

**REPORT TO THE CHRISTOPHER COMMISSION REGARDING
MISCONDUCT OF THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT IN THE AREAS
OF RACISM, SEXISM AND RESISTANCE TO IMPROVEMENT
IN HUMAN RELATIONS**

by
L. Reed Adams, Ph.D.
criminologist

Legal counsel to Dr. Adams provided by
William T. Graysen, Esq.
Graysen, Kaplan & Petrossian

June 27, 1991

CONTENTS

Chapter One: Racism (page 1)

Chapter Two: Sexism (page 3)

Chapter Three:

Resistance to Improvement in Human Relations (page 4)

CHAPTER ONE : RACISM

In late 1988 a meeting was held involving the Mayor, Chief of Police, and community group representatives for the purpose of recognizing the high quality of LAPD human relations training. Following that ceremony an LAPD Human Relations Training Officer stated to the audience (which included Jewish women) a "joke" concerning "JAP"s, or "Jewish American Princess". This was discussed with Dr. Sandberg of the Professional Advisory Committee.

On 1/22/88 at about midday, I requested of Captain Mitchell, by memo, that "I would like to help with Asian recruitment." His written response to me was "No."

On 10/26/88 while observing a human relations class at the LAPD Academy I observed Officer Davis (the instructor) state to the class that an officer who reported a racial disagreement between two officers of different races would be a "snitch".

On 10/26/88 while observing a human relations class at the LAPD Academy I observed Officer Davis (the instructor) state to the class, as a "joke", that it was against the law to sell Cadillac cars to Blacks.

During the midday period, early in 1988, at the LAPD academy, I observed two officers viewing a tape of a Black male dressed as a police officer at roll call. The Black Male was presenting an exaggerated portrayal of the stereotypical poorly educated Black male. Both officers laughed. I was told the tape had circulated among several police departments.

At the midday hour, early in 1988, at the LAPD Academy, Officer Bob Canfield stated to me that the Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) had evaluated the HRT in May, 1984, and sent a report to Chief Gates. He further stated that in April, 1984 he, Bob Canfield, was hired to implement the 19 recommendations of the PAC. He stated he "made an effort to have meetings and so forth with the Captain but it didn't work".

In February, 1988, at the LAPD Academy, Deputy Chief Rathburn stated to me "Back East you have your scum, niggers, but here we have worse scum than niggers, the hispanics".

On 11/22/88 at midday at the LAPD Academy I made a proposal to Captain Mitchell of a plan to evaluate and improve the human relations training to address racism (see J5 and J9 of attachments). Captain Mitchell refused to give permission for the plan.

On 10/21/88 during the midday period I made an offer to provide the LAPD a free source of affirmative action advertisement. Captain Mitchell rejected the offer.

On 10/26/88 while observing a human relations class at the LAPD Academy I observed Officer Davis state to the class that, in regard to the LAPD policy of racial and sexual epithets, "Believe it or not I am one of the worst offenders".

Throughout the period I was employed as the LAPD Training Administrator Captain Carley Mitchell prevented me from implementing research, planning, and programs designed to address racism. Those matters are discussed in Chapter Three and in the secondary document (FOOTNOTE 1) to be mailed to the Christopher Commission.

CHAPTER TWO: SEXISM

On 10/26/88, during the day, while observing a human relations class at the LAPD Academy I observed Officer Davis state that his partner was "gay", and referred to him as "Officer Faggot", but said the remark was a "joke". This was discussed at the time with Dr. Tom Kerz of the Academy.

On 10/26/88, in the late afternoon after a day of human relations training, at the LAPD Academy I observed Officer Davis summarize by dealing only with the matter of gays and lesbians. He gave an illustration from his experience of handling a domestic matter at the home of four professional women who were lesbians. He stated he had addressed them directly as "girls".

CHAPTER THREE: RESISTANCE TO IMPROVEMENT IN HUMAN RELATIONS

Section 1: THE TA ROLE DEFINED

The TA role is described by the Civil Service Commission as "Plans, develops, reviews and coordinates and administrates training policies..." . It requires a "doctorate degree..." .

The chain of command upward was Capt. Mitchell, Dept. Chief Kroeker, Asst. Chief Brewer, and Chief Gates.

Had the writer been willing to acquiesce to a non-critical and unquestioning role within the LAPD, ignoring the job description requirements, the TA position would have continued. Rather, after the writer's 9/1/88 report on the role of the TA all such work was "on-hold". Once ended, the TA position was not reconsidered until the recent events involving public scrutiny of the department and its policies. It has not been filled.

As it became apparent the LAPD administration would not allow the TA to function as defined in the job description, a series of meetings were held involving Dr. Neil Sandberg and the writer. Dr. Sandberg served as Chair of the L.A.P.D. Academy Professional Advisory Committee (PAC).

Dr. Sandberg bluntly told the writer that should an attempt be made to deal with the issues discussed in this report, the writer "might be fired". Yet, the two individuals agreed that the writer would attempt to bring matters of concern into the open, as outlined in the strategy discussed below.

It was decided that to be best received by the LAPD administration questions of non-utilization of the TA should be broached not by the writer, but by Dr. Sandberg. This was carried out at the 5/3/88 PAC meeting, involving a directive to the writer to provide an analysis of the TA role. That directive resulted in the writer's 9/1/88 memo (appendix F), and was followed by the memo of Dr. Rose Clayton and Mr. Bob Jones (appendix I). These actions were followed by the directive from Capt. Mitchell that all TA role functions were "on hold, do nothing else" and ultimately, the end of the position.

As the Clayton/Jones memo was made available to the LAPD administration, it seems unlikely responsible individuals in the chain of command, including Chief Gates, could have avoided knowing of the issues herein discussed.

~~~~~  
 Section 2: THE EXPERIENCES OF THE  
 LAPD TA.  
 ~~~~~

The experiences of the TA are outlined in the memo to Chief Gates. Although the writer requested to meet with Chief Gates regarding this matter, such a meeting was not allowed.

A later memo to Chief Gates requesting explanations for the termination of the post and a request that relevant individuals be called together so that the questions raised by the writer might be answered was also unanswered (appendix G).

Some documents from the TA file, including some of the typed notes of the meetings with Capt. Mitchell, disappeared. Yet, much original documentation of the events described herein is attached within the supplemental report. Events contributing to the end of the TA position are categorized below.

Rejection of involvement with religious and cultural minorities:
 Dr. Neil Sandberg provided the writer with the names of the leaders of the Asian churches in Los Angeles. A meeting was held at the writer's suggestion with those persons in an effort to involve them in the planning of the human relation training (2). Contact was made with the LAPD unit in Chinatown for the same purpose. Capt. Mitchell ordered that such contacts be stopped.

One of the few instances of a written response to a proposal involved a suggestion that sources addressing minority and female issues be targeted for recruitment (appendix M). Capt. Mitchell indicated the LAPD did not have funds for such.

One of the more unprofessional attempts to discourage the writer's efforts involved Capt. Mitchell's "counseling session". The chastisement involved the writer's misuse of proper format for letters (nothing had been explained regarding such) and the request that Dr. Robert Bing (a criminologist of Afro-American decent) coauthor an essay contest paper concerning "the contribution of police to the improvement of black and white relations in the United States". Had a prize been awarded the funds to be used to help support the TA educational effort. Capt. Mitchell reprimanded the writer for considering such (appendix F). The writer used his own personal money to establish such a fund (see below).

Material on how to deal with sexism and racism was distributed by the writer (appendix P). Capt. Mitchell indicated such was not appropriate actions for the TA.

The writer informed Capt. Mitchell of the pragmatic aspects of better human relations training and the need for research into both the nature of the human relations training techniques and the impact of such training. Proposals to research such matters and to have an impact on socialization procedures, formal and informal, by training officers on recruits after the recruits left the academy were not approved by Capt. Mitchell (3).

Human relations training classes observed by the writer involved racial and sexual "jokes" and derogatory stereotypes. It was unlikely to have significantly increased the sensitivity of recruits for minorities.

Rejection of efforts to interact with POST: The writer was allowed to go only to meetings assigned by Capt. Mitchell. Requests were made but no assignments to POST occurred. Thus, at a meeting with Asst. Chief Vernon a request was made for the writer to accompany the LAPD's representative to POST to the POST meetings. Asst. Chief Vernon did not respond to this request.

The Keller Plan rejected: As early as the interview stage of the writer's involvement with the LAPD academy, the Keller Plan of instruction was suggested as a potential valuable consideration for recruit training (appendix D). The American Educational Research Association reported:

"The single most significant conclusion to be reached from research on innovative teaching methods in higher education is that the Keller Plan is clearly superior to other methods which it has been compared. Indeed, the Keller Plan has been so consistently found superior that it must rank as the method with the greatest research support in the history of research on teaching" (Dunkin, 1986, page 759).

It was the intent of the writer to develop a Scientific Advisory Committee for the Academy to include scientists in the LA community familiar with the Keller Plan. Capt. Mitchell would not allow this to take the form even of discussion with an internal LAPD committee of relevant personnel.

LAPD involvement with professional associations: An attempt to involve Academy personnel with such as the American Society of Law Enforcement Trainers (ASLET) was rejected by Capt. Mitchell (appendix N). Capt. Mitchell rejected the writer's proposal that Academy personnel co-author papers for publication in such as the ASLET newsletter.

Interaction with police recruits contained and curtailed: A request was made to have recruits assigned to the TA's office during the time they were, by reasons of injury, unable to participate in the regular program. Such recruits were regularly assigned to other offices. The request was denied. The request was made again in regard to Officer Ron Calhoun, who was proficient in computer technology. This was approved but with the clear stipulation that the TA was not allowed to interact with the recruit in regard to anything other than computer matters.

Trained in psychodrama as a Federal Probation and Parole Officer, the writer proposed that the Situation Simulations ("Sit Sims") could be improved and expanded by the use of such techniques. This would have allowed a full range of simulation exercises covering the entire criminal justice process, missing from the "sit sims" used at the Academy at that time. No planning, discussion, or action followed the writer's proposal (appendix Q).

The door to the TA office was kept open to encourage students and officers to interact with the writer. However, the writer was told by Capt. Mitchell to keep the door shut. Also, the writer's proposal that the TA serve as an academic advisor for all students enrolled in educational programs was rejected.

Capt. Mitchell curtailed the writer's efforts to expand LAPD officers educational opportunities. The writer's efforts to secure additional scholarships for LAPD personnel and to become involved in the assignment of existing scholarships was terminated by Capt. Mitchell.

Rejection of research and planning efforts: Involvement of the TA function with the Research and Planning unit through Officer Bruce Biersborn was rejected by Capt. Mitchell. Research efforts were "stonewalled" even to the point of data collection for a study of how to help recruit classes at the Academy study more efficiently. Also, attempts to plan ways for the recruits to meet at libraries for group study when not at the academy was rejected by Capt. Mitchell (appendix Q).

At the job interview, Asst. Chief Dotson had clearly stated that the TA was expected to be involved in planning for the "police academy of the future". Yet, Capt. Mitchell prevented any such planning. Requests by the writer to attend meetings and conferences specifically dealing with such planning, including the LAPD academy planning committee, were not allowed.

A memo to Police Commissioner Schlei advising her of a conference relevant to a proposal she had made was sent to Sergeant Dalton with a request that it be forwarded to Commissioner Schlei. Capt. Mitchell instructed the writer not to communicate with her (appendix Q).

After the first PAC meeting, Capt. Mitchell directed the writer not to participate in the discussions, but to sit in silence.

A Training Division project was sent to the TA asking that an analysis of educational data be performed. When Capt. Mitchell learned of this assignment the writer was told not to comply with the directive and to take no action (appendix Q).

Capt. Mitchell gave his approval for the writer to chair a Training Development Group (TDG). That group developed changes in the instructor and recruit assessment instruments, a project begun by Lt. Carlson prior to the writer's arrival. Capt. Mitchell allowed the TDG to request permission of Officer Foote to use part of a Bulletin Board to post training hints. Capt. Mitchell exercised veto power over the material.

The writer attempted to establish a Task Force on Training Techniques to be composed of Lt. Nick Bakay, Commander Chat Spencer, Commander Larry Kramer, Sgt. Sam Barber, Commander J.C. Chambers, and Sgt. Bruce Siersborn. At about the time this proposal was being developed, Sgt. Sam Barber reported that Lt. Motle and Capt. Mitchell had approved Sgt. Barber moving into the TA office. Upon the recommendation of Sgt. Barber that the Task Force proposal would create problems and the Training Development Group (already in existence) was a better mechanism, the Task Force plan was put aside. The Task Force would have revealed the pattern of suppression of the TA activities; the TDG did not.

The writer proposed a Scientific Advisory Committee composed of scientists, local and national. The plan was rejected.

At the job interview computer modeling of the police function was identified as a desirable TA project. Capt. Mitchell rejected requests to develop this productive planning method.

Withholding of resources: Upon arrival the writer was assigned by Capt. Mitchell "to the curriculum unit". That placement, apart from the significance of its location and its inconsistency with the job description, did not provide the resources needed to carry out the TA function.

The writer bought with personal funds computer equipment for the TA's office. It was necessary to protect that equipment from water flowing through the roof with a makeshift indoor tent. The request for computer equipment through city purchase or confiscated items from drug offenders was never implemented.

The writer had to secure for himself plywood, cement block, and milk cartons (discards, from the Academy grounds) to serve as bookcases. It was decided the PAC would meet in the TA "office" in order to see it first hand. One of the PAC members observed the TA could not even make a private telephone call. A photograph of those office conditions is attached (appendix J). Following that meeting of the PAC committee, a secretary was assigned and an office provided. No other personnel, as specified in the job description, were provided.

The writer requested permission for student interns to serve at the Academy from the Departments of Criminal Justice at local universities. The request went unheeded.

Ostracization; withholding of information and of participation:

The writer was assigned to work on ways to better schedule recruit classes. Later, Capt. Mitchell and Lt. Jefferson visited the Sheriff's academy to review their scheduling arrangements. Capt. Mitchell did not include or inform the writer of the trip or of information secured from that contact (appendix P).

Only one faculty meeting was called by Capt. Mitchell during the time the writer worked at the Academy. At that single meeting Capt. Mitchell made only passing reference to the new TA position or to the writer.

No effort was made by Capt. Mitchell to systematically introduce the writer to the faculty and support staff of the Academy. The writer was denied by Capt. Mitchell the right to call faculty meetings.

The writer's secretary indicated that she was ostracized by other Academy clerical staff. Such was consistent with the nonverbal communications received by the writer. Also, persons calling the Academy for the TA were presented with a derogatory image of the TA Office and the writer by the personnel answering the "front office" telephone. This was reported by Mr. Ralph DeGutis.

Shortly after being hired, the writer was directed by Capt. Mitchell's adjutant to write a news release regarding the new TA post. The news release was given to Capt. Mitchell and was never used (appendix K).

Meetings between Capt. Mitchell and the writer were typically in Capt. Mitchell's office or the Coffee Shop, and the two were typically alone. Capt. Mitchell came to the TA's office only once.

Uncooperative environment: Numerous documents that might have served as a model for "research and development" operations were submitted to Capt. Mitchell for discussion purposes. Such was consistent with the planning of the "police academy of the future". Rather than being used as a springboard for discussion, analysis and planning, they were returned without comment.

Offers made to Capt. Mitchell to coauthor papers with the writer were rejected. This included a paper for which a request for cooperative action from another law enforcement agency had been received in Chief Rathburn's office (appendix H).

Direct intimidation: On two occasions LAPD officers attempted to physically intimidate the writer. One officer was a physical training officer; the other was Sergeant Sam Barber. The TA parking sign was ripped from concrete and torn in half.

The writer was told that his only (this was clear, his ONLY) task at the Academy was to make Capt. Mitchell "look good". In one such meeting, Capt. Mitchell told the writer he (the writer) may as well "commit suicide" as cross Capt. Mitchell.

The intimidating implications of this were obvious and clear. The writer brought out these matters in the meeting with Lt. Lee and Capt. Mitchell. There was no denial that the statements were made. These events were discussed with Dr. Sandberg.

Written records of Mitchell/Adams meetings - All topics: After some meetings the writer dictated a record of the discussion. Relevant information from those notes remaining is paraphrased below (appendix V).

1/22/88 At the time of the employment interview the writer scheduled an appointment with Capt. Mitchell. Although he was not part of the interview team he was CO of the Academy. When the writer arrived at the Academy, Capt. Mitchell was gone.

The writer suggested greater involvement with the Behavioral Science Unit, but nothing came of that. The approach to program evaluation described in Patton (1978) was discussed, but Capt. Mitchell did not cooperate.

The Keller Plan (PSI), which students prefer over other methods and which offers a much higher level of mastery of the material than recruits were at that time achieving at the Academy, was discussed. Capt. Mitchell would not cooperate in the proposed deliberation with others concerning the possible use of PSI.

Psychodrama techniques as part of the role playing of situations were suggested. Capt. Mitchell never allowed it to be discussed in a suitable forum.

Suggestions were made for additions or changes in the recruit curriculum and for in-service training. Nothing was allowed in regard to such suggestions.

The use of the TA as the academic advisor for LAPD officers enrolled in college curricula was suggested. Capt. Mitchell did not allow for sufficient contact between the TA and the LAPD force for such to become a viable operation.

The writer asked to be allowed to help with the recruitment of minorities. One of Capt. Mitchell's few written comments, to this and presumably the entire memo was simply "No" (appendix V).

2-21-88 The agenda for this meeting indicates a wide range of TA suggestions, none of which were allowed to develop. The request for participation with POST was denied.

The writer requested increased interaction with Capt. Mitchell. Capt. Mitchell agreed that the writer could join him for breakfast in the Academy coffee shop every two weeks, but only if there was no agenda and if Capt. Mitchell was notified in advance.

Other suggestions, such as attempts to secure LAPD scholarships from colleges and for research grant proposals co-authored by Capt. Mitchell and the writer were rejected.

April, 1988 San Diego Meeting After the San Diego meeting, at which the writer made a presentation regarding the US Army study of learning techniques, Capt. Mitchell told the writer the only role of the TA was to make the Capt. look good and that Capt. Mitchell had a clear and unambiguous veto over everything the writer might do. Following this the writer's assignment was changed from the curriculum unit to Lt. Paul Jefferson.

11/21/88 The writer continues to propose program evaluation research and other items previously requested as planning matters. To no avail, such matters are given no answer and no action ever occurs.

Of particular importance at this meeting is the plan by the University of California at Irvine and Riverside to develop a new center for research into criminal justice. The writer suggested he be allowed to investigate a possible involvement by the LAPD into that proposed Center, but the request was denied.

11-22-88 By November the writer had begun to experience significant frustration. Requests to meet with Capt. Mitchell and higher ranking LAPD officers were denied. Capt. Mitchell assured the writer that Dept. Chief Kroeker was fully advised of the developments with the TA and that higher ranking officers (including Chief Gates) were taking the writer's complaints under consideration. (PAC meeting minutes indicate that Dept. Chief Kroeker denied being involved with the operation of the TA post).

11-28-88 The writer again requests meetings with the "High Command". Capt. Mitchell assures the writer that the "High Command" will indicate when we are to meet and until then we are to do nothing.

Undated Research indicated that small children would experience less stress if the officer provided the child a "teddy bear". Each patrol car was provided with a teddy bear. A suggestion that we consider reporting such research to other parts of the department evoked laughter from Capt. Mitchell.

The only other subject to evoke such a response, in the form of derision (but not laughter) concerned the implications of research findings about women as police officers. It was suggested that the recruitment of more female officers might have the effect of reducing violence in confrontational situations and produce a long term positive alteration in the nature of the police force. Nothing came of such suggestions.

Efforts to reconcile differences: The effort to implement the TA position was done within the formal "chain of command" and consistent with the formal expectations and protocol of the LAPD culture.

Numerous efforts were made to alert responsible parties of the containment, indeed, the ultimate sabotage of the project. Meetings were held with Dr. Neil Sandberg with relevant officers and other professional persons within the LAPD for the explicit purpose of communication through the informal communications network that the conditions described herein were operative and destructive. As one example, Lt. Nick Bakay and Sgt. Mark Savalla assisted the writer in the writing of the 9/1/88 PAC memo and offered advice on appropriate strategy.

Advice and counsel was secured from Mr. Tom Hood of the California POST, Dr. Harry Allen, a respected criminologist, and others including respected criminologists from the local community.

Capt. Mitchell often stated to the writer that his contacts and his relationship with Chief Gates were close and personal. The implication of these repeated statements was that Chief Gates knew and approved of Capt. Mitchell's actions. Capt. Mitchell stated to the writer that "The Chief would never allow a civilian to run this Academy".

Continued efforts to assist LAPD after TA position abolished: The writer's purchase of a computer for use by the LAPD personnel is cited above. Moreover, in order to expedite LAPD personnel's access to U.S. Government documents, the writer established an account with the U.S. Government Printing Office (Account Number 114454-2) with his personal funds for LAPD personnel. Thus, those officers had access to that fund at no expense to themselves, other than the expectation that funds used would be replaced. Even after the TA position was terminated, that account was kept open without change (appendix T).

Formal meetings and communication with High Command: A formal meeting was held with Asst. Chief Brewer at which time the entire circumstances involving the matters outlined in this report were made clear (appendix L). At the first of the presentation Asst. Chief Brewer appeared hostile. By the end of the meeting his demeanor was more receptive.

Asst. Chief Brewer's written response indicated information was withheld from him and that he directed that "... a number of issues raised by you have been examined". Further, it is made clear that the action to end the position was not "necessarily a criticism of your performance" (referring to the performance of the writer and consistent with the PAC appraisal). Finally, it is clear that the decision to end the program was a decision made by Chief Daryl Gates (Appendix G).

Asst. Chief Brewer was told that Capt. Mitchell called the writer after the hiring but before the position had begun. In that conversation Capt. Mitchell stated to the writer that "We will not get along". Thus, an interpretation of the events described herein as simply a "personality conflict" is not founded in fact.

Following the review of these circumstances, Capt. Mitchell was transferred to a high crime command post as Commander of a line division. Chief Brewer retired. Capt. Mitchell retired.