Recollections of James Q. Wilson

By George L. Kelling
Professor Emeritus, School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers Newark University
Senior Fellow, Manhattan Institute

Editor’s note: Professor James Q. Wilson, who died on March 2 at the age of 80, conducted research on many topics during his multi-faceted career at Harvard University, UCLA, and Pepperdine University. But he was best known for his writings about crime; and probably his best-known work, at least to the general public, was the article he wrote with George L. Kelling for The Atlantic in 1982, titled “Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety.” (The article is available online at http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/4465/.)

Professor Kelling, a longtime friend of PERF, was the recipient of PERF’s highest honor, the Leadership Award, in 2009. He has generously shared his wisdom at many PERF conferences, including a memorable joint presentation with Professor Wilson at PERF’s 2004 Town Hall Meeting on the impact of “broken windows policing.”

We asked Dr. Kelling to write a remembrance of his colleague for Subject to Debate:

Sometime during 1981, James Q. Wilson called me to ask if I would co-author a paper with him. Jim was then a political science professor at Harvard University, where I was executive director of the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management in the Kennedy School of Government. Jim and I had known each other for about a decade, over the years developing a friendly professional relationship. We met when he was a board member of the Police Foundation, a Ford Foundation funded organization for which I conducted research and then served as director of research, from 1971 to 1980. As a board member Jim was strongly supportive of my work, especially the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment which was published in 1975 and came under attack.

Jim called not long after I had co-authored and published the Newark Foot Patrol Experiment, letting me know that the final chapter in particular had struck a chord with him. In this chapter I explained two findings and their linkage: that fear of crime consistently lessened in neighborhoods where foot patrol was conducted; and that fear of crime was more closely linked to disorderly behavior and conditions than to serious crime. Based on my observations of foot patrol officer activities, I argued that these findings could be explained by the attention foot patrol officers paid to disorderly conditions and behaviors. I suggested further that foot patrol officers negotiated a neighborhood consensus about what constituted appropriate behavior. Jim explained that he was going to do a piece for The Atlantic, suggested that I join him, and that we use, specifically, these findings of the foot patrol experiment.

I was honored and pleased. Already Jim was well known both in and outside the academy as a seminal thinker in a wide variety of areas. His early work on policing, Varieties of Police Behavior, published in 1968, was already a classic when I first met him during my early days at the Police Foundation. In it Jim identified three styles of policing—watchmen, legalistic, and service—with the watchmen
style (that is, policing with an emphasis on maintaining order) being akin to what I had observed in Newark. For me, this explained Jim’s interest in the Newark study and his invitation.

I responded that I’d be eager to co-author an article, but that if he merely cited the foot patrol experiment, I would be more than happy. After all, Jim had everything in hand to write the Atlantic article alone: his own research and writings about police order maintenance and discretion, the extant literature about citizen fear of crime, and the Newark study. Yet he insisted that we work together.

Nevertheless, Jim warned me, even in our first conversation, that there would be a cost: I would be linked to a political conservative in a field, criminology, that was overwhelming liberal, and I expected future criticism and attacks. His prediction certainly came true. Nonetheless, having adjusted to vociferous critiques from elite criminologists and police after publication of the *Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment*, I assured Jim that it would be nothing new and not a problem for me. And so Jim asked me to write down all the things that I thought should go into the paper and get them to him as soon as possible. He put together our material and turned them around quickly. The metaphor of broken windows was pure Jim Wilson. I recall just how delighted I was the first time I read it.

Probably the area that Jim and I discussed most during the early drafting was the issue that has generated the most controversy since *Broken Windows* was published—that is, how strongly we wanted to put forward the idea that disorder was linked to serious crime. About the linkage between disorder and fear of crime, we were fairly certain; ample evidence supported it. Likewise, we were fairly confident that paying attention to disorder led to reduction in fear of crime. This was the heart of the Newark study. But the study did not find or establish that crime itself was reduced as a result of police order maintenance activities. (I believe now this was because no one understood the crime prevention potential of foot patrol officers at the time, and the Newark Police Department made no attempt to link foot patrol activities to the rest of the department’s activities. But this is a complicated issue that I will not go into here.) Suffice it to say that Jim and I agreed upon the probability of a sequential link between disorder and serious crime and left it at that.

To say that Jim and I were stunned by the response to *Broken Windows* (and by the extent to which the article would prove to have “legs”) is an understatement. It caught on quickly among both neighborhood groups and police, and interest in it persists and has even increased up to today.

In my mind, several factors explain its attraction and persistence. First, the broken windows metaphor is powerful, taking a complex and subtle set of issues yet putting them forward simply and memorably. Second, it resonated both with citizen groups and police. Citizens were already verbalizing their concern for minor problems—graffiti, drunken youths taking over parks, aggressive panhandling—and police were starting to listen. During the early 1980s as community policing was dawning, police started to share citizen concerns. The Fenway project in Boston, in which William Bratton cut his teeth on neighborhood problems, was but one example. A few academics, like Egon Bittner and Nathan Glazer, also began to raise issues about the problem of disorder. Finally, other occupational groups—teaching, probation and parole, business and commerce, medicine and public health, you name it—picked up on the metaphor and applied it to their fields.

In other words, Jim and I caught the wind: it was the right idea at the right time, presented simply and accessibly.

For Jim, of course, *Broken Windows* was only one “corner” of his interests. As columnists and writers of obituaries have chronicled, his interests ranged from the operations of bureaucracies and government to the development of character and the Moral Sense—the title of one of his most important works. More than anything else, in writing *Broken Windows* with him I learned to think beyond the victimization of individuals to the victimization of neighborhoods and communities and the terrible consequences of such victimization.

Jim and I communicated irregularly after the publication of *Broken Windows*. Although we never discussed it, I have always had the feeling that Jim referred a lot of inquiries about *Broken Windows* to me: lectures, media contacts, interviews, etc. Jim also was far more cautious about attributing crime reduction outcomes to “broken windows policing” than I have been. My position continues to be that there have been so many “coincidents” of crime reduction following the implementation of broken windows policing that it is fair to conclude that creating order prevents crime. Jim, typically, wanted stronger evidence, preferably based on rigorous experimentation.

Jim and I wrote several more papers together. I note two. The first, also published in the *Atlantic*, was entitled “Making Neighborhoods Safe.” Published in 1989, it was stimulated primarily by the developing insights of the Harvard Executive Session on Community Policing. By this time, the parameters of community policing had been largely identified, and problem solving, as developed by University of Wisconsin Law School Professor Herman Goldstein, was taking shape as a primary police methodology. Our goal was to integrate community policing, problem solving and broken windows. The article never got the attention of *Broken Windows*—in my view, unfortunately—because it positions community policing as the really “big” idea in shaping the new policing paradigm. And, for me at least, it made clear that broken windows is properly thought of only within the context of community policing.

The final piece that Jim and I wrote together was in 2006 in the *American Interest* entitled “A Quarter Century of Broken Windows.” More a note than a full article, we assessed the impact of the original article and how it had stood up to criticism and attacks.

With fond memories of Jim’s unique intellect, his repeated generosity in our relationship, his civility, and with acknowledgment of how lucky I was that he chose to engage me as his colleague, I close with the last paragraph we wrote together:

The broken windows idea does two things, one indisputably good and the other probably effective: It encourages the police to take public order seriously, something that the overwhelming majority of people ardently desire, and it raises the possibility that order will mean less crime. The first goal requires no evidence. The second does, and so far most studies suggest that more public order (along with other factors) is associated with less predatory street crime. With all this in mind, we believe that it remains a strategy worth pursuing.
ON FEBRUARY 23, PERF CONVENED A SUMMIT IN WASHINGTON, D.C. TO DISCUSS EFFORTS BY POLICE DEPARTMENTS TO REDUCE USE OF FORCE, ESPECIALLY IN TERMS OF DE-ESCALATING ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN POLICE OFFICERS AND PERSONS WHO HAVE MENTAL ILLNESS, DEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS SUCH AS AUTISM, DRUG AND/OR ALCOHOL ADDICTIONS, POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER, OR OTHER CONDITIONS THAT MAY CAUSE THEM TO EXHIBIT AGITATED OR ERRATIC BEHAVIORS.

This meeting, part of the Critical Issues in Policing series undertaken by PERF with support from the Motorola Solutions Foundation, will be the subject of a forthcoming Critical Issues report. Following is a sample of quotations from some of the participants at the Summit:

PHILADELPHIA POLICE COMMISSIONER CHARLES RAMSEY: Moving Up the Use-of-Force Continuum Is Easy, But the Hard Part Is Ratcheting It Back Down

I can’t think of a topic more important then use of force. And it’s one that’s going to always be on our front burner. One of the things that I’ve discovered during my time as a police officer is that it’s easy for us to go up the use-of-force continuum, but the hard part bringing it back down, and de-escalating situations effectively. These are dynamic events that are taking place. An officer may be justified in using a certain level of force at one moment in time, but that doesn’t necessarily mean that the same window is open three, four, five seconds later in an unfolding event.

This becomes more and more of a challenge as we get new types of “less lethal” technology available to us. Sometimes our policies on new technology don’t keep pace with how we instruct officers to apply the new technologies within the use-of-force continuum. So I think we need to spend more time focusing on training.

Another thing to consider is that some of the police officers coming on now don’t have the same social skills as in the past. The new officers are comfortable with things like texting messages, but not so much with looking people in the eye and talking to them. It’s a whole new generation. These are the kinds of “little” things that are important, because these skills can help you avoid resorting to high levels of force.

Finally, we can talk about another part of the problem that I’ve seen: that police officers can be on solid ground in terms of using force, but they don’t know how to explain what they did in a written report. And if you can’t put it on paper and it’s second-guessed, you’re going to have a problem.

NEWPORT NEWS CHIEF JAMES FOX: The Military Is Moving People Off Military Bases, So We Have More People with Mental Health Issues In the Community

In our area of Virginia, we have a lot of military personnel from the Navy, Army and Air Force. I don’t know if many people are aware of this, but the military is getting out of the housing business. They’re moving as many people as they can off post. So people with post-traumatic stress or other issues are living in our communities, and we’re facing more issues. I have heard generals say that there are simply not enough doctors to keep up with the issues that they’re having with people coming back from the battlefield.

CHIEF CLINICAL OFFICER ELSPETH RITCHIE WASHINGTON, DC DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH: Remember that Veterans Are Very Proud of Their Status

I retired from the Army a year ago after 24 years on active duty as an Army psychiatrist. So I am familiar with the issues around post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, pain, disability and substance abuse. For example, back in 2003 Fort Bragg had a spate of homicides and suicides and I was part of the investigating team there, as I’ve done at Fort Carson and a number of other places.

One question we ask is, if there is an increase in violence among veterans, how much has it increased? Certainly it is in the news. But nobody really knows if there is an actual increase among recent veterans. By violence, I mean the combination of events that you all are talking about—suicide, domestic abuse, homicide, in some cases sexual assaults. Based on a review of suicides, the increase appears to be related less to the number of individual deployments, and more to chronic exposure to violence, desensitization and a sense of fatalism.

As a police officer, it is important, when you are approaching a veteran in some type of crisis, to be very conscious of how proud they are of their status, and be aware that they don’t like to be talked down to. Frankly, most of them would rather do anything
than go see a psychiatrist. So there is an issue that there are not enough doctors, that’s certainly true. But it is more important that veterans are very reluctant to seek help. When you’re approaching them, you need to take that into account. Treat them with respect. And finally, if you’re trying to establish a connection with a veteran who is barricaded or in some kind of difficulty, if you have a veteran who’s a member of your police force, that may be the most appropriate person for the job.

ALBUQUERQUE POLICE CHIEF RAY SCHULTZ:
People with Mental Illness Cycle Through Our Jails

We have talked about jails being the number one service provider for dealing with people who have mental illness. When a person is released from a city or county facility in New Mexico, they usually are given just three days’ worth of medication. Often they don’t have the money to get a prescription filled, even if they could get a doctor’s appointment within three days. So unfortunately, they tend to get into trouble, we put them in jail, we get them stabilized, we get them back in treatment and on the right course, but then we release them, and three days later the cycle repeats itself. The thing that most of these people have in common is prior contacts with law enforcement. More than a third of them have at least 20 documented contacts. They have documented mental health issues that are not being treated appropriately.

HOUSTON POLICE CHIEF CHARLES MCCLELLAND:
We Actively Intervene with “Chronic Consumers”

Note: Chief McClelland discussed the Houston Police Department’s Chronic Consumer Stabilization Initiative (CCSI), which is a joint program with the county mental health agency designed “keep individuals with serious and persistent mental illness from continually going into crisis.” The program identifies 40 or more persons with mental illness who have the largest numbers of encounters with the Police Department, and works with those persons and their families to actively manage the conditions that lead to crises. The program won a Community Policing Award from the IACP in 2010.

We started our Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training in 1999, after we had some of the “lawful but awful” types of incidents that will be discussed here today. Since then, we have required all our officers to have at least 40 hours of training in this. And every other year, you go back for an eight-hour refresher training.

We also have advanced CIT training, and we have at least eight units per day on all three shifts where officers with advanced CIT training are riding with a mental health clinician. Dispatchers and paramedics also have to be trained to recognize these incidents.

Under the Chronic Consumer Stabilization Initiative, when these people are not in crisis, we do proactive follow-up with them and their families, to make sure that they’re still on their medication and so on. And we keep accurate records on them, so officers will know what type of mental health issues they have, and they know what type of de-escalation techniques to use when they come on the scene of an incident.

PHILADELPHIA POLICE CAPTAIN FRAN HEALY:
CIT in Philadelphia Is a Bridge Between Two Worlds

It’s interesting; you have to look at CIT from a global perspective. Crisis Intervention Team training is not a curriculum only for police; CIT is a bridge between two worlds. The police get the de-escalation training and the awareness training, but CIT is also the connection with the mental health industry.

In Philadelphia we have a mental health coordinator, so officers on the street have direct access to the entire mental health system. When we come across people in crisis, we de-escalate. We do what we need to do in a particular incident, but the larger goal is to ensure that we won’t keep coming across them again and again. So we need to get them into the system so they can get the help they need. Our CIT coordinator is not a Police Department employee per se; she works between the Department of Behavioral Health and the Police Department. Our officers in the field directly contact her, provide whatever information is needed, and she can activate the services that anybody would need if they are missing medication, or have homelessness issues or veteran’s issues. It can all be accessed from the mental health world, and we work as a team to solve the problem.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD POLICE CHIEF TOM MANGER:
We’re Teaching Officers to Take Their Time
If a Situation Doesn’t Require Immediate Action

We have had a number of in-custody deaths that were found to have involved excited delirium. So we ended up doing a block of training on this in our in-service training, teaching our officers to recognize the symptoms of excited delirium. Sometimes in these
situations the person is not particularly aggressive; he’s not attacking the officers as soon as they arrive. So we’re trying to change the mindset to recognize that some situations do not require immediate action. You know, take a breath, take a moment and try to better assess what the situation is.

**VIRGINIA BEACH, VA CHIEF JAMES CERVERA:**
*Tighter Policies Prevent Overreliance On Electronic Control Weapons*

We recently put out about 300 additional Tasers™ in our department. It’s voluntary; not every officer has to take one. We tightened up on our policy about when they can be used, because we had a big spike in Taser activations. Officers were going for the Taser immediately, as opposed to trying to use verbal techniques and other methods to effect the arrest. We also viewed the use of the Taser as a Department issue and decided that training, or re-training, was the best way to begin the process and shift the culture.

We also get supervisors to the scene a lot quicker than previously, and we have multiple levels of review when a Taser is used: by the supervisor, the lieutenant, the commander, and Internal Affairs reviews all of them. And when we see a case that we feel might not be within the new policy, we go back to the individual command. We’re putting the responsibility back on the commanding officer of the precinct. We’ve seen the usage come down and they’re being used more effectively.

We also said that every time an officer unholsters the Taser, a use-of-force form should be filled out. We’re finding that the vast majority of times, all the officer has to do is touch the Taser, and the average citizen looks at it, knows what it is, realizes where this is going, and they comply.

So we tightened up our policies on how officers use Tasers, and after the initial spike, it’s starting to come down.

We are also up to 25 percent of our sworn members being fully certified in CIT, having completed the 40-hour course, and everyone in the Department will complete the 8-hour course by the beginning of summer.

**WINSTON-SALEM POLICE CHIEF SCOTT CUNNINGHAM:**
*We Are Training Officers To Use All Their Skills*

We implemented Tasers to the entire department. We have 570 sworn employees, and every officer is required to carry one and utilize it according to policy. When we first went to full deployment of Tasers, the use of batons and OC fell right off the table. In the last year we had one baton use; almost all other use of force is now with the Taser.

We have not had any adverse outcomes with the Tasers so far. But there is an impression that our officers in many cases are using it in ways that, while authorized and legal, may not be the best choice. And that’s one of the issues we’re trying to deal with right now, especially with the young officers—trying to ensure that they don’t quickly go to the Taser or another weapon instead of trying to talk their way through a situation.

**SALT LAKE CITY POLICE CHIEF CHRIS BURBANK:**
*Cases of Simple Noncompliance Are Difficult*

We run into problems when dealing with persons who simply refuse to comply with a police officer’s order. The situations in which an officer uses force because someone charged at him, struck him, attacked him are relatively rare. Most of those cases are not the problematic ones in terms of excessive force. Our problems come with the simple noncompliance incidents. I don’t think that pepper spray or a Taser are the proper response to noncompliance. There have got to be other skills that we teach our officers, some other avenue, before they make that jump.

**AUSTIN, TX CHIEF ART ACEVEDO:**
*Most Improper Uses of Force Stem from Officers Abandoning the Tactics We Taught Them*

We don’t have a “Use-of-Force” policy; we have a “Response to Resistance” policy, because in most of the cases, that’s exactly what an officer is doing. I really believe that the vast majority of improper uses of force, especially deadly force, are a direct or indirect result of officers abandoning the tactics that we spent a lot of time and money training them on. And consequently, what I’ve done in my department is develop a discipline matrix that says that if you abandon your tactics and you’re involved in a critical incident, you will be indefinitely suspended, which is the equivalent of being fired.

Officers endanger themselves as well as the public when they abandon their tactics like this. So I think that one of the conversations we need to have is about making a commitment to hold officers accountable for their tactics. When they abandon their training, there has to be a consequence.
TAKOMA PARK, MD POLICE CHIEF RON RICUCCI:
I’m Retraining Officers on Defensive Tactics

Like other people in the room, I saw the use of Tasers going up, so we reviewed the policy and tightened it up. But the thing that I saw was that defensive tactics weren’t being used. I’m in a department of 42 officers, so I can do certain things that the bigger departments can’t do so easily. We are now training once a month on defensive tactics. It’s an eight-hour day, and it cost me in my training overtime budget. But I’m getting them to go back to the basics of using verbal skills and defensive tactics, as opposed to automatically going to the Taser, which we were seeing. Last year, the use of the Tasers went down, and we also saw injuries go down.

MINNEAPOLIS POLICE CHIEF TIM DOLAN:
Make Sure Your Trainers Are Training to Your Policies

We set tighter policies on Tasers and other uses of force, but we had a reluctance in our training unit to accept some of the changes. And we’d have very frank discussions with them, saying, “We understand where you’re coming from and we understand your argument, but this is going to be the policy of the Police Department, and this is what you’re going to have to teach to.” And that didn’t go well with some of them, so I ended up bringing in different people and starting it all over. We brought everybody in and put them through new training. You have to really get inside the heads of your trainers and make sure that they understand exactly what you’re doing and why, and make sure they’re on your team, because if they’re not, they can sabotage the whole thing.

FRESNO, CA POLICE CHIEF JERRY DYER:
We Involve Our Training Unit in Everything We Do

Like Chief Dolan, I think that we sometimes have a disconnect between our training and our policy. So what we have done is make sure that we have incorporated our training unit into everything that we do. Our training unit responds to every officer-involved shooting. They’re part of the initial walk-through, and they’re part of the review that we conduct on every OIS.

The training commander also reviews use-of-force reports completed by a supervisor. So they know what types of incidents are occurring out there, and they’re better equipped to put together the types of training that we need.

We have found that our best training tool is the force option simulator. Every one of our officers goes through it annually. The simulator provides various incident based scenarios to our officers, and they’re realistic. They’re stress-induced scenarios, and we can branch out the scenarios depending on how they respond at various points. So if an officer is engaging the individual using appropriate communication skills, then we de-escalate the situation. If the officer forces the issue, then we branch that scenario to where it becomes an escalation of force, and the officer ultimately has to use some type of force that might have been avoided if he had handled it differently at the beginning. And then we critique the officer’s handling of the situation.

FREDERICK, MD POLICE CHIEF KIM DINE:
The Officer on the Street Is the First Responder

For me, this conversation about Crisis Intervention Teams highlights the incredible combination of traits that are needed to be a police officer today. For decades we have focused on getting crime rates down and locking up offenders. And now, rightly so, we also want officers to respond to people with problems and be sensitive and problem-solve, so we can’t forget how important it is to be able to talk to people.

Policing is a people business, and we ought to spend as much time teaching our officers how to talk to people as how and when to use force. There’s no piece of equipment known to mankind that’s going to replace the ability to communicate with people on the street.

I think the challenge for the officer on the street is they’re the first one on the scene. You can’t always call for someone else, you can’t even always call for the supervisor. The officer is the first responder, the one who is faced with the dilemma of what to do and how to determine what type of person they’re dealing with.

And the statistics about people suffering from mental illness are huge. One-in-four or one-in-five, that’s the way the mental health advocates talk about it. So a lot of people out there are suffering from different crises, and we need to know how to talk to them.

A couple years ago, we started a mental health task force with a few of the agencies in Frederick County. We meet every couple of months, and now essentially every agency comes to the meetings. We’ve retrained everybody in the Police Department, and then we turned around and did training for the mental health workers, so
they are safer and more comfortable on the street and will know how to work with the police officers better.

RON HONBERG, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ALLIANCE ON MENTAL ILLNESS:

Police Are Doing Better Than Ever, But Budget Cuts Are Hurting Mental Health Care

I’ve been with NAMI for close to 25 years, and I remember when the “Memphis Model” of crisis intervention first evolved. Today, CIT exists in more than 2,000 communities around the country. So a lot of police departments are doing CIT: you all have really stepped up to the plate. Officers that I’ve talked to around the country have said that CIT helps make them feel safer, because these are some of the most difficult, unpredictable situations that they can imagine. The normal rules of the game don’t apply to somebody who’s psychotic. And where CIT really works is where the mental health system is on board and where there’s a true partnership with the police.

Unfortunately, over the last three years, we’ve cut billions of dollars from the public mental health system. And I know that there are a lot of police jurisdictions that are very frustrated right now. They’re still doing CIT, still training their officers, but are more and more often seeing the same people back out in the streets that they have to respond to over and over again. So I hope that we can use the political capital that many of you have to reverse that trend.

I don’t mean to give you a negative message here. Overall, things are so much better than they were 20 years ago, and that’s a credit to all of you. I hope that every community in the country will be doing CIT soon, and we’re moving in that direction. But the mental health system and vital support services must be there right there with you if it’s going to work.

JOSH EDERHEIMER, PRINCIPAL DEPUTY DIRECTOR, COPS OFFICE:

Training Must Also Recognize the Threats to Officers

I think that one thing to remember is that effective tactical and use-of-force training incorporates recent trends and pressing issues that are on the minds of police officers working in the field. Sometimes training has been prompted by a lawsuit or championed by an advocacy organization, and fails to adequately address police officer concerns. For example, the fact that 71 police officers were shot and killed last year and shooting ambushes of police have increased is what’s on the minds of officers today. In fact, as we speak, I just received an alert from the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund regarding a Washington State Trooper who was shot and killed on a traffic stop this morning. Today’s officers get these alerts via e-mails, tweets, Facebook, and the web. Police training today must recognize that such dangers are on the minds of officers, and those concerns are going to affect how they use their skills as well as their capacity to de-escalate and minimize use of force.

PHILADELPHIA POLICE COMMISSIONER CHARLES RAMSEY:

Dealing with Violence Every Day Does Affect Officers

Yes, one thing that we haven’t talked about is the fear and anxiety that a lot of police officers have when they’re out in some of these neighborhoods. We don’t talk about that because, you know, cops aren’t supposed to be afraid of anything. But that’s a lot of BS. When you ride around all day long and you’re dealing with shootings, you’re dealing with robberies, you’re dealing with all this violent crime that’s constantly going on, that’s going to also influence how you respond in certain situations. And we have to take that into account in our training. We teach our officers to try to interact with people and realize that not everybody in a given neighborhood is a thug or a criminal, they’re not all out to hurt you. These are important things that I think we’ve got to face head on.