A NEW LAW ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGE: LIMITING USE OF FORCE TO SOLELY NONLETHAL WEAPONS

JOURNAL ARTICLE

BY

MICHAEL J. BOSTIC

COMMAND COLLEGE XVII

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

JANUARY 1994

17-0335

This Command College Independent Study Project is a FUTURES study of a particular emerging issue in law enforcement. Its purpose is NOT to predict the future, but rather to project a number of possible scenarios for strategic planning consideration.

Defining the future differs from analyzing the past because the future has not yet happened. In this project, useful alternatives have been formulated systematically so that the planner can respond to a range of possible future environments.

Managing the future means influencing the future--creating it, constraining it, adapting to it. A futures study points the way.

The views and conclusions expressed in the Command College project are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).

INTRODUCTION

In the late 1980's, the author began research into nonlethal weapon technologies for law enforcement as a result of a college project. For the purposes of this paper, a nonlethal weapon is a weapon that can be used to replace a firearm for police officers. This weapon must work 100% of the time in stopping a suspect from any type of physical attack, when the weapon is accurately applied to the suspect. It must also not cause any lasting medical or physiological damage to suspects or officers. That project created a personal drive within the author to explore and become intimately involved in the development of future nonlethal technology for law enforcement. The author has kept this personal commitment in spite of government bureaucracies and red tape in the military that has made access to data and available research next to impossible. The author formed a committee of some the top scientists in the aerospace and military development fields to begin a dialogue about collective and unclassified knowledge in the area of potential or existing nonlethal technologies for law enforcement. Those meetings and dialogues continue and were given greater emphasis by the Los Angeles Police Department as part of the author's regular responsibilities as a result the infamous March 3, 1991 incident involving the videotaped use of force by Los Angeles Police Officers on Rodney King, after a vehicular pursuit. The Rodney King arrest changed the future focus of law enforcement in the United States forever.

Early research into nonlethal and less-than-lethal technologies was disappointing. Since the United States was formed in 1776, over two hundred years of the development of this nation has left police, for the most part, equipped with same basic tools: some form of striking instrument and a gun.1 The only true research efforts in the area of law enforcement use of force has been on the development of various use of force scales. These have been academic efforts to depict reasonable use of force by officers. That debate continues today, and focuses almost exclusively on guns, striking devices and physical contact.2 The only notable exceptions in two hundred years are various forms of chemical agents and electrical stunning devices.3

Throughout the research efforts regarding nonlethal technology, the movie Star Trek and the Star Trek fazer weapon has been the most discussed in literature and general conversations with scientists in the field of weapons. It is difficult to identify those actually working on any such weapon.

> ...technology is a big part of the television show's allure...where science and engineering have greatly improved the human condition. But, do we really have to wait until the 24th century...? Surprisingly, much of the futuristic equipment...might arrive in our lifetime.4

As the author explored the writings about "Star Trek" technology, not a single article touched on the "Star Trek" fazer. With the world's focus for so many decades on weapons of destruction, in seems that the best one can hope for immediately is sprays, stun devices and electronic "screaming devices" in the field of self defense.5

On April 1, 1991, the author was assigned by former Chief of Police Daryl F. Gates to search the world for a better way to train and develop officers in self defense. That charge included the search for current technologies that could be applied to use of force situations and reduce injuries to suspects and officers. The

author was not alone in this search. Federal, state and most local agencies were also stung by the public backlash to the King incident. Many people were looking for new answers to the old question of how police officers can humanely take the momentarily "insane" into custody.

The current state of technology is difficult to accurately access because most of what is written on weapon technology is classified. The literature research, from the accounts of scientists in the field, is dramatically limited by the processes that moves information from the realm of classified material.6 The common estimates are that available literature is at least ten years behind technology. It is so limited, no one could accurately access state of the art in any weapons field.7 Most weapons research is in "black projects". Nonlethal technology is also hidden in this area. Scientists explain that if nonlethal data was available, information could easily be applied to new lethal technologies that most governments will not release. Thus, the "catch 22" makes research for broad based information clearly impossible for those without proper clearances.8 The next obstacle for those with proper clearance is the "need to know" theory of access to classified information. This layer further blurs the picture of other technologies that might apply to a field of research.9 The current systems make the possibility of immediate development of a nonlethal weapon through unclassified research difficult. However, according to most experts in the field of aerospace and military technology, through personal interviews and group dialogue, such weapons may already exist or will be developed in the next five to ten years.

The author had lengthy discussions with scientists of Motorola Corporation and with the biomedical research teams of General Motors Corporation during the past two years. Within the

discussions, it was painfully clear that some technologies may already exist. However, no one was able or willing to discuss or provide information that could lead to obtaining these technologies. Each of these scientists encouraged the author to continue the search; particularly in the area of electromagnetics. Research indicates current technologies with potential for nonlethal applications in law enforcement include manipulative mechanical devices, electromagnetic devices, various gases, chemical injections, and optical devices. Manipulative mechanical devices include certain types of projectiles that are less-than-lethal and mechanical devices for immobilizing a suspect. Electromagnetic devices include such things as the current tazers and stunguns used today.10 Moreover, many experiments continue with electromagnetic devices that interrupt brain wave patterns. These devices alter one's state of mind and may render humans unconscious without long term damage to the human body. New tear gases are being developed that are more effective on persons under the influence of drugs and alcohol, as well as people with mental problems. Experiments continue at the national level, through the National Institute of Justice, with chemical injections from dart guns. Finally, many experiments continue with various optical devices that can alter moods and control behavior of violent individuals. The research is difficult to obtain, but many discuss some progress and success.

The purpose of this futures article is to look into the future and to see how law enforcement can prepare for the future application of these technologies, not just from the routine operation considerations. The implications of truly nonlethal technologies are staggering.

Socially, human beings have lived in conflict since the beginning of time. The murders during war are classified as a necessity of future peace. Yet, the aftermath of every war of

human history is replete with the continued destruction of the participants. Through suicide and psychological responses to the moral realities of taking human, life regardless of its noble cause, thousands still suffer. Nonlethal devices could reverse this wanton destruction forever. The use of deadly force in law enforcement creates no less a dilemma and today is far less acceptable in the minds of the public.

Technologically, weapons of destruction could become obsolete, regardless how difficult that goal may become. Most human beings would celebrate the day of obsolescence, and technology would be changed forever.

Economically, nonlethal devices would dramatically change the focus of economies and provide money to address many of the world's greater needs. In police work alone, billions of dollars will be saved in lawsuits, medical costs, and pension benefits throughout the United States.

Environmentally, the change from lethal to nonlethal technologies would greatly impact pollution caused by the use and waste of our many different types explosive devices used today. The basic handgun and all types of deadly weapons create pollution that is still mostly uncontrolled. Disposal of nuclear waste is a crisis by most standards today. The nonlethal technologies discussed to date do not seem to have the long range environmental implications.

Politically, nonlethal weapons could potentially change the course of human events in law enforcement today, but not without dilemma and struggles. Nonlethal weapons and their development are the moral responsibility of police leaders today. Without that focus, another two hundred years will pass in law enforcement and officers will still be carrying a stick and a gun. Yet, as law enforcement develops the nonlethal weapons of tomorrow, a greater challenge will arise. As nonlethal technology is introduced, police officers will begin to use it. As success of the devices become

routine, the community will call for the removal of lethal weapons. Simultaneously, as police struggle with this community demand, the criminal element will remain armed with the latest in deadly weapons. Law enforcement, as it begins the process of taking away lethal weapons, will be requiring officers to face deadly force with nonlethal force. The moral outrage for police will become a major issue for police administrators. The backlash of many police officers could be monumental.

Nonlethal technology is coming. One can choose to ignore it and wait for it to be forced upon police officers without adequate preparation and research. Visionary police administrators can pioneer the change.

FUTURES STUDY

As research began, an issue evolved regarding how law enforcement will prepare for such a change. Regardless of the form that nonlethal technology takes, the greater challenge will be preparing for its future. Therefore, the following question for a futures study: WHAT IMPACT WILL LIMITING USE OF FORCE TO SOLELY NONLETHAL WEAPONS HAVE ON MAJOR CITY LAW ENFORCEMENT BY 2002 A.D.?

After formulating the issue question for the future study, a group of six law enforcement managers, attending the California Peace Officers Standards and Training Command College, assisted the author, by group discussion, in the development of three sub-issues derived directly from the issue question:

WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACT ON POLICE OFFICER RETENTION?

WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACT ON POLICE OFFICER RECRUITMENT?

WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACT ON POLICE OFFICER TRAINING?

MAJOR FINDINGS

As one looks at this topic from the standpoint of futures

research, one technique used to study potential futures is the nominal group technique. The author chose a group representing all levels of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), scientists and political staffs from Los Angeles to discuss potential futures. For the purposes of the future study, a nominal group technique was used. The group identified the top ten trends and events.

The same group conducted a Modified Conventional Delphi process to forecast the future of the trends and events. The group was asked to numerically forecast the future of each trend and event based on a scale that aided in providing uniformity in the interpretive results. The forecasts included five year and ten year projections. The group also projected, numerically, where they believed the trend or event was five years ago. Finally, the group went back to private analysis and was given the opportunity to give new numerical values to each forecast for the trends and events.

TRENDS

The top ten trends selected by the group were:

1. Pressure on local government to purchase and use nonlethal weapons regardless of fiscal impact.
2. Efforts to convince officers of their personal safety while using nonlethal weapons.
3. Improved field tactics training of officers and daily use impact on use of force.
4. Movement toward hiring and training officers with human empathy and the "gunfighter" mold.
5. Number of people from the community applying for law enforcement jobs.
6. Criminal Justice System efforts to rehabilitate as opposed to jail and house convicts.
7. Movement towards "problem oriented policing" and away from

"arrest and jail" mode.
8. The patrol function becomes more automated for quicker response and greater efficiency in daily tasks.
9. Level of protection of body armor.
10. Number of crimes of violence on persons in ratio to population.

EVENTS

The group selected the following as the top ten events:

1. Demonstration of a totally nonlethal weapon.
2. A controversial officer-involved shooting focusing political and media attention on nonlethal weapon alternatives.
3. A police department adopts a nonlethal weapon.
4. First successful use of a totally nonlethal weapon.
5. The nonlethal weapon fails to stop a suspect after police application.
6. A police union files suit to stop deployment of a nonlethal weapon.
7. A police officer uses the nonlethal weapon to abuse a suspect.
8. A department develops a new use of force policy requiring use of the nonlethal weapon prior to deadly force application.
9. A long term negative medical affect of the nonlethal weapon is discovered.
10. An officer's misuse of the nonlethal weapon leads to attempts to "politically" ban the use of it.

CROSS-IMPACT ANALYSIS

The group next reached consensus regarding the impact each of the events would have on both the events and trends based on a percentage of impact either positive or negative. The author took this group consensus and then made final decisions about impacts.

At this point, a computer program was used to develop alternative futures based upon the generated trends and events (ten

each). The following data was entered to provide tables from which to develop alternative futures:

*Event-to-event cross-impact matrix results

*Event-to-trend cross-impact matrix results

*Cumulative event probability for ten events

*Median forecasts of ten trends

The program compiled and correlated the sets of input data and generated 100 iterations or alternative futures.11 The one chosen is the one believed to be the most likely to occur. The purpose of this scenario is to give the reader a glimpse of a potential future and allow strategic planning to be based on futures research rather than pure hunch.

FUTURE SCENARIO

In 1993, the Carefree City Police Department, located in Southern California, continued to experienced unprecedented population growth. The city of four million was made up of cultural communities representing all major world countries and many new emigrees are first generation. The city enjoyed a rich cultural diversity. However, 1993 has provided policing problems unprecedented in the city's two hundred year history. Marked by the largest civil disturbance of any major city in the United States in this century, Carefree continues to struggle with cultural clashes and civil disturbances that had polarized many of the minority communities and the local police precincts. Several highly publicized cases involving police use of force, viewed as excessive and sometimes criminal, continued to haunt police efforts to establish community based policing programs.

Law enforcement nationally continued to struggle with the use of force issue because of the antiquated systems of self defense for police officers and the lack of technological advances in the area of less-than-lethal and nonlethal alternatives to physical

force. The budget deficit of the city hampered any research and development for such technology, a pattern that was consistent throughout law enforcement nationally. Police in Carefree used the basic weapons of police that are at least a century old: a gun and baton.

The aerospace and military industries faltered and downsize as a result of the reduction in military budgets. These industries struggled to find new direction in civil applications of technology, however, funding for research and development lagged. Several small companies looked into law enforcement technology applications. The single largest problem of technology transfer from military to civilian industries remained the cold war systems of "black projects" that keep much of the needed research data in classified documents. This required industries to reconstruct millions of dollars and years of research that has already been completed. This remained the hurdle for new technology transfer to police work in 1994. The large aerospace industrial developers began efforts to create bureaucratic changes in government storage and classification of research.

In 1993, crimes of violence out-paced population growth. Carefree Police attributed the rise in violence to gang and street narcotic activity. The designer drug manufacturers made great strides in meeting the insatiable demand of the drug using public. Police and the criminal justice system remained at a loss to effectively reduce the problems of drug use, sales, and of gangs and violence.

Carefree Police Department began a program to develop better field tactics for its officers. The first pilot test of the new tactics were favorably rated by the officers involved. Also, the Department redesigned the entry level testing and oral interview process to identify police candidates with superior social and human interaction skills. This change was not received well by existing police officers and seen as a dramatic lowering of hiring

standards. The police union attempted to stop the change through court action but was flatly rejected during early court hearings. The new practices were put in place during November, 1993.

With the combination of the media coverage of the many controversial use of force situations and the court battle over hiring standards, Carefree Police saw a decline of applications for police careers. It was becoming critical in minority and female classes, and it strained the Department's efforts to meet its affirmative action goals.

The criminal justice systems was again overwhelmed in 1993, and Carefree saw a large increase in early release and halfway house confinements of previously incarcerated felons. The system struggled in 1993 to find alternatives to overcrowded jails and lack of support services in parole and probation programs.

The technology advances for automated dispatch systems and report writing systems began to improve police response in 1993. These same advances saw some improved research and development of experimental body armor for police protection with new prototypes on the horizon.

In 1994, The City of Carefree continued with moderate increase in violent crime that out-paced population growth. But, the improvement was negated by the increasing number of calls for service and no new personnel increases for the police department. The criminal justice system struggled with overcrowding and nothing of note was offered to effectively resolve the problem.

In February, 1994, Blaster Industries (BI) demonstrated a new, handheld electromagnetic device that stunned humans and created a state of instant unconsciousness. The United States Department of Justice withheld public use of the weapon for further research to ensure public safety based on minimal research done by Blaster Industries regarding long term affects for humans. The device worked by slowing brain wave activity and many civil rights and environmental groups protested the intrusion on the mind of any

human being.

In Carefree, the minority communities continued to struggle with what they perceive as a more concentrated use of force by police in their communities. News reports of the new device and the restrictions on its use by police was seen as racially motivated and an institutional attempt to keep minorities oppressed by excessive use of force. The protests led to several civil unrest situations and clashes with police during 1994.

Carefree Police continued hiring and training of new personnel, emphasizing community based policing efforts and human relations skills. Police application rates improved in 1994 as the media recognized the Department's efforts to recruit community oriented police officers. The training efforts in new tactics of the day, showed improvement for field operations and some reduction in police use of force situations was noted. Emphasis on nonlethal alternatives to physical force continued in training as officers are kept informed on the development and application of potential future technologies such as the Blaster Industries Brain Sleeper (BIBS). Several new prototypes of body armor were tested in police operations by Carefree P.D. In December, 1994 a national controversy developed over an firearm killing of a 13 year old minority in Carefree who attacked police officers with a pocket knife. The incident spark days of protest in the minority communities. The protests were marred by sporadic crowd violence and clashes with squads of helmet-clad police. This further fueled that debate over perceived federal government "foot dragging" on the BIBS device.

In 1995, the often violent protests of police use of force continued in Carefree. Each new violent demonstration led to countercharges of police brutality and further violent demonstrations. The pressure continued on local, state and federal governments to release the new technology for nonlethal weapons. Individual violent crime significantly declined in 1994 and the

only explanation seemed to be a community focus on unity over the police use of force issues.

In 1995, Carefree saw an increased in revenues for the first time since 1990. With the current focus on policing and crime, the city funnelled new life into the hiring and training of police. The community perceived this as effort to hire police more empathic to community concerns and more representative of the cultural mix of Carefree. The training programs had paid off in better field tactics and better protective body armor was purchased for police. The Department trained and prepared for the eventual implementation of nonlethal weapons in deadly force situations. The community based policing efforts began to gel into successful eradication of community problems and less emphasis on arresting every law violator by police.

In 1996, Carefree P.D. became the first police agency in the country to gain temporary approval to test the BIBS device in actual field tests. The experiment was closely controlled and monitored by the U.S. Department of Justice. Because of this caution and the limited use by a few officers, the community continued its protests of what they perceived as unnecessary delay in full implementation. The City Council studied ways to finance purchase of the device for $4,000 per unit. It represented an almost insurmountable cost for full implementation of the device. The community demanded implementation at any cost.

Officers were initially skeptical of the new device, feeling that political influence would cause implementation before the weapon was properly tested. Officers protested its use until their safety was guaranteed, considering there were no second chances in deadly force situations. Training and updates on the device and the pilot project were stepped up in 1996 as the Department responds to the concerns of its personnel.

Carefree continued hiring new police officers and increasing the size of the Department. During 1996 the Department experienced

a dramatic decrease in applications for police jobs. This was attributed to renewed suspicion of police from minority communities. Police officials also believe that the new nonlethal device had created the same moral dilemma of meeting deadly force with only nonlethal force for people considering a career in law enforcement at the time.

In 1996, new body armor was obtained for police in an effort to head off criticism of the new weapon technology. The new armor covered more body mass, was lighter and had increased stopping power. Police officers were enthusiastic in the use of the armor.

A disturbing leap in crimes of violence shook the foundation of the entire use of force issue for police. Police protests focused on the dramatic rise in violent crime as a signal that requiring nonlethal use of force put police at a great psychological disadvantage and potentially a great threat of personal risk. Issues between police and the community flared into protests in 1996.

In 1997, a Carefree P.D. officer used the new device on a jailed prisoner, who was merely using verbal threats to him from within a jail cell. A closed circuit monitor was being observed by a supervisor and a video tape was obtained for the internal investigation. During the investigation, a police officer released the video to the media thinking it would at least delay the implementation of the new weapon. The release initially caused an adverse reaction. However, the effort backfired. Civil rights groups acknowledged the intolerance of abusive use but worked on the angle of the minimal damage that resulted from this type of "force" abuse. Efforts to fully implement the weapons continued to increase from the community and the City Council desperately pushed for ways to finance the implementation. The test pilot continued with no adverse results.

Dramatically, in December, 1997, Carefree P.D. adopted the new weapon and required it use prior to deadly force. Despite great

advances in tactics and body armor that has dramatically reduced confrontations and injuries to officers and suspects, police officers were gravely concerned and protested. Training continues and the police protests remained professional. The justice system was used in attempts to stop deployment.

In 1998, the Carefree community supported implementation of the new weapon. But suspicion prevailed. Many communities believe that the weapon was held back unnecessarily because police preferred guns. However, the focus turned positive as the year progressed and injuries and deaths to citizens and police dropped dramatically in the first year of full implementation. The Department training programs continue in full swing. The training had paid great dividends in better field tactics and lessened fears of the new weapon and policy.

The community reaction to new technology and reduced use of force situations created a significant increase in the number of applicants for police careers.

On the down side, violent crime skyrocketed in 1998. The growing street violence centered on gang violence. Gang activity began to cross all economic and social scales and has permeated even the most quiet of communities.

In January, 1999, a second officer uses the weapon on a jailed prisoner to let him know "who is in charge." The outrage in the community and media force politicians that represent minority communities to push for banning the weapon. However, in a key victory for the Chief, in rare coalition with civil rights groups, the merits of reduced injuries and use of force quells the attempt to ban the BIBS device. In the months after that event, the coalition gained community support for the new weapon and safeguards that the Chief installed for reporting and reviewing each use.

The Police Department worked hard in its continuing effort to recruit officers that represent the best of community based

policing skills. The unauthorized use of the weapon and the continued controversy had a devastating effect on the number of people that applied for the Department in 1999.

Technology in the body armor field made strides in 1999 with the development of clothing weighted material that could stop small caliber bullets. This technology began to improve the officers' feeling of safety, despite the loss of deadly force in deadly force situations. The City of Carefree was progressive in spending the money it took to equip its officers with all new advances in body armor.

In the year 2000, community support for the Department vastly improved as a result of community based policing efforts and the successful reduction of controversial uses of force. Use of physical force was down 72% after the new weapon was fully deployed. Field tactics greatly improved, as did police confidence in the new technology.

In 2000, a highly sophisticated computer dispatching and mobile phone system dramatically improved the response time of police in Carefree. The same year violent crime reduced significantly. Police attributed response time and the new weapon for the reduction in violent crime, despite the criminal justice system's continued efforts to rehabilitate criminals released from jails.

In 2000, the Chief instituted a new policy that eliminates the hand gun from field officers and only allowed deployment to special weapons and tactics team. Despite years of training and preparation, the protest was loud and long by police, culminating in a law suit. However, public sentiment and the successful record of the BIBS device quickly led to a court ruling in favor of the Chief. Many believe this issue also affected the number of people applying for police careers.

In 2001, several trends of the previous five years took a slight downturn. The community support continued to improve. Officers became accustom to the new policy on deadly weapons.

Officer safety issues were lessened after the new weapon proved very reliable. Police applicants began to increase in numbers as the initial hysteria about the hand guns was overcome. Violent crime continued to improve for a two year period. 2001 became a year of solidarity and calm on most fronts in Carefree. In 2002, Carefree experienced hiring freezes for all city employees and police applications plummeted. Although support for the Police Department had reached a several year high, the economic crunch brought new frustration to the application of new technology advances to the City. The budget crises caused the City to forestall the purchase of new BIBS device with greater technological advances and effectiveness. The City disregarded the poor repair of the old units.

In May, 2002, an officer was killed because the BIBS device did not work on a suspect with a gun. The fury of protest lasted beyond the revelation that poor repair was the cause and not the weapon itself. After months of training, meeting and discussions, the City bought the state-of-the-art models. One new advance in the body armor field, a clothing-weight suit, was developed that could stop most bullets. This technology was field tested by police as uniform material and the police focus shifted to obtaining these items for 2003.

OVERVIEW

Futures research cannot accurately forecast the future regardless of the techniques used, or the expertise of the researcher. However, police leaders would be foolish to dismiss the implications that futures research provides. Clearly, from the scenario provided, the wide range of alternative futures has an infinite number of possibilities and outcomes that no one could ever anticipate. Since the beginning of man, future prediction has been in the imagination of everyone. Unfortunately, one does not

always follow "hunches" or intuition about our future. Futures research helps to guide and document that intuition in a form that all good leaders can one day develop and refine on a daily basis.

In police careers, we too often become slaves to the chaos, crisis and carnage of our daily activities. We seldom stop to look forward and find long range solutions to seemingly insurmountable issues.

In the scenario provided, it is hoped that one would realize the common threads that could be controlled by strategic planning. A department cannot have a single future planning effort and then wait for it to happen. As leaders, the ultimate responsibility is vision and vision is made up of dreams and values. Those dreams and values of an entire organization can be captured in futures research if only the commitment is made.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

As one returns to the issue and sub-issues of this futures study, the events and trends forecasted have differing impacts that require thought about the police issues facing a major police agency. For this consideration of policy, the author selected his own agency, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD).

Focusing on the sub-issue of training, the scenario clearly point out the impact of preparation versus the lack of preparation. From a policy standpoint, the LAPD must unequivocally develop a future strategy that focuses on the development of training and information systems to implement any new nonlethal technology. As the future scenario points out, preparation can focus efforts on those situations the LAPD know will occur, positive or negative, and prepare now for the actions to deal with the events and trends forecasted. The LAPD knows it will have controversial uses of force with any new device and preparation for that happening can deal with the issue head-on rather than reactionary and defensive.

The LAPD can also take great advantage of positive events and trends for both retention and hiring, the other two sub-issues this study addresses.

If the LAPD commits in strategic planning to develop training and information programs for nonlethal weapons application, the retention issue will be lessened. Current officers can be brought into the process of implementation to ally their fears that a non-lethal weapon places them in any danger.

Moreover, the sub-issue of recruitment is directly impacted by the feelings of current personnel at the time of those recruiting efforts. If the LAPD has prepared its current employees, this will not be a significant deterrent to hiring. However, The LAPD must also place in it's strategic planning efforts to educate and prepare the public at large about potential nonlethal technologies.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

To provide adequate summary to the issue of nonlethal weapons, one must first revisit the issue question: What impact will limiting use of force to solely nonlethal weapons have on major city law enforcement by 2002 A.D.? The focus of this futures study has been on the Los Angeles Police Department.

One major concern noted in this futures study was the moral dilemma that police officers must face when nonlethal weapons replace deadly weapons as standard equipment. When this occurs, police officers will be asked to use nonlethal weapons against a suspect who will most often be using deadly weapons. As police officers ponder this issue, police managers will prepare to help officers work through the dilemma. The ultimate goal of law enforcement is to enforce the law with the minimal force necessary at all times. This goal will overcome the initial dilemma through training and education.

Another problem for future management of the police use of

force issues, is the current heightened awareness of the community by the media. Since the King Affair, the entire nation has had law enforcement under watchful eye, with similar events being questioned throughout the country. The challenge for management will be to ensure proper and accurate reporting of information to the community through all forms of media. Law enforcement managers will have to anticipate the many future "King" affairs that will happen as long as police officers are recruited from the human race. Managers will have to swiftly react to these incidents with candor, discipline, training and research on all use of force alternatives. Focusing on the sub-issue questions provides a broader overview to the challenge for police executives.

The impact of nonlethal technology on the retention of current officers will be directly proportionate to the preparations made by the LAPD prior to any testing and implementation of nonlethal technology. The process must be methodical and comprehensive. It must include police officers who may eventually use the weapons, in the evaluation and testing process. As weapons are tested, managers must resist powerful forces internally and externally, to implement the weapons before adequate testing and training are complete. If current officers ultimately assist in development of the device, this will lessen the impact on slowed applications to police jobs. This is true because a significant portion of police applicants are recruited by existing personnel. As progress is made on testing, evaluation and implementation, a carefully crafted public awareness program will also lessen the fears and concerns of applicants in the general public.

The sub-issue of training will be the cornerstone of strategic and transitional management plans. The training programs must include technology evaluation and testing progress reports; field testing evaluation reports; policy change issues; implementation plan; and ongoing evaluation process updates. Training must be a methodical and comprehensive plan to effectively contain the

emotional and initial ethical questions nonlethal technology represents. As all phases of this program are developed, all levels of the organization must be included. Anything less will spell disaster.

Included in the training and evaluation process will be the critical mass identified earlier. As each member of the critical mass is identified and focused on the long range effort that nonlethal technology represents, lack of information will derail the interest of these individuals over time. It is critical that each receives the same type of comprehensive updates scheduled for the officers and the public. Moreover, those updates must be timely to prevent to inherent jealousies that exist among those in positions of power throughout our society.

Tremendous community tension exists today regarding the issue of police use of force. As violence continues to grow in our cities, police officers are becoming daily targets. The injuries and deaths of police seem to go unchecked. Nonlethal technology focus will also provide benefits in improved training in tactics. This will be the outgrowth of preparation for nonlethal weapons. Moreover, the focus on these weapons, and the need to improve the safety of police officers, can cause a systematic improvement in equipment. Bullet resistant clothing and helmets are standard equipment in the LAPD. A focus on safety will drive improvement in these items as well. Nonlethal weapons represent the ultimate form of protection for police officers because the current deadly weapons consistently create doubt and anxiety prior to their use. Nonlethal technology, by definition, erases the concerns that deadly weapons raise.

The weapons development and transitional management plans presented represent a monumental task for Chief Williams and the Los Angeles Police Department. Yet, the LAPD is in a political position to accomplish this task. Chief Williams has brought back the respect the LAPD once enjoyed according to most print and local

media evaluations. An exhaustive effort in the area of nonlethal technology could bring new recognition and pride to a battered organization. More importantly, law enforcement could finally remove the enormous wedge between police and some of the communities they serve: use of physical force.

END NOTES

1. J. C. Desmedt, "Use of Force Paradigm for Law Enforcement," Journal of Police Science and Administration, Vol. V, No. 2, June, 1984: 170-176.

2. Ibid, 170-176.

3. J. H. Schmidt, "Survey of Police Weapons Data," International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1988: 47.

4. Mike Langberg, "Earthlings Near Star Trek Tech at Warp Speed," The Arizona Republic, October 3, 1992: 2.

5. "A Can of Self Defense," U.S. News and World Report, September 28, 1992: 82-86.

6. Michael Allen, "Weapons Labs Seek Peacetime Projects," The Wall Street Journal, September 17, 1992: 2.

7. John R. Emshwiller, "Collegians at Federal Labs Major in Commercialization," The Wall Street Journal, September 17, 1992: 1.

8. Bob Davis, "Group Urges U.S. Labs to Target More Commercial Technologies," The Wall Street Journal, September 25, 1992:1.

9. Ibid, 1.

10. G. Meyer, "Your Nonlethal Weapons Alternatives," Journal of California Law Enforcement, Vol. 15, No. 3, 1981: 125-136.

11. Wayne Boucher, Ximpact, Version 1.6, 1992.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, Michael, "Weapons Labs Seek Peacetime Projects," The Wall Street Journal, September 17, 1992: 2.

2. Anonymous, "Impact Weapons - The Shape of Things to Come," Police Federation Magazine, England, Vol. II, No. 4, December, 1988: 3.

3. Anonymous, "A Can of Self Defense," U.S. News and World Report, September 28, 1992: 82-86.

4. Ayoob, M. F., "Fundamentals of Modern Police Weapons," Charles C. Thomas, Illinois, 1978: 168.

5. Beckhard, Richard and Reuben T. Harris, Organizational Transitions: Managing Complex Change, Pocket Books, New York, 1981: 187.

6. Boucher, Wayne, Ximpact, Version 1.6, 1992.

7. Davis, Bob, "Group Urges U.S. Labs to Target More Commercial Technologies," The Wall Street Journal, September 25, 1992: 1.

8. Desmedt, J. C., "Use of Force Paradigm for Law Enforcement," Journal of Police Science and Administration, Vol. V, No. 2, June, 1984: 170-176.

9. Emshwiller, John R., "Collegians at Federal Labs Major in Commercialization," The Wall Street Journal, September 17,

1992:1.

10. Ferrin,. D. and D. Lamb, Use of the Baton - The Lamb Method, Bay State Inc., Maryland, 1987: 117.

11. Gerjuoy, Herbert G., "The Most Significant Events in the Next Thousand Years," Futures Research Quarterly, Fall 1992.

12. Gore, A., "Infrastructure for the Global Village," Scientific American, September, 1991: 150-153.

13. Johnston, D. "Stop! or I'll Throw My Net At You!," Police Magazine, Vol. 4, No. 2, March, 1981: 23-28.

14. Langberg, Mike, "Earthlings Near 'Star Trek' Tech at Warp Speed," The Arizona Republic, October 3, 1992: 2.

15. Meyer, G., "Your Nonlethal Weapons Alternatives," Journal of California Law Enforcement, Vol. 15, No. 3, 1981: 125-136.

16. Naisbitt, John and Patricia Aburdene, Megatrends 2000, William Morrow and Company, Inc. New York, 1990.

17. Schmidt, J. H. "Survey of Police Weapons Data," International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1988: 47.

18. Sheth, J.and R. M. Janowiak, 2021 AD: Visions of the Future. National Engineering Consortium, 1991.

19. Willis, H. L., "Defensive Tactics for Police Officers," Police Product News, Vol. 4, No. 4, April, 1990: 38-41, 44-25.