

Position Paper on The Police Exception
and the Domestic Abuse Law

Beating a spouse is wrong. Fighting is wrong. Domestic Abuse is wrong. This is a very simple concept and lawmakers, police officers, and citizens of our country for years have been in majority agreeance with these concepts. One of the punishments our government has come up with for convicted domestic abusers is revoking the privilege to carry weapons in public. This prevents convicted abusive citizens from having the ability to tote a potentially murderous weapon around, at any time ready to be assistance to their destructive and unstable personalities' wishes. Police amended. Officers have recently been added to the list of people who are not allowed to carry guns in public if they have been convicted of Domestic Abuse. Some precincts are outraged, however this seems to be the proper law and should stay as it is

Law officers are human, and just like everyone else, they make mistakes. An up-and-coming officer could get in a skirmish at the local bar and be charged with Domestic Abuse. This same officer could become one of the most effective law enforcers in the country. With this law, this officer would not be allowed to continue his services for his county and his fellow police officers. Many people feel that this officer is being done a great injustice and should be allowed to continue his otherwise flawless career as an officer of the law. Interesting. One simple conviction could ruin the lives of every cop in the country. Hard working, one-time offensive policemen and women would be barred from police work forever. Many people think that this is entirely too harsh for a poke in the chest or a slap to the face of a spouse. Many people think that the law was produced in haste and that the solution is simple-make the judgement of each officer's career jurisdictional and personalize each case. Interesting.

Finally, some people believe that by swiping the badge of a convicted Domestic Abuser the government is causing two totally new problems. The first problem caused by the new law is the decline in officers on the street and the resultant increase in criminal behavior. The second problem is the fact that the policeman or woman that is dismissed is probably expecting that income to support a family. Interesting.

Criminal behavior is wrong. Proponents of reinstating the convicted police officers and abolishing the amendment have not fully considered the circumstances that provoke such measures. The law does not apply to those people whom have been charged with Domestic violence. The law applies to those officers (and citizens) that have been convicted of the crime. This means that the action had to be so serious that someone pursued a lawsuit against the alleged criminal and a servant of the public's best interest had to see that the action was worthy of punishment. A "poke in the chest" at the local bar with very unlikely draw a conviction of Domestic Abuse. If the action was serious enough to be brought to court, someone was very effected by the actions of the future protector of the peace. If a judge found the person guilty of a crime, and the same mind that produced the rage to commit the crime still exists, it's hard to put faith it the ability of that criminal to protect citizens from bad guys.

Spouses who are victims of Domestic Violence probably experience one of two different types of abuse. The first, and extremely rare, is the isolated incident where the abuse only occurs once. The second type is the repetitive and continual occurrences. In the first type, it is probably minor and certainly not worthy of someone potentially losing their job years down the road. However, there is extremely little likelihood that the spouse of the abuser will prosecute the abuser and have them convicted. With the more frequent type of abuse, the spouse is much

more likely to attempt to prosecute the offender and have them punished. So if the police officer was convicted of spousal abuse in the past, the incident was probably not isolated no minor.

We should not be so sympathetic toward criminals. A convicted criminal has no right to be enraged because his job was taken away. If these police officers are our leaders in upholding justice and moral actions, they must certainly have the demonstrative characteristics necessary to set examples. It is almost hypocrisy to have someone make on-the-scene judgments as to whether or not a person will be spending the night in jail for a domestic crime if the judge himself has done the same crime.