

48257

THE EFFECT OF A STRONG MUNICIPAL EXECUTIVE ON A CITY'S CRIME RATE:
MYTH OR MAGIC

Charles K. Eden

Abstract

What is the effect of a strong municipal chief executive on the crime rate of his jurisdiction. Is his pronouncements of 'law and order' a magic deterrent or is it all a folktale myth?

In this paper the author examines the announced rate of reported criminal activities in comparison to the elected official's term of office. Examining a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area in the Southern United States, official reports, contemporary records, personal observations, and confidential interviews are used to compile a factual representation on the changing crime rate. The geographical names of political entities in this investigative report have been replaced by the terms 'State', 'County', and 'City', etc.

Introduction

What is the function of a law enforcement agency in a democratic society? The debate between the peace keeping of status quo preservation and proponents of law and order rages as a major topic of discussion of the seventies.

Does the state have the right to extend itself into the very lives of its individual members to the degree of executing its own citizens? We need look no further than the United States Supreme Court decision of early July, 1972. But if law enforcement is to vigorously serve the law and order function, the debators say, then the death penalty must be invoked. All proper protection to the accused is provided, these voices claim, by the administration of justice: due process of the criminal proceedings, just deliberation of a jury of peers, speedy and open trials, full assistance of counsel, the soul searching of jury members for their decision, distinct sentencing actions, provisions for appeal, availability of executive review with the possibility for clemency, and the opportunity for pardon.

Even if the debate of capital punishment is to be settled what would be the propriety of an administrative agency of the executive branch to execute individual citizens. What would be the responsibility of a citizen who either allows or demands its law enforcement officials, armed with the power of half-a-god on his hip to apprehend, charge, prosecute, judge, sentence, and execute a suspected offender. This topic of expedient executions raise several general questions.

Why do we see such a variegated pattern of governmental administrative styles. How is it that Chicago's Mayor Daley's much heralded 'shoot-to-kill order' of 1968 was so widely acclaimed as the proper response. What are the social forces which encourage a twenty-eight year police veteran and former city police commissioner of Philadelphia, Mayor Frank L. Rizzo, to suggest in essence that people take the law into their own hands.¹ Are these actions taken in response to demands of the overwhelming majority, as silent as it may be, or, are these actions taken to cope with a violent criminal minority -- those who are branded creeps, addicts, muggers, rapists, and murders. Are these administrative actions a vanguard of social policy to be seen throughout the nation or will they remain deviant when compared to the totality of available administrative styles.

Vital as topics of discussion, a search for explanations may be an enigma. One additional question that can be asked, and for which an answer may be provided, is what is the effect of a law and order policy in a community. Does the pronouncements of a municipal executive effect the crime rate by reducing the number and rate of offenses? Does soft, tolerant reaction of debate and understanding provide more offenders than an administrative style which proclaims that looters will be shot on sight? Does the personality of the mayor become such an influential factor that it controls law enforcement reaction and forges dynamic policies of retribution? Is the mayor's pronouncements of law and order a magic deterrent or is it a folktale myth? In this paper we will examine the announced rate of reported criminal activity in comparison to the selected official's term of office. Examining a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area in the Southern United States, we will utilize official reports, contemporary records, personal observations, and confidential interviews to compile a factual representation of the crime rate.

The Scene

"City", located in the geographic center of "State", has a population of 122,423 and has approximately 51 square miles of land within its corporate boundaries.² This population reflects a substantial increase from ten years ago.

Increase in Growth - "City"

Population 1960	Population 1970	Change From 1960-1970
69,764	122,423	75.5%

Source: Basic Government Data 1972, Middle State Area Planning Commission, City, (1972), p. 11, Table 1B.

The community is a rapidly growing urban population composed of a preponderance of youthful inhabitants who are native to the state.

While the employment level is lower than the nation as a whole almost one half of the working population is employed in white collar jobs with a median family income exceeding \$8,000. But the nonwhites fall below the state average with an abundance working in blue-collar and service occupations that have average annual income not exceeding \$4,755.³

Major divisions within the population are noted.

Population Divisions

Total Pop	Pop Under 18	White Under 18			Black Under 18		
		Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
122,423	35,644	19,814	10,112	9,702	15,803	7,835	7,955

Source: Basic Government Data 1972, Middle State Area Planning Commission, City: (1973), p. 55, Figure 1A.

The City Charter provides for the Council-Mayor form of government but City is unique in the abnormally large size of its governing body, fifteen. With sixty-five cities in State utilizing a city or aldermanic council, eighty percent or fifty-two jurisdictions reported their bodies of 5-10 members, fifteen percent or ten jurisdictions reported 1-4 members, and in a category by itself, only one jurisdiction in State, City, reported a membership of fifteen.⁴ The aldermen must be at least twenty-one years of age; reside in that ward from which they are to be elected; a freeholder; and are all elected simultaneously for a four-year term to serve at \$2,400 per year.⁵

The City Police Department employs a staff of 200 officers, categorized in the following manner:

Uniform Officers		Plainclothes Officers	
Traffic	24	Detectives	57
Motors	6	Superior Officers	8
General Patrol	105		

Source: Feasibility Study For State-County Correctional Facility, Middle State Area Planning Commission, City, (November 1972), p. 147.

The force has seen consistent growth in all but two of the past several years.

The Department is predominantly white with 190, or 95% of the two hundred officers in this category. The Department employs nine blacks and one Mexican; less than five percent of the force is nonwhite.⁶ The Department requires that new employees have high school educations or the GED equivalent. Almost 90 percent of the force has high school diplomas, and 5 percent has some college credits.⁷

Number of Full Time Police Department Employees

Year	Total Employees	Sworn	Civilian
1971	213	200	13
1970	189	182	7
1969	174	167	7
1968	168	164	4
1967	160	157	3
1966	161	158	3
1965	166	163	3

Source: Uniform Crime Reports: 1971-p 166; 1970-p 167; 1969 p 153; 1968-pl55; 1967-p 161; 1966-p 155; 1965-p 156.

Police Department Education Level

Total Officers	Less than High School	High School	College Credits
200	23*	167	10

Source: Criminal Justice Regional Profile 1972, Middle State Area Planning Commission, City: (1972), p. 28.

*Alleged to include Chief and Assistant Chief both with less than high school graduation.

The starting salary for patrolmen is \$6,024 per year; maximum salary is \$6,864. The salary range for Sergeants is \$6,528-7,440; for Lieutenants \$7,764-8,820. The highest salary category is that of Chief; \$12,024-13,725 per year. All officers are scheduled for forty hour work week; when overtime is required, employees are reimbursed at the rate of their regular hourly pay. Approximately 95% of the personnel have other jobs to supplement their incomes. The obvious reason for this moonlighting is inadequate pay.⁸

Age and Years of Service - Police Department

Age of Force				Years of Service*			
20-30 yrs old	30-40 yrs old	40-50 yrs old	50+ yrs old	-1 yrs svc	1-3 yrs svc	3-10 yrs svc	10+ yrs svc
107	62	18	13	12	30	88	77

Source: Criminal Justice Regional Profile 1972, Middle State Area Planning Commission, City: (1972), p. 28, Figure 4A.

*Years of Service categories do not add to total membership of force, 200.

The force is relatively youthful in composition. Of the total personnel 78.5 percent are under thirty-five years of age. An additional fifteen percent are between thirty-five and fifty years of age. Only 6.5 percent are over fifty years of age. Two percent of the total force is over sixty years of age.⁹

Financially the Police Department is 'big business' with a 1971 annual budget of 1.9 million dollars.¹⁰ One of the very earliest recipients of federal funding, the department received \$13,000 for riot equipment in 1968, and, in addition to other awards, as late as Autumn of 1972 received funding for a Mobile Crime Laboratory.

Though the Department reports that approximately 33% of its arrestees are juveniles, and it estimates 33% of crime is juvenile caused, there is no juvenile unit or no juvenile officers.

City Police Department operates on a twenty-four hour basis and receives an average of three hundred calls for assistance per day. Of these calls, 50 percent involve traffic problems, 10-15 percent involve criminal acts of a substantial nature, and 25-35 percent are for complaints of minor offenses. In all, the Department handled approximately 27,000 cases of all types during 1971. Approximately sixty percent of the Department's personnel time is spent answering these calls. Approximately 10-15 percent of cases handled by the Department require criminal investigation.¹¹

Police Department Activity

# Calls Per Day	% Time Answering Calls	% Time Traffic*	# Traffic Cites	# Criminal Arrests
300	60%	50%	27,066	1,280

Source: Criminal Justice Regional Profile 1972, Middle State Area Planning Commission, (City: 1972), p. 4B.

*Activity of Department, as reported, exceeds the 100% level with no allowance for preventive patrolling.

By its very nature, the total volume of criminal activity is never known. We can safely assume that the actual amount of crime is several times that reported.¹² A graphic example is presented in a flow chart which shows both 'Undetected Crimes' and 'Unreported Crimes' in a nebulous relationship to those offenses known to the police. A National Opinion Research Center survey estimated the rate of personal crimes to be twice as high for crimes against property; forcible rapes were more than 3-1/2 times the reported rate, burglaries were 3 times, aggravated assaults and larcenies of \$50 and over were more than double, and robberies were 50% greater.¹³ An even larger deviation from 'known' figures was discovered in a survey by the Bureau of Social Science

Research in the District of Columbia. The survey rates for various offenses are from three to ten times greater than the reported rates.¹⁴

A review of crime statistics for City, the major jurisdiction within the City, State, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area reveals that from 1965 through 1971 'crime' has doubled, both in absolute number, and in the rate per one hundred thousand population.

'Crime' In City, State Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area

<u>United States</u>			<u>South</u>	
<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rate</u>
1965	2,780,015	1,434	759,982	1,265
1969	4,989,747	2,741	1,316,755	2,087
1970	5,568,197	2,740	1,507,263	2,400
1971	5,995,211	2,906	1,598,290	2,500

<u>State</u>			<u>City</u>	
<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rate</u>
1965	52,271	1,199	3,357	1,718
1969	82,750	1,783	5,649	2,708
1970	101,279	2,206	7,113	3,447
1971	111,081	2,381	7,366	3,495

Source: UCR; 1965, US p 52, South p 52, State p 54, City p 80; 1969, US p 58, South p 60, City p 71; 1970, US p 66, South p 68, State p 68, City p 89; 1971, US p 62, South p 64, State p 64, City p 86.

Not only did crime in the City SMSA grow each year but each of the four reporting periods selected reveal that this SMSA exceeded the crime rate of State, it exceeded the crime rate of the South, and it exceeded the crime rate of the United States.

Perhaps it is unfair to draw conclusions from national figures, for after all, other jurisdictions are included within this SMSA. A view within the State level could be illuminating. State has no uniform crime reporting system which can give an accurate count of the number of crimes committed and the nature of offenses. In a recent (Governor's) Commission survey of State law enforcement agencies, 528 questionnaires were mailed and 194 responses received relative to submission of statistics for FBI crime reports [sic]. About 50.77 percent replied that they did not submit statistics.¹⁵ Fragmentation and lack of integration are readily recognizable in any view of the state; that a proliferation of police agencies exists in this state can't be denied. Three state agencies and 549 local agencies share the police task in the 159 counties, with one county having eleven policing agencies.¹⁶

Perhaps, then, the best level of government to pursue our study is the local, for it is here, in the municipality, that we find the majority of law enforcement agencies in State; most being relatively small with half the 378 departments having ten or fewer officers.¹⁷ The municipal police departments typically enforce state and local laws within the area limits of the municipality. Normal duties include prevention of crime, enforcement of traffic laws, and investigation of personal and property type offenses.

A review of the City municipality in three past years reveals steadily increasing criminal activity; both in real numbers and in the offense rate.

Criminal Activity

Year	Population	Offenses	Rate per 100,000
1965	121,000	2,741	2,148
1966	123,000	2,973	2,411
1967	126,000	3,193	2,520

Source: A Report of the Governor's Commission on Crime and Justice, State Planning Bureau, Capitol City, State, (1968), p. 14.

A review of data ranging as far back as ten years ago also reveals an increase in the numbers of specific offenses.

Number of Specific Offenses In City 1962-68

Year	Homocide	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Burglary	Auto Theft	Force Rape
1962	28	72	40	1,270	332	10
1963	18	75	29	1,121	322	14
1964	20	75	447	1,609	342	22
1965	19	89	272	1,350	323	24
1966	10	125	216	1,594	369	24
1967	32	120	154	1,689	354	21
1968	32	165	166	2,108	382	22

Source: State Statistical Abstract 1970, University of State, University City, State (1970), p. 369.

A review of a more recent recording sees the similar increasing trend.

Number of Specific Offenses In City - 1971

Year	Homocide	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Burglary	Auto Theft	Force Rape
1971	43	299	489	2,638	1,027	41

Source: Criminal Justice Regional Profile 1972, Middle State Area Planning Commission, City, State (1972), p 28.

Within the municipality, offenses other than the seven Crime Index offenses also increased in 1971. For the entire year of 1970 a total of 11 confirmed arsons occurred. During the seven day period following the end of June, some 17 confirmed arsons were committed within the city limits.¹⁸ During the first quarter of 1971 some 27 bomb threats were reported, and projected on an annual basis, an increase of 86% in bomb threats could be expected.¹⁹ City has not been immune to the alarming increase of drug-related offenses. During 1970 some 35 cases were made for drug abuse offense within the city but during the first seven months of 1971 a total of 68 cases were made: for the months of May, June, and July, 1971, there was an increase of these cases of almost 300% per month.²⁰

The most recent figures available also reflect the gross increase of offenses. The month of April was selected as it was the first month in 1972 that computerized tallies of all offenses were constructed and November was chosen to represent a bi-polar model of the year as well as being the most current figures during this investigative research.

April

	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>
CASES (State Statutes)	473	256	285	388	194
CASES (City Ordinances)	3819	2967	3815	4234	5594
<hr/>					
GRAND TOTAL	4292	3223	4100	4622	5788

November

	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>
CASES (State Statutes)	358	231	281	390	232
CASES (City Ordinances)	2853	3427	2588	3488	4046
<hr/>					
GRANT TOTAL	3211	3658	2869	3878	4278

Source: Compiled from Official Files City Police Department and Office of Recorder's Court, City.

Reported offenses within the municipality have been increasing, and increasing at a faster pace than the population rise, and thus the crime rate has been increasing, too. But who knows what is the actual offense rate in City, the 'dark shadows' of the undetected and un-reported offenses.

The Actor

The Mayor of City must be at least twenty-five years of age, a resident for two years, and a freeholder. He is elected to a term of office of four years, succeeding himself only once, at a remuneration of \$17,500 per year.²¹

The incumbent was elected to his first four year term in 1967, and re-elected in 1971. In 1968 he was selected as one of "State's Five Outstanding Young Men," possessing 'three golden threads: professional accomplishment, civic participation and religious affiliation and conviction.'²² While much can be said concerning his political activities we will examine a sampling of his behavior while in office these last several months.

At the end of May the Mayor "threatened to cancel graduation exercises at four city high schools."²³ A stirred community responded to racial slurs by ensuring graduation exercises, postponed from evening to daytime scheduling, for better 'police control,' were held. No incidents occurred.

In the middle of August, partially in response to a newspaper editorial claiming that the Mayor used the live radio broadcasts of weekly City Council meetings for his own "political purposes," he suspended broadcasts. A local furor erupted over the 'right' to broadcast and the ineptness of the Mayor in using public hearings as his own political sounding board. The whole matter cooled when, just as quickly as he turned off the radio broadcasts, his Honor turned them on again.

The Mayor's campaign for election to the United States House of Representatives gives an example of his bizarre behavior. He early caused innuendoes that he "had been offered a 'sizable sum of money' to withdraw from the congressional race," but never elucidated his claim.²⁴

Running as "The Toughest Law and Order Man In The United States,"²⁵ he failed to comply with the federal law requiring him to report campaign contributions, missing four deadlines, and not filing with the State Secretary of State.²⁶ Campaigning out of his future constituency in order to appear with an United States Senator at City in the district of a United States Representative, the Mayor landed at the airport and when the police noted all the attention given to him offered an escort downtown. The Representative's staff were "flabbergasted and miffed when the Mayor instead of the Representative stepped out of the car at the scene of the day's activities."²⁷ He frustrated his opponent,

the incumbent Congressman during an attempt to have a television debate; the Mayor claimed he could use his copy of his segments of the debate film as he saw fit in an apparent disregard for what the Representative claimed were previous agreements.²⁸

The entire campaign effort was lost however, when the total tally showed the Representative pulling 60.7 percent of the vote, or 27,779 to 14,691, or 39.3 percent, for the Mayor. In a post-election telephone interview the defeated candidate claimed that a substantial number of city voters wanted to keep him at the helm for three more years instead of sending him to Washington; he claimed people voted for him to stay in city as "they could sleep comfortable with me in City Hall."²⁹

But not all were sleeping comfortably; as a matter of fact because he was in City Hall some citizens were sleeping uncomfortably -- if sleeping at all. Some were out collecting signatures on a petition requesting that anyone elected Mayor submit to a complete physical and mental examination.³⁰ Such a petition lay dormant in Council for a year but when concerned citizens requested City Council to begin impeachment proceedings it was sent back to the City Clerk without action, even though a spokesman appeared before Council and wanted to add 400 names to the 724 already gathered.³¹ When the same group spokesman appeared before Council on 19 September asking to know why his petition of 12 September and a letter of 13 September asking for the Mayor's resignation had just been thrown in the trash can in his, and this author's presence, he was unanswered by the Mayor or by Council.

Most of this latest commotion was related to the report of 2 August that the Mayor had been admitted to a hospital for the third time since 17 June.³² The doctor reported that the Mayor was in for evaluation and the Mayor's secretary said that the purpose was to observe if he did not suffer permanent impairment from his recent airplane accident.³³ It was publicized that while piloting his private aircraft the plane suddenly dropped in an airpocket causing the Mayor to dash his skull against an unpadded section of the cockpit's ceiling, leading to a three-week hospitalization for mental depression.³⁴

Not wishing to become a victim of the 'Eagleton Complex', the Mayor was open about his treatment and said that "... no recollection of the time spent in the psychiatric institution nor of the course of treatment followed. Part of the time I was unconscious; I don't know how I was treated."³⁵ He later announced that the medical records of his recent physical and mental hospital treatments were open for public inspection,³⁶ but within a week he altered the promise to make public the medical records and said he intends to offer them for a 'fee.'³⁷ Regardless of his offer to view records for free, or fee, none were ever shown.

"X-rated" movies were the next target of the Mayor's behavior. Evidently feeling that City Council's earlier motion to ban certain

films was the public's will, the Mayor issued a statement; "I'm going to try to get all obscene movies out of town."³⁸ No violations were reported, however.

The Mayor then became embroiled in the Sunday-closing, "blue-law", controversy. Claiming "several" complaints against the manager of a convenience store's Sunday opening, the Mayor specifically instructed detectives to make the arrest.³⁹ The Mayor was careful not to conduct the city's business on Sunday himself, however, and said he would seek a legal opinion from the City Attorney the following Monday.⁴⁰ The Mayor then announced he planned to have the police make cases against all businesses found violating the state law and police detectives effected another arrest the following Sunday.⁴¹ Even though the two cases were dismissed, city detectives arrested forty in Sunday sales crackdown the following week⁴² but at the succeeding Tuesday's Council Meeting it was announced that the Mayor and Council decided not to prosecute those persons until the Governor provided equal protection in the courts for the 107 year old Sunday closing law⁴³ and wrote the Governor asking for such protection.

That letter to the Governor brought some quick reaction. First, the Governor said, "In my opinion, City is suffering from erratic leadership."⁴⁴ Secondly, the state government issued an announcement by the State Revenue Commissioner that the Mayor's request to allow the continuation of pouring of wine and mixed drinks to the January 1973 referendum authorizing such activity would not be favorably considered, and if the city didn't stop the pouring immediately the State Revenue officials could.⁴⁵ It seemed that the Mayor had raised another tumultuous outcry of the citizens for in the adjoining county where the same referendum was to be voted, the wine and mixed drinks were still flowing because their Mayor did not mention to state officials the illegality of accustomed practice. Some non-supporters of the Mayor were so unkind as to infer that the Mayor's own pastor (of one of the five largest churches in the state) was actually running city government from the pulpit.⁴⁶

Even in the waning weeks of the year the Mayor's behavior made local headlines. Though advised by letter early in 1972 the Mayor took no action for an entire year and allowed the privately own BEE Transit Company contract to expire, leaving the city with no public transportation. Even if Council favored a resolution providing a \$11,000 a month subsidy to the company to allow it to continue into January 1973, and every month thereafter, the Mayor said he would not sign it.⁴⁷ The Company, Incorporated, of Virginia studied the bus situation in their report submitted a year ago and said that if the bus service had to be halted;

"most certainly social service cost could increase. Some young people could no longer attend school, and crime may increase significantly. When mobility is stifled and

social needs are not met, widespread tension and frustration follows throughout the community. If families go hungry, angry and desperate parents could resort to theft."⁴⁸

Yet the law and order mayor allowed the busses to cease at midnight 31 December.

There is a high degree of affiliation between the Mayor and the Police Department. There has also been very close interaction between the two parties.

During the period this reporter was personally observing developments, both the Mayor and leading police department officials were subpoenaed by the County grand jury. Although an investigation into operations of the police department in general and the vice squad in particular, was the purpose of the subpoenas, the foreman of the grand jury said that because no specific criminal charges were made or no specific person was named he felt the subpoenas were in the nature of invitations.⁴⁹

The Mayor was particularly interested in awarding the police department an increase in pay. A one grade classification increase in addition to an overall salary increase given city employees was the proposal advocated by the Mayor. When the proposal was tabled by the City Council the police department began a work slow-down and sick-out for the following two days, ending their activity at the request of the Mayor.⁵⁰ When the matter came to Council's attention at the following meeting it was favorably considered amidst much applause and cheers for the Mayor by the police officers who were present en masse.

The County grand jury criticized the Mayor for his "over enthusiasm in his desire to establish law and order" in their July presentments.⁵¹ The grand jury also noted that the Mayor by-passed the chain of command in the police department.

In actuality, the police department is reluctant to act on direct orders from the Mayor. With regards to verbal orders from the Mayor which are received over the radio a key official said, "We just don't act. We notify our own chain of command and follow their instructions."⁵² Another source within the department reflects that the Mayor is merely fulfilling his public role when he makes crass public remarks over his personal radio. Others are listening, it seems a popular local treat is to tune to the police department's wave length, and the mayor's proclamations are in reality, bluffs.⁵³

The Mayor's influence and concern over the police department is quite visible. In April the Mayor's announcement that a proposed plan for consolidation of city and county governments was unacceptable to him brought bright orange "Merger Is Murder" buttons onto the dark blue police uniforms and partisan bumper stickers were observed on police vehicles.

The Overall Effect

Regardless of this close interaction with the police department there is an absence of evidence that the Mayor's actions have assisted in crime control. A brief review of the factual information which supports this view is appropriate. The Uniform Crime Reports reflect crime in the City Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area has doubled from 1965 through 1971; the Governor's Crime Commission showed a steady rise in offenses in the crime rate from 1965-1967; The State Statistical Abstract reflects a steady increase in each category of offenses, 1962-1971, and a continuing rising trend is reflected in the 1972 Criminal Justice Regional Profile; detailed datum compiled from official records from February 1971 and 1972 compared with November 1971 and 1972 also reflect a continual increase of criminal offenses.

The only information which reflect contrary indicies to the steady increase was announced at the end of December. Relating that City was one of 83 which have recorded overall decreases in crime during the first nine months of 1972, the Chief of Detectives commented that the figures were an accurate estimate of crime in City.

According to the figures, there were 2,048 burglaries in 1972, 64 more than last year and 789 auto thefts, 49 more than last year in City. Rapes increased to 33, 11 more than 1971 and robberies totaled 212, an increase of four. Assaults totaled 131 which is a decrease of 49 from last year. Fifteen murders were committed during 1972, a decrease of one. Larceny totaled 1,188, a decrease of 138.⁵⁴

Even this item reflects a change of only 60 offenses from a reported total of 4,416. To isolate any single factor which precipitates such a minuscule change is to place unsubstantiated credit on intangibles.

No clearcut correlation between the announced law and order policies of the Mayor and the continually rising crime rate can be established. Just as it is not absolutely accurate to congratulate the Mayor for holding the line on crime, for we have shown the continual expansion of known criminal activity, so, too, is it inaccurate to blame him for what is in actuality an expansion of deviant legal behavior.

Crime is, after all, a social problem and the concern of the entire community.⁵⁵ As such it must be viewed in its entirety, within the social milieu.

END