

1947

Ethics in Police Service

Don L. Kooken

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Don L. Kooken, Ethics in Police Service, 38 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 172 (1947-1948)

This Criminology is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

ETHICS IN POLICE SERVICE

Don L. Kooken

In this issue we present the second and concluding portion of Captain Kooken's thought provoking article on a code of police ethics. If the police service is to become a profession as its present day leaders hope, many reforms are needed. Captain Don L. Kooken, who is Acting Director of the Institute of Criminal Law Administration of Indiana University and an Associate Editor of this Journal, has clearly pointed out the way in this fundamental discussion of the police service.—
EDITOR.

(Continued from the May-June Issue)

ABUSES OF AUTHORITY

Early in the development of police service lawmakers recognized the necessity of granting power to policemen beyond their inherent rights as citizens in order that they would be able to act effectively in discharging their duties. Accordingly, power and authority commensurate with their responsibilities were vested in them by law. The lawmakers recognized the fact that unless policemen were exempted from obedience to certain laws and regulations they would be seriously encumbered in the effective discharge of their duties. The exemptions were specifically provided for, however, for the reason that the lawmakers were aware of the danger of abuses of power involved in granting blanket privileges or powers to public offices. The public has not been so discriminating in its consideration of the situation and has gone well beyond the law in excusing policemen from full obedience to regulatory measures.

The liberal interpretation that the public has placed upon the right of police officers to disobey the law has been motivated in part by public confidence in law enforcement and in the sincere desire of the public to assist the police in every way in the performance of their duties. Most citizens are not interested in the technicalities of law enforcement and are ignorant of the legal limitations that are placed upon the authority of policemen. Most citizens are inclined to look upon policemen not so much as representatives of government and agents of law enforcement but more in the light of policemen being the law in themselves. It is a regrettable fact that because citizens generally are unaware of the limitations placed by law upon policemen, that many policemen assume rights that they do not legally possess.

Policemen are in a position of constant temptation to use their real or pseudo authority to their own personal advantage. To succumb to the temptation is a most reprehensible breach of public trust. There are innumerable instances whereby reason of the subtlety of the temptation, policemen, innocent of ulterior motive, find themselves in most embarrassing or compromising positions. The American people are an appreciative and generous people. They like to demonstrate their appreciation in a substantial and public fashion. It obviously follows that when policemen in the performance of their duties, render valuable services to citizens, it is only natural that the citizens will attempt to reward the policemen in some manner. We do not deny that commendation, recognition, and reward have definite value as morale incentives, but, if we reflect upon the fact that policemen are duty bound to render services daily that represent distinct value to specific citizens, then it is not difficult to perceive the implications. If policemen are permitted to accept these material tokens of appreciation from the public in recognition of duties well performed over a period of time, they will come to expect extra remuneration for the normal performance of duty.

Most policemen recognize no wrong in accepting free admissions to public entertainment, discounts on their purchases, special favors and considerations from persons of influence, or tips and gratuities for services performed in the line of their regular duty. They choose to look upon these incidents as being strictly personal matters between themselves and the donors and are unwilling to recognize the fact that moral obligations are involved. They are naive indeed to believe that their authority was not an influencing factor in the matter.

No matter how much effort is expended to minimize the derogatory effect of the acceptance of gratuities and favors by law enforcement officers the practice has become so prevalent that the public generally concede that policemen are the world's greatest "moochers". Aside from the question of the effect of the practice upon the officer's effectiveness in enforcing the law, it is a certainty that a reputation for "mooching" does not elevate the standards of the profession in the public's mind.

Many police administrators see no harm in permitting policemen to accept gratuities and favors, but in localities where this practice has been condoned over long periods of time policemen have not been content with accepting gratuities and favors but actively solicit them. It is but a short step then to the use of their authority to expedite compliance with their solicitations.

In many jurisdictions "mooching" has become a lucrative "racket", an activity that is equally as costly to the public and as vicious as the well organized racketeering activities of the criminal bands. In the one instance the citizen is forced into compliance with the racketeer's demand by reason of the threat of physical violence at the hands of the criminal; in the other instance, if he fails to comply, he is faced with the proposition of prosecution on trumped up charges of violation of obscure laws or ordinances.

A mid-western newspaper recently reported that the Yule spirit of policemen had reached a point where taverns in that city were almost forced to close. Squads of policemen, the tavern owners said, were ranging in droves demanding "What's Santa Claus giving away this year." License owners emphasized that some largesse to policemen on the beat is to be expected at Yuletide, "But what are you going to do when they come from all over—guys we never saw before" said one. One tavern reported 72 bottles had been given away by 4 P. M., and other estimates ran from 39 to 200. In some instances the tavern owners reported that the police officers bothered the customers when their demands were refused.⁴

A most reprehensible practice that is quite prevalent in the police service and one that is usually condoned by the police administrator is found in the improper use of informers or "stool pigeons" in securing evidence of criminal violations. In most instances the motives of informers are purely mercenary, and their veracity generally is so unreliable that their information is of questionable value. The fact that an informer stands to gain financially by bringing in the kind of information that he believes the policemen wants, coupled with the fact that his sense of moral value is usually questionable, tends to nullify their information. The most objectionable practice, though, in the use of informers is that of condoning or actually protecting criminal activities of the informer for indefinite periods of time in return for his promise to turn in information relating to the activities of other criminals. Usually the violations that are turned in under such agreements are but minor ones, and are far short of measuring up to the opportunities for criminal gain afforded the informer by the immunity from police molestation guaranteed by the police themselves. Not only does the protected informer stand to gain from his unmolested illegal activities, but very often by gaining the confidence of the police officers with whom he works the informer is

⁴ Detroit Free Press, December, 1946.

in an advantageous position to sell real information of the activities of the police to other criminal gangs.

Another prominent factor in destroying public confidence in police service and in creating disrespect for law enforcement arises from special privileges granted to favored individuals by those who are charged with impartial administration of the law. This is a dereliction of duty and responsibility that is not confined to police service alone, but is found in all levels of authoritative government from the highest to the lowest. The police, of course, cannot be held accountable for the mal-functioning in the upper levels of government, but they most certainly are responsible for the obnoxious practices that occur within their own sphere of authority and control. The practice by law enforcement officers of extending special privileges to violate the law and immunities from arrest to favored persons because of friendliness, favors to be expected, or by reason of other involved obligations has contributed greatly to the general disrespect of law in America. The condition is made more insidious by reason of the facts that the recipients of the privileges and immunities are usually persons of positions and influence who should set the example for law obedience. They are the persons who are quick to demand the strict obedience to law by the less fortunate, and they possess the power to constitute a real threat to the public officer who has the courage to defy them.

One form of police racketeering that is particularly objectionable is found in the sale of advertising in "Police Annuals". Many police departments officially permit annuals to be published with the provision that the proceeds from their publication accrue to the police pension fund. The objection to this practice lies in the fact that the major portion of the advertising is solicited from persons who are engaged in activities of a questionable nature or that are subject to considerable police supervision, and though the cost of their advertisements ostensibly represents a contribution to an honorable and charitable cause (the rates being entirely out of line with any real advertising value), the contribution in fact implies a purchase of protection for their questionable practices.

Other variations of the racket are found in Police Benefit Balls and other police sponsored gatherings, where admission charges are involved and where the charitable disposition of proceeds are alleged. The usual practice in these instances is to dispose of tickets far in excess of the actual accommodations of the gathering, by the simple expedient of delivering books of ten, twenty, or even larger numbers of tickets to all the persons

engaged in questionable activities with the statement, "Here is your share of the tickets for this event." This technique is identical with methods perfected by Al Capone in the distribution of bootleg liquor stocks.

The corruption of policemen often begins with obligations that are innocently acquired; involvements that have come upon them subtly. Clever criminals fully aware of the weaknesses of man recognize that the most powerful motive of human behavior is the desire to be of importance. They know too that men will vigorously defend themselves against loss of face. Crooks will use the techniques developed in confidence games to play upon the vanity of policemen whom they hope to corrupt. Working subtly and by the most indirect routes the policeman is maneuvered into a position where he will accept a gift or favor without knowing the real identity of the donor at the time. Once the initial step is taken the policemen rapidly becomes more seriously involved. It is but a short step until he is faced with the choice of corrupting his office to the benefit of the criminal, or publically accept responsibility for his past indiscretions.

Another form of corrupt practice that has brought much discredit upon the police profession is involved in the attempts of police administrators to appease one pressure group without incurring the disfavor of the opposing group. This practice is usually found in the enforcement of anti-gambling or other vice laws. For example, when laxity of enforcement of vice laws in a jurisdiction has brought sufficient pressure upon the police service that immediate action is imperative, the police heads order the raiding of gambling establishments, but abuses of police authority will be deliberately made in the procedure under which the raids are conducted. In this manner, the anti-gambling pressure groups are momentarily appeased, and some time later when the cases are brought to trial, they will be dismissed because of the illegality of arrests, thus no great harm befalls the violators. The real responsibility in practices of this character rests squarely upon the shoulders of the police heads. Nevertheless, the police officer who willingly enters into the illegal action is also responsible.

The prevailing habit of policemen seizing upon every opportunity to use their official positions for mercenary gain leads them into practices that are even more discreditable than their "mooching" proclivities. Included in this category of irregularities are many instances where police officers who investigate traffic accidents involving commercial vehicles, appropriate to

their personal use merchandise salvaged from the wreck. In many other instances officers serving search warrants upon illegally operated establishments will carry away and convert to their own use personal property that is not included in the contraband listed in the search warrant.

Abuses of authority are not confined to the official activities of policemen but are often detected in his private undertakings. Outside businesses or occupations of policemen often influence or limit their effectiveness in the discharge of their public obligations. Instances are of record where policemen have used their official positions to the direct benefit of private business or undertakings in which they may be interested.

TRAINING

Versatility is necessary to success in police service. More professional techniques are involved in modern police science than in probably any other field of endeavor. Policemen are challenged at every turn to render skilled services to the public. In a routine day a policeman may have to render first aid to an injured motorist, deliver a safety address, trail and apprehend a dangerous criminal, convince a runaway boy of the error of his ways, assist in the prosecution of a criminal case—these and many more are the abilities that the public confidently expects of policemen. Ideally, policemen must have some of the knowledges and skills of the lawyer, doctor, and the engineer; they must possess the endurance of an athlete; have the insight of the sociologist and psychologist and the compassion of a minister. They must present resolute, dynamic personalities particularly characterized by magnanimity.

Proper training is an important responsibility of the police profession and involves careful consideration of the quality of training and a close attention to the need for continuous training and research to keep abreast with the demands arising from the complex occurrences in our social development. The full liberality of education must be preserved, and the police profession should in no way seek to dominate the field of police training. On the contrary, it should encourage the development of police training in our institutions of learning and should insist that the standards of these courses are maintained at a true professional level. In-service or refresher training is a direct responsibility of the profession and of necessity must be carried out within the profession, but should be geared to the preparatory training programs of our institutions of learn-

ing in order that effective interchange may be effected throughout the profession. The full facilities of our universities and colleges should be used both in preparatory and in-service police training.

Proper training and research will do much to ease many of the problems of cooperation that are so troublesome to law enforcement today. For many years bar associations and the judiciary have sought constructive reforms in the machinery of prosecutions, in the constitution of courts, and in criminal procedure. Progress has been slow, so slow at times to be discouraging; but with the rapid infiltration into the law enforcement field of carefully selected and highly trained policemen, it is believed that impetus will be given to this effort. Instead of the unjust criticism of the courts and the law that has been so common in the past, properly trained policemen are competent to recognize the common interest of the problems and are eager in their desire to cooperate in the solution. Intelligent analysis of the problems, made in the light of the viewpoint of the law enforcement officer, should be a valuable aid to the bench and the bar in their diligent efforts to bring about the much needed reforms.

Proper training is bringing about a marked improvement in the relationship of the police service with the public. For many years the public generally looked upon the police service as a necessary evil. Police work was condoned as a necessary defense against the incursions of the anti-social. Policemen were looked upon as doorkeepers to the social habitation, stationed at its portals to keep off intruders, but excluded from enjoying the activities within. This relationship has undergone a decided change as trained policemen, alert to the value of public relations, have encouraged the public in becoming better informed on the many activities of policemen that are not so directly associated with the activities of criminals. A more intelligent appreciation of police service has evolved, and policemen have renewed interest in such subjects as courtesy, community responsibilities, and other public relations subjects.

The field of research offers almost unlimited possibilities for the trained police officer. There is not a single phase of police service that does not hold out alluring possibilities of exploration. In the problem of traffic control alone there are unlimited opportunities for research students to profitably apply their effort.

Education is so important to the solution of the problems of human relationships that the blame for nearly all of the im-

proper and objectionable practices of law enforcement officers can be placed, fundamentally at least, upon a lack of proper training. Many of these mal-functions of law enforcement and incidents of unethical conduct of law enforcement agents can be directly attributed to inadequate educational preparation for the work.

On many occasions prosecutors are confronted with acquittals in criminal cases because policemen who make the investigations are not reliable, and the fundamental reason for their unreliability is their ignorance—ignorance of the exacting rules of evidence, of the necessity for continuity of custody of physical evidence, and lack of familiarity with criminal procedure; all of these are contributing factors in the acquittals. The lack of proper training and not being equipped to effectively discharge their duties is directly responsible for the loss of many criminal cases. In many instances, however, the officers whose very inadequacies are responsible for the dismissal or loss of a case will publicly criticize the prosecutor or court or both and will charge them with failure to properly present or evaluate the evidence. In some jurisdictions the unwarranted public criticism of courts, prosecutors, and other law enforcement agencies by policemen who are ignorant of their own shortcomings has seriously disrupted proper cooperation. In most of these instances, thorough inquiry will disclose that the misunderstandings causing the friction would never have occurred if the police had better understood the full responsibilities of government.

The failure of law enforcement in many localities can, in most instances, be traced to failures on the part of the rank and file of police organizations to recognize their basic responsibilities in crime prevention. They fail to realize that crime is caused by a complex of related influences and that a program of crime suppression alone cannot effectively meet the need. They are in utter confusion as to what measures can be relied upon to produce results. It is surprising how many policemen still cling to the age-old fallacy that teeth in the law is the only effective deterrent to crime. Thus because of a lack of understanding of fundamental principles, when sudden waves of criminal offenses break out, they are met with hysteria instead of an intelligent analysis of their causation. As a result of misunderstanding of cause and ignorance of proper method of correction, crime drives are launched, criminals are rounded up and charged, not with the crimes for which they may be guilty, but on trumped up charges of vagrancy or disorderly conduct. Many poor unfortunates whose only crimes were that of being unable to satisfactorily

explain their presence on the street are sent to jail, all because the police services were unable to meet a difficult situation intelligently.

COOPERATION

The importance of cooperation in law enforcement cannot be over-emphasized. The rapid expansion of community horizons and the ever widening sphere of individual influence has greatly intensified the necessity for unrestricted cooperation among all agencies charged with the administration of the criminal law.

The speed of transportation and its availability to the masses has been an important factor in extending the perimeter of community influence and has contributed greatly to the difficulties of speedy criminal apprehensions. Within the span of a single lifetime we have witnessed the extension of community horizons from the confines of counties to areas of national extent, and with the present promising developments of high speed air transportation in the very near future the scope of individual influence may soon become world wide.

During the period of community expansion the territorial jurisdictions of law enforcement officers remained unchanged. Jurisdictions that were fixed by laws enacted in the horse and buggy days limit the areas within which policemen may freely exercise their authority. The officer's problems are made still more troublesome by reason of the fact that many of the laws he is required to administer are also products of the horse and buggy era and are presently inadequate or at least cumbersome and difficult of enforcement. Some assistance has appeared in new laws designed to simplify the problem, but there is still much to be desired. Interstate operations of criminals are commonplace today and involve many violations that fall within the jurisdiction of both Federal and State authority. Criminal methods too have grown more complex by reason of the broader areas involved, thus adding more complexities to the problems of detection and apprehension.

The police service cannot arbitrarily cast aside the jurisdictional restrictions that have been placed upon them by law, nor can they shirk their immediate responsibility by obstinately insisting that the law should be changed. The law may limit their jurisdiction, but there are no territorial limits placed upon their moral responsibilities. The fact remains that policemen can effectively meet the changing condition if they will permit their professional interests to expand into an area of influence that will keep well abreast that of the communities. The police profession must be willing to discard the old horse and buggy

concepts of localized responsibility and wholeheartedly accept the proposition that an unsolved crime in San Francisco is not alone the responsibility of the San Francisco Police Department, but is a national police responsibility, one that is important to every law enforcement agency in the United States. The police profession must forever discard the traditional practice of retiring behind the walls of their own bailiwick and lending a helping hand to those outside their citadel only when there is reasonable assurance of receiving public credit for their participation. The prevailing practice of using legal jurisdictional restrictions as an alibi for failure to cooperate must forever be ended.

Satisfactory progress can be made in the fight to suppress crime if real cooperation is effected among all law enforcement bodies. Cooperation is defined as "association for common benefit." It is obvious then that real cooperation cannot be attained if selfish interests are allowed to enter. True cooperation is team work and necessitates full recognition and acceptance of its implications by all the agencies of law enforcement. No agency can claim to be cooperating if it remains only on the receiving end; it must give as well as receive. True cooperation involves a unity of purpose and coordination of effort that is founded upon a sincere desire to heed the common interests of all.

Cooperation is more than promises, it is more than the announcement of programs or plans of coordination, it is more than holding conferences accompanied by back slappings and oratorical pronouncements, and it is more than public pledges and agreements to present a united front. Cooperation is the translation of the principles of good teamwork into definite and continuous action. It is an inescapable fact that the principles that bring about cooperation deal with simple, elemental considerations of harmonious relationships.

The problem of obtaining cooperation in law enforcement is a complex and troublesome task. There is no simple formula or master plan that can be brought to bear upon the situation, nor is there a compulsory authority that can be evoked. Its solution can only be reached by mutual willingness of law enforcement leaders to accept their responsibility in the matter, and to play their part on the team to the limit of their ability.

The greatest bar to achievement in this direction is the petty professional jealousies that permeate the very fabric of law enforcement effort. The blame for this condition primarily rests with the administrators, the heads of enforcement departments, who by compulsion implied in political expediency or by personal

design, give first consideration to credit and notoriety. They become so engrossed in accumulating credit and building personal reputations that their departmental policies reflect their attitude and the policies and concepts of the leaders are in turn definitely reflected in the action of the rank and file. Jealousies of reputation and bickering over publicity exists not only among law enforcement agencies but is particularly common among members within the same department. In many police departments the jealousies arising between detectives and members of the uniformed division have become so intense that cooperation has been as effectively blocked as would be the case if an insurmountable wall had been constructed between the two functional divisions. A condition is frequently found in the investigation of singularly important crimes where two or more separate agencies are engaged, and each one will be bending every effort to prevent the other from having access to the facts that it has uncovered. Many examples of lack of cooperation between policemen and between police agencies could be recorded, but they are so commonplace that they need little exposition. The fact that is to be emphasized is that they invariably involve the same motivating factor, namely desire for credit and notoriety.

Police administrators, when brought to task for permitting petty jealousies within their departments to block effective enforcement activities, are quick to place the blame upon politics. They will readily admit the condition but will cry, "What can we do about it?" They may be correct in the assumption that political intervention is a serious obstacle in the administration of their department, but in their willingness to adopt the defeatist role they openly admit their own unwillingness to accept their full responsibility to society. The supreme need of law enforcement today is for leadership—leadership that is characterized by vision, understanding, unselfishness, and determination. Police service needs men in high places who will not brook defeat but who go on fighting for ideals with a faith that cannot be shaken. It is a basic responsibility of the real leaders in police service to convince the political leaders of the political expediency of efficiency in law enforcement.

The defeatist attitude that is so general in the law enforcement field not only contributes heavily to the inefficiency of police service, but also constitutes a major obstacle in the way of true professionalization of the service as well. A profession is characterized by an organization of those engaged in a common service, which is based primarily upon common interest and public responsibility. This is a constructive characteristic that

is not compatible to defeatism. Cooperation cannot occur among police agencies until their common interests can be fully recognized and appreciated. No one agency of law enforcement, no matter how strong its influence or how sincere its purposes, can alone bring about harmonious cooperation; neither can cooperation be accomplished among many agencies, so long as they are compelled to act independently and without a common objective. Unless there is a common bond and definite organized effort they will not reach common ground, and their efforts no matter how earnest will be at variance by reason of strong individual bias.

CHARACTER

The importance of character as a factor in the consideration of police ethics cannot be fully appreciated unless the significance of leadership in police service is understood. The leadership exercised by policemen in the routine discharge of their duties is of an impersonal type. It is leadership of a regulatory nature that is predicated upon the authority that the policeman represents, rather than the leadership of cooperation as exercised by a person in a supervising position. Obedience to the will of a policeman does not necessarily imply deference to the officer's personality. The willingness of citizens to submit to the commands of policemen is motivated to a great degree by appreciation of the importance of public safety, respect, and confidence in the police service. A powerful influence in securing the public's confidence in a police department is found in personalities of the members of the department; the effect that their personalities have upon the citizens with whom they come into contact. If in the aggregate these contacts are favorable, then public respect and confidence are assured. This personal type of leadership, which is much less tangible than the leadership of authority, deserves careful consideration in the evaluation of character.

True leadership is personal; it is the psychological effect that a well-integrated personality will have upon those who come under its influence. It is difficult to enumerate specific characteristics that combine in the personality of a true leader, because individuals differ in their viewpoints and reactions. The American public is a willing body of people who ask little more of a leader than those qualities that will command their respect, loyalty, and obedience. The qualities that seem most common to persons who command public respect and confidence are those that rate highly as influences in shaping strength of character. Among the most important of these traits or qualities are: self-

confidence, self-sacrifice, paternalism, fairness, initiative and decision, dignity, courage, and moral ascendancy.

Self-confidence is faith in oneself, and it is predicated upon knowledge, skill in applying knowledge, and in the ability and willingness to pass one's knowledge on to the benefit of others. Self-confidence is in fact a state of mental satisfaction that arises from being able to put the possession of knowledge to a constructive use.

Self-sacrifice is fundamental to true leadership. It is an inescapable fact that to contemplate a situation without bias requires first a complete subordination of self. Effective police work requires the utmost in self-sacrifice. Policemen who are selfishly impressed with their authority cannot succeed as leaders. Obsessed with fears of the loss of power or authority, they are in a defensive position, which seriously affects their efficiency and eventually destroys public confidence in their integrity.

Paternalism is a quality found in men who are mindful of the welfare of others. It is basic to police leadership because public welfare is a primary responsibility of police service. Harmonious relationships between police service and the public depends, to a great degree, upon the paternalistic influence that enters in the shaping of public policies.

Fairness and honesty are qualities that have universal appeal. Nowhere is there greater opportunity or greater need to display these qualities than in the police service. A preponderance of public criticism of law enforcement agencies is occasioned by reason of partiality or unfairness in exercising the police function. Impartial application of laws and regulations and fairness and honesty in exercising the authority of office are powerful forces in insuring continued public respect of police service.

Initiative and decision are characteristic traits of men who act correctly and at the proper time. The ability to act decisively and correctly is a manifestation of thorough preparedness and an interest in and an appreciation of the task at hand. Knowledge, mental alertness, and judgment all enter in the development of this very desirable trait. The ability of policemen to meet emergencies with propriety and decision has a profound effect upon shaping favorable public opinion.

Personal dignity is indicative of a policeman's appreciation of the honor of his position. It is an excellent manifestation of his "esprit de corps" and is a powerful factor in creating public respect. Policemen who are paternalistic in their concern for public welfare, sympathetic in caring for citizens in distress,

calm in the face of danger, firm in the enforcement of law, and dignified in their public relationships may be assured that they will be held in high esteem by the citizens they serve.

The public assumes that policemen are physically courageous. The mere fact that they are in the uniform of law enforcement officers implies that they have courage, yet true courage is not thoroughly understood by most people. It is a common misapprehension to consider reckless disregard of danger as a manifestation of courage or bravery. True courage is that state of devotion to duty that will give men the moral stamina impelling them to the performance of duty even in the face of full knowledge of the dangers involved. There is still another type of courage that is demanded of policemen—a kind of courage that is of even greater importance than physical courage. It is moral courage, the particular kind of courage that enables men to take it on the chin, to assume the responsibilities of their office without quibbling, and to bravely stand up for their conviction without attempting to shift blame or evade personal criticism. Moral courage is synonymous with integrity.

Moral ascendancy is the influence that one person exercises over a group of persons by reason of the exemplary nature of his character. It arises out of the practice of self-control, of the ability to withstand the hardships and vicissitudes of the work, and of a sincerity of purpose that is manifest in willingness to personally adhere, without equivocation, to the same standards of conduct that he is duty-bound to enforce upon others. Policemen are particularly vulnerable to public criticism for lack of this quality. They must be able to control their emotions, tempers, and their likes and dislikes. They must be patient in times of stress, calm in the face of danger, physically able to withstand hardships without complaint, and be able to effectively conceal their worries. The final measure of moral ascendancy is found in the true character of the individual, by the example he sets in his own living.

Moral ascendancy is most important in evaluating the effectiveness of commanding officers in the police service. The moral force or lack of it in commanding officers is reflected in the very character of the men under their control, and obviously becomes an important influence in the public's appraisal of police service. Commanding officers cannot maintain leadership over their men if at any time they are placed in positions of moral embarrassment. Questionable character of leaders in public service reflects upon all the members of the group.

SUMMARY

The Police Chiefs Association and the American Bar Association have frequently stated that police service should be professionalized. We must accept the fact, however, that police service as it is now conducted does not meet all the requirements of a professional service. We recognize no serious bar to success in professionalization of the service though full attainment of our aim may still seem to remain in the distant future. The greatest obstacle to achievement of our objective seems to rest with the police themselves. The police must recognize that their goal cannot be reached by the simple expedient of pronouncement or proclamation, but that the elevation of the standards of police service to professional acceptance must arise from a firm foundation of basic principles. Some of these principles have been accepted, others have not. Probably the most important principle still waiting acceptance and its proper place in the complete structure is the one that is concerned with rules of official conduct, for it is only through ethical consideration of police service that we can fully appreciate the fact that no greater power nor higher honor can be bestowed upon any man than the duty of upholding and defending the principles of the American way of life.
