to go to a private institution.

Formal education, I believe, is a great part of

this answer as to how we get a better understanding between 1 the police and the public. 2 Is it your experience, does an officer with a 3 higher degree of formal education, does that officer become 4 more resistant to the "we versus them" mentality, if you 5 will? 6 7 I think so. But then I think also the officer Α is not so subject to become a robot, automaton, but a 8 thinker. And I believe that if you think things through, 9 you can come out with a proper response, whether he's being 10 told to do something and to go about doing it like you've 11 12 always done it. I describe myself as an operational optimist, 13 0 14 and I am on most things. But I must tell you that I -- so 15 often when public officials or private officials express 16 surprise, it doesn't surprise me. The Rodney King incident 17 didn't surprise me at all. The recent army incident of 18 sexual abuse didn't surprise me at all. The Texaco incident 19 didn't surprise me at all, I'm sorry to say. I quess I've 20 been around long enough to see so many of those incidents 21 that it doesn't surprise me. I always hope for better. 22 But so I want to shift just for a few minutes 23 to the newer, but in some ways very similar issue having to 24 do with integrating females into the police force. 25 Again, in Los Angeles, as you know, there have

been some studies made that indicate that the police department is having a hard time integrating females into the police force. And you mentioned in the very first part of your testimony that it didn't surprise you.

Why does it not surprise you that the L.A. -
I'll just speak about L.A. because that's what I read

about -- the L.A.P.D.'s having a hard time integrating

females into the police force?

A I don't know about L.A., but I can talk in general.

Q All right. Sure. That would be more helpful.

A The people who are doing selecting, the people who are doing the questioning, the people who are predominately part of the assessment center process, whatever you name it, are men. I think if you change that around and you had an equal distribution of men and women, you'll have a much more positive response, I think, across this country.

One of the things we're trying to do in our department is that persons in charge of our personnel hiring is one of our women sergeants. The person in charge of our training is a woman sergeant, to give a different prospective on things.

Now, that does not mean automatically, but I think it sends a different message that we are not willing

to do business like we've always done business. I think when you have people on there who are different from the folks you've always had on there, you bring a different outlook. You bring a different prospective onto what questions are being asked. Certainly things that were being said before will not be said at this particular point because of a great representation of diversity of gender wise.

Q I've read it is your experience that in many situations female officers are more effective than male officers because they're not quite as confrontational; that is, they seem to be able to make an arrest without having to use force and that sort of thing. Or is it your experience that they -- that is pretty --

A I think so. I think so. And if I had my druthers, I would hire a greater number more of women officers than I would of men officers because of the less number of citizen complaints, the less confrontations, the less number of challenges that you have out there in the field.

Q Assuming that any court challenges to Prop. 209 are not successful, what effect is that going to have, do you think, on the ability of police forces like yours to bring in more women into the police force? Do you think that the process of integration has proceeded so far that it

will continue, or do you think there will be some lessening of those efforts if you can't overtly go out and say, you know, we need to recruit more women?

A I think it's going to all come back to the leadership qualities of the persons you have in those positions. Those people, if they are true leaders, they're going to figure out ways, and I'm talking legitimate ways, to still have a diverse community, a diverse force, diverse representation.

Q Finally, let me ask you about the leadership.

You emphasized several times, and it is quite understandable that the leadership sets the tone. And indeed that was your response to any question on integrating on the basis of gender. The workforce, the same thing, I assume, would apply for race, ethnicity, language, and so on.

But there is a culture, as you indicated, in many police forces, maybe all of m, and sometimes -- and Commissioner Anderson was asking about management relations. I may be wrong, but I think I see that quite often, indeed, in the relationship that top management has with union representation quite often.

And we have seen sometimes efforts by top
management to do more integrating on the basis of gender or
ethnicity or race. And we certainly have seen efforts on
the part of top management to do more community policing.

And yet sometimes we see resistance, particularly by the organizations of police officers. That makes it very difficult, it seems to me, to have the leader be as effective as one would hope because there's that tension.

So I just -- I guess I'm asking you to think a little bit more about whether leadership will always quite get you to where you've indicated we need to get because you do have those elements of resistance. And how do you overcome those elements of resistance?

A I look upon leadership really as a process of seeds ministry, is that you are throwing out seeds. And some of those seeds are going to land in the right places, and some of them are going to land in the wrong places. But over time --

Q This sounds biblical.

A -- it's going to -- it will give its increase with the watering and, you know, the fertilizing it's going to give it. And it's not going to be -- maybe you'll get a chance to see it, but it will occur over time.

And so what you have to be, I believe, is steady about your job. You have to recognize who you are and why you are in this position. And it wasn't because of just something that you found yourself as a leader of this organization.

You got to take your best shot, when you can,

of recognizing you're only going to probably be here a short 1 time period -- probably a chief of police three to four 2 years, which means I'm on the outside now going on the other 3 side -- and you got to do what should be done. And you have 4 to recognize what's right, I think, an internal sense of 5 what's right, and take your best shot and do it. And the 6 heck with those people out there who don't believe in what 7 you're doing. 8 The naysayers. 9 0 That is right. 10 Α And your message to me is that this will take 11 0

- Q And your message to me is that this will take time, but it won't get better unless you continue this leadership.
  - A That's correct.
- 15 MR. REYNOSO: Okay.
- 16 | Counsel, any further questions?
- MR. ANDERSON: I have no further questions.
- 18 MR. REYNOSO: Counsel, any further questions?
- 19 MR. HAILES: I have no further questions.
- 20 MR. REYNOSO: Well, thank you very much for coming.
  21 Again, I'm sorry that we have a complicated process of
- 22 having hearings and all that, but this actually completes
- 23 our Los Angeles hearing, and we're very thankful for your
- 24 | testimony.

25

12

13

14

As I indicated at the beginning of my

questioning, this is one of the most troublesome areas with 1 which this Commission has struggled since 1957. 2 sure we'll continue to struggle with it. 3 But the testimony that you've given to us and 4 the testimony we have previously, I think, will provide us 5 the opportunity to come forward with some very positive 6 recommendations to Congress and to the President and, 7 through our reports, I think to the country as a whole. 8 So I want to thank you very much for coming 9 10 this afternoon. I'd just like to say also in ending, as THE WITNESS: 11 12 long as you have humans, you're going to always have the problems that we are having. But I think it's a matter of 13 quiding those humans to get the results that you want. 14 MR. REYNOSO: Very good. Thank you so much. 15 (A recess was taken.) 16 Could the public session please come to 17 MR. REYNOSO: I understand that in the federal register we 18 order. 19 indicated there would be a public session at 4:00 p.m. has been our practice to take names of those people who hope 20 21 to testify and then hear as many as can be heard during the 22 time that has been allotted for the public session. 23 It is my understanding that no witnesses have

presented themselves to testify at this public session.

Unless I hear otherwise from the staff present, and I do not

24

25

1	hear otherwise, I would like to call this session to an end,
2	adjourn the session, both the session for the witnesses
3	which we already had, and now this public session.
4	Thank you very much.
5	
6	(Ending time: 4:04 p.m.)
7	
8	* * *
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	·
14	
15	•
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA ) ) ss.
2	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )
3	
4	I, LYNN ZINK, CSR No. 9466, a Certified
5	Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, do
6	hereby certify:
7	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before
8	me at the time and place therein set forth, at which
9	time the witness was placed under oath;
10	That the testimony of the witness and all
11	objections made at the time of the examination were
12	recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter
13	transcribed;
14	That the foregoing transcript is a true and
15	correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.
16	I further certify that I am neither counsel for
17	nor related to any party to said action nor in any way
18	interested in the outcome thereof.
19	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name
20	this <u>18th</u> day of <u>November</u> , 1996.
21	
22	$\varphi$ $\varphi$
23	Jynn Juk
24	LYNN ØINK, CSR)No. 9466 State of California