# T – Policing (NSDA Novice Packet)

# Neg

# 1NC v. Implicit Bias

## Interpretation: Policing is the use of state power for law enforcement

Scott **Tighe and** William **Brown 15** – [both from Western Oregon University ("The Militarization of Law Enforcement: Bypassing the Posse Comitatus Act" Justice Policy Journal ! Volume 12, Number 2 (Fall), http://www.cjcj.org/uploads/cjcj/documents/jpj_militarization_of_law_enforcement_-_fall_2015.pdf]

The Bureau of Justice Statistics describes law enforcement as a collection of agencies responsible for maintaining public order and enforcing the law (BJS, 2015). Michalowski (1985, p. 170) defines policing as "the **use of state power** by delegated authorities for the purposes of **law enforcemen**t and the **maintenance of order**." Law enforcement is commonly perceived as the implementation of laws that accommodate the majority of people. Maintenance order typically includes the **management and control of minor offenses** and **behavioral/social disruptions** that may threaten the status quo, which includes individuals, businesses (including corporations), and other organizations who benefit by keeping social, economic, and political arrangements stable (Shelden, et al., 2016).

## Violation: The affirmative changes an police activity, not policing itself

## Limits & Ground – allowing the aff to change anything police do unlimits the topic to small administrative changes, removing single officers, and a host of other tiny affs that skirt neg generics and explode the research burden. Independently, it undermines clash and depth of testing, which link turns their offense.

# 2NC – Interpretation Good

**Their interp defines "police" reform, not policing reform – only <u>our interp</u> removes the <u>tiny affs</u> their <u>mixed definition</u> includes**
**Davis 16** [Ronald L. Davis Director, COPS, "**Police Reform vs. Policing Reform**," community policing Dispatch, the e-newsletter of the COPS Office, Volume 9, Issue 8, August 2016, https://cops.usdoj.gov/html/dispatch/08-2016/police_reform.asp]

<sub>Yet</sub> <u>the discussion of police reform seems to focus primarily on individual officer behavior and ignores the operational systems that have an even greater impact on policing outcomes</u>. The great management guru William Edward Deming captured this notion through his 85/15 rule, which says that 85 percent of the problems in any organization are system-related while only 15 percent are worker-related.

<u>Rank-and-file officers do not decide organizational policies and practices. Nor do officers establish hiring standards or have the power to administer discipline. They also do not decide whether an agency embraces crime-reduction strategies that result in racial disparities</u>. Yet when disparities or other systemic problems do occur, rank-and-file officers are quickly demonized and blamed for those outcomes.

There is no question that rank-and-file officers must be held accountable for their actions. However, if the systems in which they operate are flawed, even good officers can have bad outcomes.

If we are to achieve real and sustainable reform in law enforcement, **our focus must shift from the police** (those individuals sworn to uphold the law) **to policing systems** (<u>the policies, practices, and culture of police organizations</u>). And **through reform, our policing systems must identify** not just the **roles and responsibilities** of the police but the roles and responsibilities of the community as well. After all, communities are a vital part of the policing system. In the words of Sir Robert Peel, the founder of modern law enforcement, "<u>The police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen</u> in the interests of community welfare and existence."

To separate the community from the policing system is akin to separating patients from the health care system or students from the education system. Indeed, even the best teacher cannot help a student who refuses to study. Nor can a doctor cure a patient who refuses to take prescribed medication or to follow the doctor's orders. The same applies to policing. The level of community involvement in the policing system and the level of personal responsibility each community member assumes by cooperating or collaborating with the police greatly impact the outcome of the system. Focusing on the policing system does not ignore or excuse the misconduct of individual police officers. To the contrary, **the stronger the policing system**, the more likely bad officers will be identified and removed from service. The stronger the policing system, <u>the more likely the culture of police organizations will reject officer misconduct and embrace accountability and transparency.</u> And the stronger the policing system, the more likely recruitment and hiring practices will focus not only on hiring diverse, qualified candidates who reflect the communities they serve but also on hiring candidates who see themselves as members of that community.

As a veteran police officer with almost 30 years of experience serving communities in Oakland and East Palo Alto, California, I feel optimistic about the future of the American policing system.

The reason I have faith in a positive future for American policing, even amid a growing chasm of distrust between the police and many communities, is that I see firsthand the outstanding work the vast majority of dedicated men and women in law enforcement do every day. I see them take great efforts to identify the best ways to serve their communities. And I see evidence that many communities, even those that feel the most disenfranchised, yearn for a stronger relationship with the police. People in neighborhoods all across the country are working diligently and in collaboration with the police to make sure their communities are treated fairly not only by the law enforcement officials who are sworn to serve and protect them but also by the policing systems in which those officers operate.

We are at a defining moment in American policing history. Our collective efforts to meet the challenges we have faced over the past few years have opened a unique but very small window of opportunity—a window through which both police and the communities they serve see the need for policing reform and recognize the necessity of working together to achieve success.

The Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing provides a roadmap for this reform. The task force report outlines 59 recommendations that, when implemented, will result in positive changes in the American policing system and **organizational transformation** within individual law enforcement agencies.

It is my hope that law enforcement officials across the country not only will read the task force report but will also use its insights, information, and recommendations to reform the policing systems in their own departments.

Let's not waste this unique opportunity on bickering and finger pointing. Instead, **let's forge ahead together to reform the American policing system** to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Affecting change is never easy, but as President John F. Kennedy said, "Change is the law of life. And those who look only to the past or present are certain to miss the future."

## Policing is the core activities done by officers in the enforcement of the law
## Collins Dictionary ND [https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/policing]

**Definition of 'policing'** Word Frequency policing in British English (pəˈliːsɪŋ) NOUN

1. the activities carried out by police officers in order to preserve law and order the policing of public places

2. the actions of a person or group in authority in order to ensure fairness and legality in an area of public life the policing of new housing developments a more rigorous policing of new developments independent policing of clinical procedures

## "Policing" can be defined narrowly as just the activities of *per se* police, or broadly as any form of social regulation
## Platts-Fowler 16 – Lecturer in Criminology, Victoria University of Wellington

Deborah Platts-Fowler, The University of Leeds School of Law, Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, 'Beyond the Riots' – Policing in Partnership to Prevent and Contain Urban Unrest, 2016, http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/16063/1/THESIS%20FV_DPF.pdf


The **distinction** between **police, police-work** and **policing** is an **important** one for facilitating understanding about the police role as it has evolved and currently exists in England and Wales. It is also important for understanding the relationship of the police to other public authorities, both generally and in the context of urban unrest. In Anglo-American societies, the term '**police'** refers to 'a **specialised body** of people given **primary formal responsibility** for **legitimate force to safeguard security'** (Reiner 2010, pp.4–8). **'Policing', narrowly defined**, refers **only** to the **activities performed by the police**, but there is also a **broader definition**, which is used to signify **social regulation**, recognising the term's etymological link with politics and governance (Rowe 2013). **To avoid policing becoming a catch-all for every institution and activity contributing to social regulation**, which might **include schools** and schooling, Reiner (2010) **practically suggests narrowing it** down to 'the creation of systems of surveillance coupled with the threat of sanctions for discovered deviance' (p5). Thus, what the police do is policing, but other institutions, groups and roles also contribute to this activity.

# 2NC – Limits

**Policing is a <u>broad term</u>, but the <u>only coherent</u> limit defined in any <u>theoretical lit</u> on the subject is the literal activities of police while enforcing the law – broadening it to <u>other issues</u> tangentially related to law enforcement is <u>no limit at all</u> – prefer a review of the lit**

<u>**Rowe 8**</u> [Michael Rowe is Professor of Criminology at Northumbria University. "Introduction to Policing." https://www.corwin.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/19049_01_Rowe_Ch_01.pdf]

<u>The difficulty in **thinking about policing** in these **broad terms** is that it becomes **difficult** to know where the **category can be closed**</u>. It might be important to recognize that <u>policing is not just the business of the **formal police service** and that other institutions play a **crucial role** in developing, for example, public perceptions of criminal or deviant behaviour, but the same could be said for almost **any** and **every aspect of social life**. For this reason</u>, much of <u>this book will focus on the **narrow approach** to policing and **concentrate** primarily on the **activities of the police service**</u> and so this initial discussion of 'What is policing?' is also <u>cast relatively **narrow**</u>. Other agencies, both in the private and the public sector, play an increasingly important role in the business of policing and, where relevant, these are included in the discussion and analysis in chapters that follow. Since the police service cannot be understood in isolation from broader social developments the wider dynamics of policing are crucial to many of the topics featured throughout the book. For the purposes of understanding 'What is policing?', however, <u>it is to the narrower role of the police service that the analysis now turns.</u>

## That's <u>consensus</u> in the lit

<u>**Britannica ND**</u> [https://www.britannica.com/topic/police]

Police, body of officers representing the civil authority of government. <u>Police typically are responsible for maintaining public order and safety, enforcing the law, and preventing, detecting, and investigating **criminal activities**. **These functions are known as policing**</u>. Police are often also entrusted with various licensing and regulatory activities.

However, <u>police scholars have criticized this **popular understanding**</u> of the word police—that it refers to members of a public organization having the legal competence to maintain order and enforce the law—for two reasons. <u>First, it defines police by their **ends** rather than by the specific **means** that they use to achieve their goals. Second, the variety of situations in which police are asked to intervene is much greater than law enforcement and order maintenance</u>. <u>There is now a **consensus among researchers**, based on a **definition** first proposed by</u> American sociologist Egon <u>**Bittner**, that the common feature among all the different agencies engaged in **policing** is the **legal competence** to enforce **coercive, nonnegotiable measures** to resolve problematic situations</u>. Such situations are characterized by two features: their potential for harm and the need to solve them urgently before they develop that potential. Hence, the actual use of coercion or the threat of using it allows police to put a quick, nonnegotiated, and conclusive end to problematic situations (e.g., keeping people away from the scene of a fire for their own protection and to allow firemen to do their job).

## Making "policing" broader than <u>police activities</u> implodes the whole topic

<u>**Wisler 9**</u> – PhD, Founder & Director of Coginta which has managed, designed, and implemented police restructuring programs for many countries; & Professor of Administration of Justice-TSU

Edited by Dominique Wisler, standing member of security sector reform rosters of experts of the United Nations Departement of Peacekeeping Operations, the United Nations Development Program, and the Swiss Foreign Office, former professor in political sociology at the University of Geneva, he has published widely in scientific reviews, and overseen police and Ministry of Interior restructuring programs in countries including Afghanistan, Chad, Sudan, Iraq, Turkey, Mozambique, Haiti, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Occupied Territories of Palestine and the Democratic Republic of Congo, member of advisory committees of academic associations (South Asia Association of Criminology), academic journals (Police Practice and Research. An International Journal), and Editor of the Working Paper Series of the International Police Executive Symposium, DCAF and Coginta, and Ihekwoaba D. Onwudiwe, Professor of Administration of Justice in the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University, *Community Policing: International Patterns and Comparative Perspectives*, CRC Press (Taylor & Francis Group): Boca Raton, FL, 2009, Foreword, pp. xi-xii

In all cases, COP (or a related phrase) is the term used to describe what is being done, even though the specifics of **policing** practices and the **interactions of formal and informal social control** are **unique** and **widely disparate from case to case**. What to make of this?

The book, especially the introduction, raises a fundamental question: What should be the relationships between the police, who are employed by the state, and informal or self-help forms of providing security? The **editors** argue that COP can be viewed from the **top-down** as a **state police-sponsored** form of participation by communities that is controlled, steered, and guided (despite the rhetoric of partnership) **by the police** to protect and promote the goal and interests **of the police**. **In contrast**, COP from the **bottom-up**, **includes all the civic society forms of providing security**, be these **community efforts**, **informal vigilantism**, or **even corporate and private security**. Whether top-down or bottom-up, **all of these are forms of policing** and are **based on various political justifications** and influence. The question is this: How do these **two** basic categories meet, or how do the police deal with informal policing structures, and how does the community deal with the formal state police? Since **informal policing exists everywhere**, in forms that reflect history and contexts, top-down and bottom-up will always meet, clash, or cooperate, and have to be reconciled politically.

On a slightly critical note here, **it is not clear that a bottom-up form of social control should be called policing. That widens the conception of what constitutes policing so broadly** that **policing itself becomes undefined**. A more **distinct language**, which incorporates, but also **differentiates**, state-provided **policing** from **informal social control**, could use the language of **security** as a field of action populated by many actors having different powers, legal status, and goals.

The chapters as a whole provide extensive empirical analyses of the policing problems and changes faced within their case study countries, as well as sophisticated theoretical ruminations on the nature of this set of practices called "policing," of what constitutes "community," and what constitutes the "state." It is a solid contribution to the expanding, and now vast, literature on COP, as well as a useful and necessary corrective to the assumption that community policing can be understood in a general way without

taking into account the contexts that shape how values, ideologies, and goals will transform patterns of policing.

# 1NC v. Defund the Police

## Reform is changing practices- not abolishing

**Miller, ND** (Chelsea Miller, writer for States of Incarceration, a program dedicated to exploring the roots of mass incarceration, No Date, accessed on 6-26-2020, Statesofincarceration, "Prison Reform/Prison Abolition | States of Incarceration", https://statesofincarceration.org/story/prison-reformprison-abolition#:~:text=%E2%80%9CReforming%20the%20prison%20entails%20changing,to%20the%20prison's%20very%20existence.%E2%80%9D)

"Reforming the prison entails changing its existing practices to make the system a better one. Abolishing the prison entails dismantling it wholesale. Reformers object to how the prison is administered. Abolitionists object to the prison's very existence." — Ruby C. Tapia, co-editor of Interrupted Lives: Experiences of Incarcerated Women in the United States (2010). "A cage is a cage is a cage. We want strategies that let people out of cages, not ones that are for building nicer or better cages." — Annotation in the meeting notes of the Statewide Harm Reduction Coalition (SHaRC) in Chicopee, MA, 2006. Activist work focusing on incarceration in Massachusetts has followed two **distinct**, yet sometimes overlapping, philosophies: prison abolition and prison reform. Prison reformers have uniquely focused on advocacy, policy change, and healthcare support for people already in the criminal justice system. Prison abolitionists have advocated for policy change and community alternatives to incarceration, including community centers, schools, and physical and mental health care resources. Where they overlap, however, is in their work to expose the impacts of mass criminalization, to change public perceptions of incarcerated men and women, and to serve as advocates for people who are incarcerated.

## Calls to defund are distinct from reforms

**Weichselbaum and Lewis, 20** (Simone Weichselbaum and Nicole Lewis, staff writer who focuses on issues pertaining to federal law enforcement and local policing. She is also The Marshall Project's co-chair of diversity & inclusion, graduate of The University of Michigan and CUNY Graduate School of Journalism. She was the recipient of the 2016 Education Writers Association National Awards for Education Writing in magazine and feature writing for her contribution to a series on desegregation in the public school system, 6-9-2020, accessed on 6-28-2020, The Marshall Project, "Support For Defunding The Police Department Is Growing. Here's Why It's Not A Silver Bullet.", https://www.themarshallproject.org/2020/06/09/support-for-defunding-the-police-department-is-growing-here-s-why-it-s-not-a-silver-bullet)

Our reporting exposes injustice and examines solutions for a criminal justice system in crisis. To support our journalism, please consider a donation to The Marshall Project today. Minneapolis city council members made an historic pledge over the weekend when they vowed to dismantle the local police department and shift money to community-based strategies. The pledge to develop a new system of public safety—supported by a veto-proof majority — follows weeks of protests across the country in the wake of the police killing of George Floyd. Officials in other cities, including New York and Los Angeles, have also said they would cut police budgets, though neither has echoed Minneapolis city council members's statement that the city's police department is

beyond reform. Once a radical notion, the push to defund the police is gaining ground. Across the country, organizers, celebrities,and former city officials are calling on lawmakers to reimagine the role of police in public safety**. Proponents of taking money away from cops say cities cannot simply reform** their way out of the current policing crisis. And in the wake of the pandemic, some have highlighted a deadly disparity: many cities spend millions more on law enforcement than they do on most other services, including public health. Opponents say it is too soon to abandon the progress police departments have made to curb officer violence and improve their relationships in communities of color. Some point to the effects of the 2008 recession, where cities cut police funding with no real plan, with unintended consequences, including increasing complaints over use of force. But what do people mean by defunding the police? It **doesn't just mean slashing budgets**. One of the main ideas is that police departments are often the only agency to respond to problems — even if the problems are not criminal in nature. Police handle mental health crises. They enforce traffic laws. They patrol public school hallways and contract with colleges and universities. In many small towns, police answer 911 calls about barking dogs and loud parties. Advocates of defunding the police argue that many of these functions would be better left to other professionals, such as social workers. Decades of over-policing in black and brown neighborhoods has led to black and brown people being disproportionately victims of police violence and overrepresented in prisons. A better approach, proponents of defunding the police argue, redirects law-enforcement funding to social services programs such as public housing, early childhood education and healthcare. By equitably distributing resources, they say, the need for police could be dramatically reduced. Molly Glasgow, a volunteer with MPD150, a grassroots initiative to abolish the Minneapolis Police Department, said **decades of previous reform efforts have not broken a cycle of violence** followed by unrest and promises of improvement that have failed. "What we are **asking** is **that we step out of that cycle**," Glasgow said. "When we say **dismantle**: Yes, we mean **divest and defund, but also invest in community programs** and initiatives **that are actually supporting people's needs**." Past attempts to cut police spending or alter police policies offer cautionary tales of how some efforts backfire, and entrenched aggressive tactics and racially discriminatory attitudes remain. Previous Marshall Project investigations into cases of attempted police reform in cities like Memphis and Chicago found that cutting law enforcement budgets did not reduce police violence or produce healthier relationships with the neighborhoods they patrol.

**Vote neg for ground- abolition is key neg ground- it's the only real critique of reform. Allowing the aff to claim the best neg ground makes it impossible to be neg**

# Ext – Interpretation

## Abolition and defunding are <u>distinct</u> from reform

<u>Lopez, 20</u> (Christy E. Lopez, professor at Georgetown Law School and a co-director of the school's Innovative Policing Program, 6-7-2020, accessed on 6-26-2020, The Washington Post, "Defund the police? Here's what that really means.", https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/06/07/defund-police-heres-what-that-really-means/)

Defunding and abolition probably mean something different from what you are thinking. For most proponents, "defunding the police" does not mean zeroing out budgets for public safety, and police abolition does not mean that police will disappear overnight — or perhaps ever. <u>Defunding the police means shrinking the scope of police responsibilities and shifting most of what government does to keep us safe to entities that are better equipped to meet that need. It means investing more in mental-health care and housing, and expanding the use of community mediation and violence interruption programs. Police abolition means reducing, with the vision of eventually eliminating, our reliance on policing to secure our public safety</u>. It means recognizing that criminalizing addiction and poverty, making 10 million arrests per year and mass incarceration have not provided the public safety we want and never will. <u>The "abolition" language is important because it reminds us that policing has been the primary vehicle for using violence to perpetuate the unjustified white control over the bodies and lives of black people that has been with us since slavery. That aspect of policing must be literally abolished. Still, even as we try to shift resources from policing to programs that will better promote fairness and public safety, we must continue the work of police reform. We cannot stop regulating police conduct now because we hope someday to reduce or eliminate our reliance on policing</u>. We must ban chokeholds and curb the use of no-knock warrants; we must train officers how to better respond to people in mental health crises, and we must teach officers to be guardians, not warriors, to intervene to prevent misconduct and to understand and appreciate the communities they serve.

## Defund goes beyond reform

<u>Russonello, 20</u> (Giovanni Russonello, 6-9-2020, accessed on 6-28-2020, The New York Times, "A Movement Meets a Question: Defund or Reform the Police?", https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/09/us/politics/defund-police-joe-biden-trump.html)

<u>**Defund, or just reform**? That is the question now at the heart of this moment. Protesters, along with progressive elected officials around the country, are demanding that police departments be defunded, disbanded and replaced by a newly anti-racist system of public safety and justice. In Minneapolis, there are already signs that such a drastic change could soon occur.</u> Proponents of a more moderate approach support new measures to exert oversight over police departments and regulate the use of force, but not break up the departments. Democratic leaders in the House backed this approach yesterday when they unveiled a sweeping police-overhaul bill amid fanfare on Capitol Hill. The bill would make it easier to prosecute officers accused of wrongdoing and would put new restrictions on the use of force. Where does all this leave Joe Biden, the presumptive Democratic nominee for president? Just a few weeks ago, he was still adamantly defending his support for the 1994 crime bill — a law that put 100,000 new

police officers on the street, and spent nearly $10 billion on prisons. Biden's campaign will probably walk a fine line on matters of policing, as he works to shore up support on the left while courting moderate voters. Yesterday, he threw his support firmly behind the more moderate reformers. "No, I don't support defunding the police," he told CBS News, in a similar statement to the one that recently got Mayor Jacob Frey of Minneapolis booed out of a rally. "I support conditioning federal aid to police based on whether or not they meet certain basic standards of decency and honorableness," Biden said. It's clear what side President Trump is on. "There won't be defunding, there won't be dismantling of our police, and there is not going to be any disbanding of our police," he declared on Monday. He spoke alongside law enforcement officials and top members of his administration, including state attorneys general, the national president of the Fraternal Order of Police, the president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and officials from some police departments. "You'll see some horrible things like we witnessed recently, but 99 — I say 99.9, but let's go with 99 percent of them — are great, great people," Trump said of the police. But polls suggest that Trump's hard-line stance over the past two weeks has not particularly helped him. In a CNN poll released yesterday, just 38 percent of the country approved of his job performance, his lowest marks since January 2019 — even as the country proceeds with a cautious economic reopening. And only 31 percent said they liked how he was handling race relations — roughly on par with past results to this question, and an indication that even some of Trump's supporters are uncomfortable with his positions on racial issues. According to a new analysis by Nate Cohn of The Upshot, Biden's lead is up across the board, putting him in a stronger position than any presidential challenger since Bill Clinton in summer 1992. Looking only at the most reliable recent polls conducted by live telephone interviewers, Nate found that Biden is now ahead of Trump by an average of 10 percentage points. That's a four-point increase compared with polls from the previous month.

# **Aff**

# 2AC – Counter-Interpretation – Implicit Bias

**Interpretation: Policing reform requires change to police practices**

<u>**NAACP 19**</u> --- NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, NATIONAL POLICE FUNDING DATABASE Using Data to Promote Fair and Accountable Policing Practices, Thurgood Marshall Institute, Website created 2019, https://policefundingdatabase.tminstituteldf.org/policingreform (BJN)

<u>Policing reform involves changing how police</u> departments <u>operate</u>, especially <u>how they provide public safety services </u>to communities. <u>From a civil rights perspective, the goals of policing reform are to change policing policies and practices to ensure that individuals are treated fairly</u> and without regard to race, national origin, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or other characteristics protected by the U.S. Constitution or civil rights laws.

<u>Policing reform can focus on a variety of police policies</u> <u>and practices,</u> <u>including use of force; stop, search, and arrest practices; and internal and external systems designed to hold police departments</u> and individual officers <u>accountable</u>.

# 2AC – Counter-Interpretation – Defund the Police

## Defund the police *is* reform– not abolition

**Ray, 20** (Rashawn Ray, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park, and the David M. Rubenstein Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, 6-19-2020, accessed on 6-26-2020, Brookings, "What does 'defund the police' mean and does it have merit?", https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2020/06/19/what-does-defund-the-police-mean-and-does-it-have-merit/)

George Floyd's death has galvanized much of America to move the needle toward police reform ideas—such as defunding police—that were previously viewed as radical. "Defund the police" means reallocating or redirecting funding away from the police department to other government agencies funded by the local municipality. That's it. It's that simple. Defund does not mean abolish policing. And, even some who say abolish, do not necessarily mean to do away with law enforcement altogether. Rather, they want to see the rotten trees of policing chopped down and fresh roots replanted anew. Camden, New Jersey, is a good example. Nearly a decade ago, Camden disbanded (abolished) its police force and dissolved the local police union. This approach seems to be what Minneapolis will do in some form, though the nuances are important. Different from abolishing and starting anew, defunding police highlights fiscal responsibility, advocates for a market-driven approach to taxpayer money, and has some potential benefits that will reduce police violence and crime. Below, I outline some of the main arguments for defunding the police. Data show that 9 out of 10 calls for service are for nonviolent encounters. Now, this does not mean that an incident will not turn violent, but police at times contribute to the escalation of violent force. Police officers' skillset and training are often out of sync with the social interactions that they have. Police officers are mostly trained in use-of-force tactics and worst-case scenarios to reduce potential threats. However, most of their interactions with civilians start with a conversation. Advocates for the defund movement like Phillip McHarris and Thenjiwe McHarris argue that shifting funding to social services that can improve things such as mental health, addiction, and homelessness is a better use of taxpayer money. This approach further enhances the push to decriminalize and destigmatize people with mental health conditions and addiction problems. Ever since the overcriminalization of people addicted to crack cocaine in the 1990s, some scholars, practitioners, and policymakers have said that this shift is long overdue.

# Policing = Broad Changes

## Defining "policing" based on their discrete <u>functions</u> is bad – aff's reform must address the <u>deeper</u> political and social dynamics

Alan **Wright** (lecturer at the Institute of Criminal Justice Studies at the University of Portsmouth, Honorary Research Fellow at Keele University, and former police officer) **2002** "Policing: An introduction to concepts and practice" p. 31 https://doi.org/ 10.4324/9781843924708

These inquiries show that <u>it is not possible to make an institution more effective by ignoring the ambiguity inherent in its practice.</u> Indeed, <u>they illustrate why the whole modern idea that institutions are rational structures defined by their functions is deeply flawed</u>. Political, economic, social and technological change means that <u>we can no longer associate policing with the police alone</u>. In fact, <u>reference to the functions of the police can no longer answer the question, 'What is policing?' at all. The only way to do this is to provide an account that interprets policing practice in terms of its social and political purposes</u>. Such an account will point to the rich pattern of relations between policing, the state and other agencies, groups and individuals. It will recognise that policing can only exist in an 'informational society' of the kind discussed by Bell ( 1980) and Castells (1989). We will discuss this further in Chapter 7. <u>In the light of the evidence</u>, therefore, <u>we should abandon any attempt to understand policing as a range of functions of the police. Instead we should develop an account which recognises the diversity of meanings</u> which now characterise the terms 'police' and 'policing'.

Diversity of meanings

<u>Functionalism has not led to a unified scientific account of police work. Nor has it produced practical measures for police reform</u>. As we have argued above, <u>the reason for this is that we can no longer simply understand policing in terms of the functions of the police. We need to look anew at the meaning of</u> 'police' and <u>'policing' to establish new ways of approaching these questions</u>. It is true that <u>there is a rapidly expanding literature on the police. However, it seldom discusses the deeper meaning of the concept</u>. Studies of police work regard policing as a transparent concept. Those who recognise the difficulties, however, are aware that <u>there are problems associated with the meaning of the term 'policing'.</u> Indeed, <u>it is</u> now <u>unsafe to use the term as if it refers to the activities of a single institution.</u>

<u>The fact that the meanings of 'police' and 'policing' are ambiguous makes them difficult to define. The context in which they are used makes a difference to the meaning.</u> For example, the use of the term 'police' by criminologists discussing police accountability may not be the same as its use by the police or those who make complaints against them. <u>Its meaning for practitioners will not be the same as that in the minds of those who consider themselves 'policed against'. The concept of policing may have had very different meanings for protesting students </u>who faced the Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité (CRS) in Paris in 1968 than for the members of the CRS who were on public order duty at that time. This is so, despite the fact that both may have believed that they were influencing the future and very legitimacy of the French state. It is all the more problematic in such cases if theoretical accounts assume that the meanings of the terms 'police' and policing' are unequivocal. <u>However, even where the meaning is elusive,</u>

'police' and 'policing' cannot simply mean anything we want them to mean. For this reason, we need to clarify the way in which the various forms of discourse use the concepts, both in theory and in practice.

## "policing" should not be rigidly defined – prefer a more abstract interpretation that denotes the its organizational history and the associations between various police practices

Alan **Wright** (lecturer at the Institute of Criminal Justice Studies at the University of Portsmouth, Honorary Research Fellow at Keele University, and former police officer) **2002** "Policing: An introduction to concepts and practice" p. 36-7 https://doi.org/10.4324/9781843924708

We can argue with some justification that the concept of 'policing' meets Ryle's criteria for polymorphism. As already suggested in relation to differences in meaning, there need be nothing going on in some kinds of policing that needs to be going on in others. For example, the action content of community policing need not be the same as the action content of law enforcement. There is no necessary overlap between them, although there may be overlap under some specific conditions. Technically speaking, our use of the term 'policing' does not rigidly designate the action content of policing practice other than the one we are specifically referring to at the time. It is an abstract general term but it does not label only one thing. This is not a complicated point. We often distinguish between forms of police work in terms of their action content, as we also often distinguish between them in terms of their context, both organisationally and historically. We can talk about paramilitary policing and not get it confused with the kind of policing which is concerned with putting identifiable marks on children's bicycles. However, we still want to make use of the word to denote some kind of association between these different kinds of practice. This indicates that we should be looking for an understanding of policing in terms of a modal logic of practice that recognises this variability. A provisional model for such a modal logic of policing practice is set out later in this chapter.

## Policing reform must effect every aspect of police organization

**Beyer 91 -** Lorraine R. Beyer, Senior Constable ("The Logic and the Possibilities of 'Wholistic' Community Policing", McKillop, S. and Vernon, J; Victoria Police, *THE POLICE AND THE COMMUNITY IN THE 1990s,* Australian Institute of Criminology) ICW-AZL

The concept of 'wholistic' community policing is not anything mystical or spiritual. It is, however, about a vision. It is a vision of a police organisational structure and management which is organised around what police actually do, rather than around only a part of their duties---that is crime fighting. Where police at every level can be efficient, effective, responsive and accountable in all their duties. This is not a 'pie in the sky' ideal. It seems that the 'wholistic' approach to community policing is essential for the future of policing. So first, what is wholistic community policing? There are three types of approach to community policing currently discussed in the literature. In the first approach community policing is seen as just one pattern or unit within the police organisation. In the second approach community policing is the name given to smallscale initiatives, usually local, which are designed to bring police into non-confrontational contact with the community in some way. The third approach is the 'wholistic' approach. This approach sees community **policing as affecting every**

**aspect of the police organisation**, including being reflected in the informal corporate culture. It would involve the police organisation being organised in such a way that it could be demonstrably effective and responsive in its service and peacekeeping tasks and in its prevention of crime and disorder. It makes sense for the police organisation to be organised around what police actually do and around what the community wants them to do. Instead though, police appear to be organised around assumptions which, at the very least, are open to question. These are discussed below.

# Reform = Transformational Change

## Criminal justice reform includes both incremental and large-scale reforms

**Blanco et al 4** (Rafael Blanco, Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Richard Hutt, Cook County Public Defender, Hugo Rojas, Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Issue 2 Spring/Summer 2004, "Reform to the Criminal Justice System in Chile: Evaluation and Challenges", Loyola University Chicago International Law Review, https://lawecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1132&context=lucilr, JRB)

IV. Evaluation of the Reform Process **The process of criminal justice reform**, as in the case of all political processes, requires periods of evaluation which **permit modifications and changes in both strategic planning and day-to-day systemic operation**. The idea is to identify advances and successes, as well as challenges, as the process moves onward. Indeed, all such political processes must pass the test of public scrutiny as well as being tested by political scientists and economists. During this period, the administration of President Eduardo Frei and the current administration of President Ricardo Lagos have closely followed the reformation of the Code of Criminal Justice. 3' At the same time, there have been ongoing studies by universities and private organizations that have contributed immensely to both a financial and political understanding of the entire process. 32 These studies have identified significant successes in this process in the following areas: (a) transparency; (b) speed; (c) contact; (d) orality; (e) due process; (f) impartiality; (g) protection; and (h) professionalism.

# Reform = Reduce Disparity

## Reducing disparity

**Salinas 9** – MPA @ Texas State U (Gevena, "A Preliminary Analysis: Prison Models and Prison Management Models and the Texas Prison System," https:// digital.library.txstate.edu/bitstream/handle/10877/3639/fulltext.pdf)//BB

Reform is defined as progressive movement toward some social, economic, or political outcome that is widely recognized as necessary and desirable (Gottschalk 2006, 1695). <u>Reform is</u> also <u>defined as reducing the vast and growing racial and ethnic disparities in the incarnated population</u> (Gottschalk 2006, 1696). Prison reform in practical terms refers to restoring civil rights and humane treatment, as well as other basic 47 rights to prisoners, while showing prisoners respect and allowing them to maintain their dignity (Gottschalk 2006).