

MODULE 6 – 2084

LECTURE 5 – THE ANSWER? - AND WRAPPING UP

COVERT + CONSTRAINTS = CUISC + INEFFECTIVE TIP

So in the end **what have we got?** What has all this alleged “**falderal**” led us to? Let’s look at the big picture. We started out saying that the two **main sources of crime info** were people and things. We saw that throughout recent history, citizens did not tolerate the use of covert human sources of crime info. And by tracing how technology can improve information from things, we saw that as we looked into the foreseeable future, although technology did significantly improve our ability to solve crime, it offered lesser improvement in preventing and detecting crime. And the old problems of the intrusiveness of technology in the lives of citizens remained. And it is likely that the benefits of future technology will be subjected to as much or even more fierce debate regarding the CC vs. DP issue, to the point where much of the benefits could be constrained, like they had been in the past. So what does that leave us with? Are we doomed to continue the struggles and conflicts of the past? After all those empires and stuff, is that **all the further** we’ve got?

Well, FARSIGHTED TRAVELER, I’ll bet you are already ahead of me here, right? OK now, see here, as much as I want to get to the truth about some things, as I said before, sometimes **I don’t want to ask the question** because I don’t want to know the answer. So let me withdraw the question about being ahead of me, because I’m not sure I can handle any more answers about not remembering and stuff, and I’ve thrown enough **hissy fits** about that already. Instead, let me assuage my personal fears and blithely presume that you do remember, and give you full and well-deserved credit for listening with a sharp ear to all I have said, and reaching the same conclusion that I am about to reveal.

Gosh, that sounds a little condescending and snotty, even to me!

But the point here, is that sometimes when you get pretty sick and tired of something, it can be really helpful to just switch to a **different mindset**. Like, I’m really tired of the CUISC and Traditional Investigation Process stuff, and I think we need to do some serious work on moving back to the CUIPDSC stuff. So looking at things from a different perspective should be of some help here. Got that?

Anyway, my thoughts are that **what we have left** is what the “**study**” and the “**survey**” led us to and what we discussed in earlier lectures – the Community Policing Detective!!! **Remember** him/her? Why, **soitenly**.

OVERT + COMMUNITY POLICING = CUIPDSC + CRIME REDUCTION

We saw that the OVERT efforts of COMMUNITY POLICING Officers contributed to **decreases** in crime. And we think we saw that COMMUNITY POLICING in investigations also led to increases in **solving** crime. And we proposed the COMMUNITY POLICING Detective as **a model** for where we want to go in the future. The COMMUNITY POLICING Detective would **OVERTLY** work with the public to collect crime info, increase their **awareness** of crime matters, and **gain their trust**.

As a model, the COMMUNITY POLICING Detective's **GOAL** is **CUIPDSC**. His/her **STYLE** is to **proactively** collect crime info in all five phases, but in an **overt** manner, with an emphasis on placing the **means** ahead of the end. The **FOCUS** is not on offenders or cases, but on **overtly** collecting crime info from **citizens** about crime in **all five phases**.

The primary **SOURCE** of crime info is the public. The COMMUNITY POLICING Detective overtly lives and works in the same community as the public, and provides the public with accurate and timely info regarding crime and crime threats in their area, the developments in forensics and technology, and how they are applied in their community. By increasing the public awareness of these matters, the COMMUNITY POLICING Detective can work to minimize the public's fear of covert methods, reinforce the need for an overt exchange of crime info to protect the community as an alternative to covert techniques, provide the public a stronger basis for making rational decisions about CC vs. DP, and provide a way to gain their trust, support and cooperation.

So in effect what we have here is a **local agency** emphasis on using **human sources** (the primary source of crime info) in an **OVERT**, rather than covert, way for the purpose of **PREVENTING, DETECTING** and **SOLVING** crime (the CUIPDSC gold standard), and in **all five phases** or the crime continuum, no less! And this would be done at the **local level** in our communities, rather than by some three-letter invisible **diktat bugaboo** spy invader from on high. The **sky spy guy** is dealt with up front. The age-old reticence of the public to **covert** operations is minimized. The honest people far outnumber the crooks, and it is **far and away in their best interest** to support the police, rather than fear them. And if the public chooses not get involved, then the only **techniques** that the police have left to use in order do their job to protect the security of our community and our families are the dreaded Informer, Thief Taker and Agent Provocateur. Kind of like giving a cop a **club and a gun** to solve the world's problems, eh?

The **means** of investigations becomes more important than the end. That is, the public is the **employer**, and it has the power to **choose** what tools and techniques it wants the police to use to protect them. And if the

public does not choose, then the police must resort to clubs, guns, covert stuff, and – my favorite – speeders, to do their job. With the **COMMUNITY POLICING Detective model**, the public is more empowered as a **responsible partner** than it was as a target or as collateral damage. So **what’s not to like?**

So let’s look in a more organized way, or at least a different way, at some of the **plusses and minuses** that COMMUNITY POLICING, in the form of the COMMUNITY POLICING Officer and COMMUNITY POLICING Detective, offer. We’re gonna look at four issues – Sources, CUIPDSC, Overtness, and Public Awareness.

Issue	Plusses	Minuses
1. Sources – people & things	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - focuses on people, the best source of crime info - people sources are local, in the community neighborhoods where crime info exists -most likely to be present in all 5 phases of the crime -most impacted/affected by crime, and therefore motivated to minimize the crime threat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - doesn’t include things so much - can’t ignore things - people aren’t everywhere, or in all 5 crime phases all the time - some people will just refuse to be sources of crime info
2. CUIPDSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - works in all 5 crime phases - decreases (or PREVENTS) crime - can help to DETECT crime - may help to SOLVE crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - some offenders will not be deterred - helping to SOLVE crime hasn’t been further supported by research - no research is planned to evaluate the SOLVING crime issue
3. OVERTNESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does CUIPDSC through OVERT contacts - OVERTLY collects info in PLAN and ACTION phases - minimizes the COVERT stigma - works with public (police employers) - helps increase trust, support, cooperation - capitalizes on public’s best interests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it ain’t perfect - cannot do all CUIPDSC - some crimes require technology - some people will still require confidentiality because of fear of reprisal
4. Public Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can brief re: local crime threat - can brief re: terrorist threat - can brief re: developments & use of investigative techniques, technology, etc., to minimize public concerns - local police officers do this - supports public making more informed, rational decisions re: CC vs. DP in their community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - some public will not participate - some public will continue to mistrust the police - some people don’t trust local officers

So it's **not perfect**. But **here's the thing** - very little is in this world. I think we've established that already. It does not prevent, detect or solve all crime. Correct again, but the Traditional Investigation Process we have now does not prevent, detect or solve **most crime**. And COMMUNITY POLICING has already been shown in the research to **do better than that**. So is this all better or worse than what we've currently got or can expect in the future? I'm big on the plusses here, and short on the drawbacks.

Well, doesn't that just about **settle everything then**? Isn't that the **ANSWER** to all our problems? What? No? Well, yes, the **research** hasn't really firmly established that COMMUNITY POLICING helps investigators **solve** crime. And that's correct, there doesn't seem to be any research planned to look into that in the near future. You're right to point all that out, ASTUTE TRAVELER, and it warms my heart that you dare to speak up and do so. But at least we have research showing that the OVERT efforts of COMMUNITY POLICING do help to decrease crime, and that's a **big thing**. If we can **reduce** crime rates by OVERT cooperation with the public, that sure beats **sneaking** around behind the public's back, it seems, and then getting constrained for doing so. At least it should be more appealing to the best **self-interests** of most of the public. It may not be in the crooks' self-interest, but the public outnumbers the crooks. And some day we may even get around to settling the matter of whether or not COMMUNITY POLICING actually helps solve **crime** also. Of course, there's always the problem of preventing and detecting the really serious crimes like **murder and terrorism and spying**, but between OVERT COMMUNITY POLICING, a more informed public, and future technology, we may be able to chip away at some of that stuff better than we do today with some of our covert techniques that keep getting us in trouble and end up constraining us, don't you think? Especially the unpopular ones.

What would you prefer? A massive federal or global government enterprise maybe a hundred times more powerful than our current NSA and intelligence community, copiously monitoring every communication by every person in the country and everywhere else, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week? Or would you rather your friendly COMMUNITY POLICING Officer and Detective talking to you directly in your local neighborhoods and communities about just exactly what's going on in the world of crime around them, and how we can all work together OVERTLY to protect our own neighborhoods and community and minimize the threat in our personal lives? **Koom-ba-ya** or something.

The **tech or the people**? The **feds or the fuzz**? Your local fuzz, that is, the ones you hire. Which do you prefer? Which do you think has the better grip on your personal safety and security, and that of your family's? In the **Boston Marathon** bombing case, we saw that, even when the FBI was alerted to and aware of the

threat, and NSA was in its full glory monitoring the cyber-world to the best of its ability, these **national-level efforts failed** to protect us from a couple of home-made bombs constructed from - **pressure cookers**, for **crying out loud!**

Now granted, **we never hear** about many of the threats and plots that the FBI and NSA and other agencies do neutralize, and there have been well over 40 major ones since 9/11. ¹²² I mean, that's a lot! So I do not mean to at all minimize their vital contributions to our security, and, at least for the next 10 - 20 years or so, we can probably expect even greater improvement in their capabilities.

But, as we've seen, they are **not infallible** and, in fact, depending on the mood of the Congress and the country regarding CC vs. DP (remember the decreasing crime rates and all that), we may even see more constraints placed upon their activities. And when we look back at some other incidents (**the Unabomber, the shoe bomber, the underwear bomber, the Times Square bomber** – Google these characters if you're not aware of them), we see again that many, if not most were **never detected** by our national security systems. Instead, they were thwarted in their PLAN or ACTION phases by normal **everyday citizens** with eyes in their heads and enough common sense to realize that these guys were about to do bad things.

Remember, **all crime is local** – it takes place in our neighborhoods and communities, where we work and live. And that's where most of the sources – that's us - and most of the information about crime exists. So are we hoping that the NSA will get big enough and strong enough to detect the threats in our community so we don't have to? And then are we gonna yell at them –again - for snooping? So **how's that been working out** for us?

MY VIEW – POWER “IS” THE PEOPLE

So **here is my view in sum**. It seems clear to me that choosing between the feds and the local **fuzz is not a good idea. We need them both**. And we saw (or dreamt of) how **future tech** could help investigations in all five phases of the crime continuum. But in the end, human societal behavior is the most complex type of behavior we know of in the universe, and **people** remain the most important source of information for criminal behavior.

I am personally prepared to abide by the decisions of the people and the powers regarding how we use technology in the future. But I think we would be absolutely **stone bonkers nutso crackers bleeping** crazy if we continue to ignore people, and fail to take advantage of the **COMMUNITY POLICING benefits of the OVERT**

collection of info. I mean, just exactly what are we talking about here – **people working with the police**, who they hire and pay to help them stop things that hurt people. And they're afraid, or too ignorant or uninformed, to tell the police, who are their employees, what they see and know? **What's up with that?**

How can you run a business like that? How do we in the CJ system live with that? Are we really so oppressive and threatening today that people still cannot trust us? After 5,000 years and 200 empires? We're still struggling with this? Come on, **gimme a break** here. We **gotta** do better than that, for **criminy's** sake. I mean, aside from occasionally ranting at students, I've always been a pretty nice guy, even when I carried a badge and credentials. Just ask me.

But just when are we planning to get around to doing better? Christmas? Next year? Oh, the next budget cycle maybe? Or maybe 2084? With our exploration of future technology, we've seen that it has the potential to help in the fight against crime, at least on the margins in some instances, already today. But it **always comes back to people**. **WE** are responsible. **WE** make the decisions, and **WE** suffer the most from the consequences of those decisions. **Geez**, this **ain't** rocket science. Using technology so that **WE** can shirk, or avoid, or ameliorate, our personal responsibilities leads to consequences that **WE** can only fear and regret in the end. And that's **my ANSWER** and I'm **sticking to it!**

So is it **back-patting** or **butt-kicking** time?

So I've been working on this stuff for awhile and consulting myself as an expert, and all. And that worked out just great, if I don't say so myself. But **gosh**, now I'm retiring, and all, and I just can't have all this cluttering up the area around my lounge chair on the beach. So I'm just wondering if anybody else is interested in, or aware of, the thinking on this, and whether they might have any ideas or thoughts to carry it on and **do something** with it. And I must admit, I'd sure be interested in hearing about those ideas and how they might fit into some of the concepts in this course. Just curious, you know.

Think your ideas may be too **looney**? Well, just look back at all the **deja vu-ing** we did in this course. Now that's what I call **looney**, especially when it looks like that's what we, **meaning you**, might continue to do in the future, even though we, **meaning you**, know better.

WRAPPING UP – WELL DONE, AND THE RETIREMENT THINGIE

So, STALWART TRAVELER, I've probably **ragged** on you enough during the course, and now I want to pay you a compliment and provide some thoughts about what **you** have accomplished. In completing this course, you have gained insights and a perspective about the police criminal investigation process that few others share or are even aware of, either in the field of criminal justice, or in academe. You are presently in the forefront of knowledge and thought about this process, and you have been exposed to more information about this subject regarding issues, history, and the future, in an organized way, than most of your peers. You now have a structure, a pocket full of tools, and ideas in your head, and with them you are capable of using them to lead our progress into the future with an informed and intelligent voice. **Not too shabby at all.**

You have earned my respect and my appreciation, and also my congratulations for a job well done. Thank you for your attention throughout the course and for sticking with it to the end. I enjoyed traveling with you. Good luck!

A final word of caution – just don't go bragging about all this to your friendly detectives working cases in the field and on the street, OK? **Remember** (I just had to say that one more time), as I said in the first lecture, this is a course about the criminal investigation process – it does not teach you how to be an investigator. And my **gut** tells me that our friendly street investigators need to **chew on** this course stuff a little bit and make known their thoughts and criticisms about what was covered. Once they take the course, then maybe we can start working to get all the **kinks** out of it, eh?

If we don't get the **ground-pounders'** views and **buy-in** on all of this **highfalutin** stuff, then I don't know what we've really accomplished.

Now if you'll excuse me, I think I see my pal **Mokey** down by my lounge chair on the beach, waving another mint julep at me ~~ Ah well, I guess it's all part of that "getting the hang of retirement" **thingie** again, eh?