

Country report – The Netherlands

January 2006 (final version), Otto Adang

- 1. Description of the country** –population, urban centers, history, culture/language. I am thinking a page or two. The recent Encyclopedia of Law Enforcement. Sage 2005, Vol 3 edited by Sullivan and Haberfeld) might be a useful guide or source for brief descriptions.

The Netherlands has been a constitutional monarchy since 1848. The Constitution (Grondwet) determines that the government i.e. the Ministers are responsible for the government policy, rather than the Monarch. The Queen enjoys a position of immunity. The Netherlands is a parliamentary democracy. The State is ruled by the government under the supervision of parliament. The government consists of the Ministers under the leadership of the Prime Minister. Parliament consists of an Upper and a Lower House.

Population: 16 million

Main urban centres: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, the Hague

Language: Dutch

Other information as needed to be found at:

http://www.minbuza.nl/default.asp?CMS_ITEM=148F3B36EF6B470F85A10BDD6859C310X3X34561X04

- 2. Structure of the police forces.** Organization, levels of obligation, or territories, degree of centralization, control, and funding. Are there any characteristics of the police or policing that are unusual, unique, or important for a non-inhabitant to understand?

Two pdf-files with information about Dutch police are attached

- 3. Legal guidelines.** What are formal legal constraints current in the country? Are there current concerns of police arising from recent incidents or political events of importance to use of force, or for justifying it? Are there case law decisions or formal Ministerial policies of relevance? What are the typical departmental policies on use of force.

Legal Guidelines related to use of force are:

- As for all European countries: Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)
- article 11 of the Constitution (Grondwet), which mentions the right to inviolable rights of physical integrity of the body
- articles 8 & 9 of the Police Law 1993 (Politiewet)
- The national official instruction on use of force (Ambtsinstructie 1994)

Police Law 1993

Article 8 stipulates that police officers are authorized to use force/ violence, when the intended goal justifies this (paying attention to the dangers inherent in the use of force) and the goal cannot be reached by other means. If possible, a warning is given before any use of force. The exercise of authority to use force has to be reasonable and measured in relation to the intended goal. (principles of subsidiarity & proportionality)

Article 9 stipulates that there shall be a national instruction on the use of force

Ambtsinstructie 1994

The national official instruction deals among others with use of force. In Dutch "use of force" is called "use of violence". It defines violence as "every coercive force that is more than negligible, exercised on individuals or objects". Use of violence/ force is defined as including threatening to use violence, which also includes getting hold of one's fire-arm.

A "means to use force" ("geweldmiddel") is any officially distributed weapon or piece of equipment that can be used for the purpose of using force.

Article 4 stipulates that use of a weapon is allowed only if the officer is in the lawful exercise of his duty, if the weapon is given to him for that duty and if he is trained in the use of the weapon.

Article 5 stipulates that when a commanding officer is present, an officer shall use force only if his commander tells him to do so, unless it is not reasonable to wait for a command.

Article 7 – 12 deal with the use of fire-arms. Use of a fire-arm is allowed only against persons or vehicles in which persons are present:

- to arrest a person of whom it can reasonably be supposed he is in possession of a firearm that is ready to use and that he intends to use against persons
- to arrest a person who attempt to evade a legitimate arrest and who is at the same time suspected of, or convicted for an criminal offense that 1. Has a maximum penalty of 4 years or more and 2. Is a serious infringement of the physical integrity of an individual and 3. Is a threat to society because of its consequences
- in specific cases of serious disturbances with specific authority

No use shall be made of the fire-arm when the identity of the individual is known and it is reasonable to assume that postponement of the arrest does not constitute an unacceptable risk to society.

An officer may only take a fire-arm out of the holster into his hand in cases where use of the fire-arm is allowed or, for the protection of himself or others, in cases where it can reasonably be assumed such a situation will arise. Whenever such a situation ceases to exist, the fire-arm has to be put into the holster again.

Prior to any use of the fire-arm, the officer has to give a clear verbal warning or a warningshot, unless circumstances do not allow this. Any warning shots should be fired in such a way that danger to persons or properties is avoided as much as possible.

Article 12 a-c deal with the use of pepper spray, which is to be used to arrest a person of whom it can reasonably be supposed he is in possession of a weapon that is ready to use and that he intends to use against persons or to arrest a person that is evading lawful arrest and against aggressive animals. Pepperspray is not to be used against individuals below the age of 12, over the age of 65, who are visibly pregnant or for whom pepperspray could be more damaging because of a known illness. Pepperspray is also not to be used against groups.

Other articles deal with use of CS (only for crowd control purposes), water cannon (also only for crowd control purposes), police dog (only by a certified dog-handler), electrical baton (only against aggressive animals at the command of a superior officer) and use of fire-arms for SWAT-teams and snipers (semi-automatic weapons and weapons for precision fire).

Article 17 stipulates that the commanding officer has to be notified of any use of force immediately. The commanding officer is the one who then prepares the use-of-force report. In specific cases the chief of police will inform the public prosecutor of the use of force: if shots have been fired, if any use of force resulted in death or serious injury or if the consequences are in another sense serious.

Two aspects are of special interest

- the way in which use of force has to be reported. This was recently (2002) changed.
- Use of violence/ force for self defence (defined as the necessary defence of one's own or another person's body or property against immediate attack) is explicitly not included in the instruction. It is argued that for police officers self defence works the same way as for every other individual and that therefore there is no need for a separate regulation for police. In this way any case law regarding self defence applies automatically to police as well. Other legal grounds to exclude culpability for use of force/ violence are legal regulations and official orders.

After the september 11 attacks in the US, one of the police unions called for expansion of possibilities to use force/ violence to fight terrorism, but this was felt to be unnecessary, as existing regulations were flexible enough to deal with this. There was a reorganisation of SWAT-teams to be better prepared to deal with terrorism-related incidents.

Other national regulations

Since 1996 a **national regulation on training in use of force/ violence** exists (since 2002 expanded and called the "RTGP"). In this national regulation it is stipulated that officers should be trained for a minimum of 32 hours a year and that they should qualify regularly (depending on the test, two times per year or once every two years) for three tests:

- a theoretical test on use of force/ violence
- a practical test in self-defence and arrest skills
- a practical shooting skills test

The national regulation on police weapons (Bewapeningsregeling 1994) details all weapons which which specific groups of police officers can be equipped. For regular officers this includes a fire-arm, a short baton and (since 2002) pepperspray. Specific groups of officers may be equipped with other weapons such as electric baton (dog handlers), long baton (mobile units), semi-automatic and precision rifles (SWAT- and sniper teams), CS-grenades (mobile units), CS-spray (close protection units). All police forces are allowed only the weapons mentioned in this regulation. They are also acquired at a national level.

The national regulation on police equipment (Uitrustingsregeling 1994) details other equipment for specific groups of police officers, such as handcuffs (all officers), bullet-proof vests or helmets, gasmasks and explosives.

Local policies have to conform to national policy. No local policies on use of force can be formulated that deviate from national policies. Of course some policies could potentially affect police – citizen interactions and thus the use of force. Two policies come to mind:

- zero tolerance type policies in use in some municipalities or police forces
- contracts between national government and police forces about specific performance to be delivered by police. One of the requirements of these contracts is to make more stops.

4. Use of Force practices current/acceptable in the country. These may be descriptions of weapons, equipment, data on shootings, or use of force accepted in the country (or that vary by regions or cities). Here, we are suggesting exploring the informal and agreed practices that may not be reflected in formal written policies or even legal guidelines. This is the appropriate place to discuss problems with the use of force in the country- excess, brutality, outright murder, and so on.

The "Bewapeningsregeling 1994" (National regulation on police weapons) and "Uitrustingsregeling 1994" (National regulation on police equipment) stipulate what weapons and equipment may be carried by specific types of officers. These regulations apply to all police forces and both weapons and equipment are acquired by the National Police Services Agency.

For ordinary officers, the following weapons are allowed: fire-arm (Walther P5 with Action 3 ammunition), pepper spray, short baton. Handcuffs are part of the standard equipment.

For (members of) Mobile units: long baton, tear-gas, watercannon

For (members of) SWAT-teams & Snipers: semi-automatic rifles and sharpshooter rifles

For trained dog-handlers: police dogs & electrical baton

Since 1990 the Action 3 ammunition is in use (Dynamit Nobel AG, type Action, model 3, calibre 9 * 19 mm). It was developed specifically in consultation with the Dutch police to meet with the required specifications: no deformation outside calibre, enough stopping power, residual energy not too high. Starting from 2005, this ammunition is gradually

being replaced by the "Action Effect" ammunition (Dynamit A.G.), which is seen as an improved version of the Action 3, because it poses less of a risk to bystanders after someone has been hit with the ammunition and because it causes less wear and tear on both weapons and shooting ranges. Wounds caused by the bullet will be marginally (less than 10%) greater than those caused by Action 3.

A study on the use of fire-arms by the Dutch police in the years 1978- 1995 (J. Timmer, J. Naeyé & M. van der Steeg, *Onder Schot Vuurwapengebruik van de politie in Nederland*, 1996, Gouda Quint, Deventer) indicated that the researchers had some difficulty finding data, because it turned out these weren't registered properly. In all, they found data on 3360 cases of police use of fire-arms: in 1368 cases the weapon was drawn and pointed at a suspect, in 1157 cases warning shots were fired and in 835 cases at least one shot was fired at an object or individual. In the course of the 18 year study-period, 53 civilians were killed by police bullets and 244 people were wounded (cases of police suicide etc. are excluded). 10 of the deaths and 28 of the wounded were the results of involuntary shots (fired in a reflex, as a result of a mistake in handling the weapon or while wrestling with a suspect). 7 of the deaths and 13 of the wounded occurred during arrests made by a SWAT-team (In the years 1992- 1995 SWAT-teams made 5060 arrests, during which shots were fired in three cases with four wounded and no deaths as a result).

Little is known about who the victims of the shootings are. There are no indications that race may be a significant factor. Although all officers are informed during training that it is futile and dangerous to shoot at cars, about 50% of all aimed shots were fired at a car containing one or more suspects (usually at the tires). 57% of shots fired at individuals are in (self-reported) self-defence, 51% are fired to make an arrest. Dutch police-officers are trained to shoot at the legs only if this is sufficient to achieve their goal.

When a police-officer shoots some-one, an inquiry is made by a special investigating body (the "rijksrecherche") under the authority of the public prosecutor. Of 181 cases of aimed shooting the opinion of the public prosecutor could be traced in the files. The public prosecutor agreed with the action taken by the police in 70% of the cases and disagreed in 24% of the cases. He disagreed significantly more often when shots had been fired at vehicles. Even if the public prosecutor came to the conclusion that the officer concerned had not acted against the law, his/ her superior could take some disciplinary measure if (national or internal) instructions had been violated.

A later study by Timmer (2005) indicated that the number of wounded police officers had risen from 6 per 1000 in 1974 to 16 per 1000 in 2000. The number of civilians hit by police bullets has remained stable for 25 years. According to Timmer, the establishment of Mobile Units (to deal with public order) and SWAT –teams (to deal with high-risk arrests) in the 1970s has contributed considerably to the safety of police work in the Netherlands.

Recently, a three year study on the introduction of pepperspray in Dutch police forces was concluded (Adang & Mensink, 2004; Adang e.a. 2005; Adang e.a., in press).

Introduction of this new weapon was done very carefully after preparatory research, a pilot in 4 forces, detailed after-care instructions. Introduction was accompanied by a three-year monitoring period, which allowed for changes in national instruction and training to be made. The conclusion of the study was among others that pepperspray is a safe use-of-force option, that is less effective than is usually thought and is at times counterproductive. Introduction of pepperspray did not lead to a reduction in the use of fire-arms, other weapons or other uses of forces. Neither was it not accompanied by a decrease in injuries to officers or a decrease in complaints on the use of force. There are some indications that it was linked to decreased need of medical attention for arrested suspects. Another conclusion of the study was that pepperspray should not be used (as it was in about 10% of the cases) as an alternative to verbal commands or normal restraint techniques for the arrest of non-violent suspects

A problem area related to police use of force is inadequate registration of use of force incidents. Although certain incidents where force was used may lead to complaints, there are no specific patterns of excesses or police brutality, no complaints of outright murder.

Since several years and based on research, the so-called "goal-approach analysis" (Adang & Timmer, 1998, 2005) was introduced in police training (both basic training and advanced training). This approach requires officers to answer five questions to themselves (and discuss with fellow officers) before answering a call/ taking action: 1. What is my goal? 2. What are the risks involved? 3. Am I allowed to reach to goal? 4. Am I able to reach the goal? (with my skills, equipment etc available) 5. How do I approach the situation? / What's my plan?

5. Terminology Relating to Force.

A. Sources to be consulted:

- a. Legislation relating to the use of force by the police (constitution; criminal code; criminal procedure code; human rights legislation; etc.)
- b. Ministerial/departmental policies on the use of force.
- c. Training manuals.
- d. Focus group transcriptions.

B. Words/phrases of interest: all that are used to refer to physical or psychological interference with civilians (e.g., force, coercion, violence, control, power). Please include any slang or special terms that are used to convey these notions.

The word used in Dutch is "geweld", which translates as "violence". There is no distinction in Dutch between use of "force" and "violence" and for violent acts by both civilians and police the same word "geweld" is used. In defining "geweld" the word "force" is also used. In official regulations the words "gebruik" (use) or "inzet" (deploy or deployment) are used in combination with the name of a weapon/ piece of equipment to refer to use of force/ violence. Also:

- aanleggen handboeien: putting on handcoughs
- onderzoek , veiligheidsfouillering: search

- vorderen: demand
- van zijn vrijheid beroven, vrijheidsbeneming: rob or take away someone's freedom (which encompasses more than just arresting someone)
- arresteren, aanhouden: to arrest
- staande houden: to stop
- dwang: coercion
- ter hand nemen van vuurwapen: taking the fire-arm in one's hand (a use-of-force according to the Dutch definition!)
- achtervolgen: give chase
- waarschuwen: to give a warning
- dreigen: to threaten
- controle: to control
- macht: power
- bevoegdheid: authority, competency, power

In the Appendix a full overview of terminology used in the focus groups is given. Key expressions have been highlighted and translated into English.

C. Material required:

An analysis of the words/phrases, including the original language and the best translation to English. Citations are also necessary (for referencing these terms).

In the Appendix a full overview of terminology used in the focus groups is given. This overview is not yet translated into English.

- 6. Important Critical Incidents/Complaints.** Perhaps recent events need further discussion here if they amplify concerns. (This overlaps with points in 3 above). Perhaps there are trends in use of force, police shootings (by the police) or shootings of or at police? Also, include here anything about complaints regarding the use of force. Have there been specific incidents that have generated a lot of public concern? Is police use of force considered a problem? Have there been calls for changes in the policies, guidelines or administrative procedures governing the use of force

Specific incidents that generated a lot of public concern not so much because of police use of force, as well as because of the nature/ target of the crime:

- in 2002 a politician was killed. His murderer was arrested immediately afterwards at gunpoint without a shot being fired
- in 2004 [after the focus groups were conducted] a film-maker was killed by an islamic extremist. He was arrested immediately afterwards after a gunfight, in which he shot at and wounded several police officers (possible attempt at suicide-by-cop) and was himself brought down by a shot fired deliberately in the leg by police

In recent years, three other incidents in which police killed a suspect raised a lot of public concern (on average three people a year are killed by police bullets nationally):

- in 2000 an officer shot a suspect who threatened him with a knife. Four days of riots followed. The officer claimed to have shot in self-defence, with which the public prosecutor agreed. Family and friends of the deceased disagreed. He was not prosecuted. [Four years later, the officer was discharged after making a false statement in relation to another incident, in which he had pushed a youth from his scooter];
- in 2003 an officer shot a youth who threatened him with a knife. Questions were raised whether or not the ethnic background of the suspect played a role in the unfolding of events;
- in 2004 [one month before the first focus group was held] a suspect who pointed and fired a gun at police was shot at 21 times (very unusual) and hit 4 times, resulting in his death. Possible instance of suicide-by-cop. The gun later turned out to be fake, but indistinguishable from a genuine fire-arm.

After a pilot held in 2000, pepper spray was introduced nationally as a new police weapon, supposedly to "fill the gap between baton and fire-arm". SWAT-teams have tested bean-bags.

Reporting use of force was changed in 2002 (see above) to avoid officers incriminating themselves.

7. Crime Rates and other relevant official data. If need be, or if relevant to the concerns of police.

2004 data can be found on <http://misdaadmeter.i-serve.net/> (in Dutch)

8. Methodology Used

- Which scenario was used (append it) to stimulate the focus groups (FG)?
- What sort of probes (questions asked to follow up on unclear remarks) were used in the course of the group?
- How many groups were assembled?
- How large were each of the focus groups?
- What departments do they represent? What are the features (size, location) of these Departments or police forces? How were the departments selected?
- Were the groups of officers mixed rank, or of single or similar ranks?
- Where were the FGs held? Police station, private home, conference room in university, etc?

- Who presented the vignette and introduced each new phase of the vignette? Were other researchers present?
- How was the vignette presented? Power point? cartoon/poster/flip chart? Verbal presentation?
- How were the interactions/ talk recorded?- written, filmed, audio, other? Did you use some combination of recording methods? How long are the transcripts-pages or words? How long are they in average and what is the range of pages e.g. 5 to 15 pages (this bears on the detail of the written recordings).
Filmed. Transcript pages range from
- In what form, if any, are they available to other members of the PUOF Group? Written, CD-ROM, filmed, audio recordings?
- How long did each focus group take?
- Were there any problems in conducting the focus groups?
- Exceptions or concerns e.g. Did it appear that one person dominated and “skewed” the discussions? Were there silent people who might have dissented.?
- What is your overall impression of the groups? Tense, lively? Serious or very serious? Agitated about something, etc. (This may not of course be relevant).
- Were there any comments to you after the sessions that are relevant? Did you have a “debriefing” after the sessions- asking the participants what they thought about the exercise?
- Were there any current or past events that seemed to pattern the responses e.g., a recent shooting in the city or of an officer?

Dutch and English versions of the scenario are attached. All interviews were conducted in september/october 2004 within a 6 week-period by a team of two Police Academy teachers, both police officers themselves. One operated the video camera, the other led the focus group. They changed roles between groups. Five focus groups were conducted, composed of 5 officers each. In all 5 were female (or 20%, which conforms to the overall % of women in the Dutch police). Average age of participants was 42 yrs, median 45 yrs, range 25- 54 years). Number of years in service: average 19, median 25, range 2 –37. Compared with police in general, participants were older and had more years in service, also average rank was higher (1 surveillant [does not carry fire-arm, 4 agenten, 8 hoofdagenten, 9 brigadier, 3 inspecteur). Focus groups were always of mixed rank and always included officers actually working the streets.

Forces were selected on the basis of the following criteria

- geographical spread (one west, one north, one south, one east, one central)
- spread in size of force/ city (large, middle, small)

Focus groups were held in police stations.

Initial situation was presented on paper. Then, step by step the researcher introduced the scenario verbally. Focus groups lasted between 45 min and 1h.

Three pilots were held: one with police academy teachers, one with police academy students, one in a police force (another police force that those actually used in the study). Focus groups were recorded on video. Videos and transcripts (in Dutch) are available. In each focus group one (sometimes two) participant tended to dominate the discussion. On occasion he was/ they were corrected. In each focus group one of the participants hardly participated actively. In each of the groups one of the participating officers had actually shot a suspect at some point (one of them with deadly consequences). Afterwards we learnt that participants were not used to/ had no experience with discussing police use of force or even police deployment in general, in this way.

Police being killed while on duty as a result of violent action is quite rare in the Netherlands (on average, on a national level one officer is killed in this way every two or three years). In the period the focus groups took place, one such incident did occur (just prior to the last focus group), where an officer was killed when trying to do a routine check on a suspected drugs dealer.

Analysis.

Divide the scenario into three stages:

Stage 1 = beginning of the scenario up to the point where one of the youths starts the car. (The Encounter)

Stage 2 = vehicle chase up to and including the youths' car crashing against the lamp post. (The Chase)

Stage 3 = youths get out of car and run, one of them with what looks like a gun, up to the end of the scenario.(Finale)

For each stage, present and discuss material from the FG transcripts organized under the following headings:

- a. Perceptions of what is going on in the situation.
- b. Actions that the officers would/would not take.
- c. Informal rules for the use of force that were mentioned.
- d. Formal rules for the use of force that were mentioned.
- e. Justifications for the use of force. Here, "justification" could be anything that officers said which could be construed as an answer to the question "why would you do/not do X?" Some of those answers could be very superficial (e.g., "because that's what the rules say we should do") while others could be more elaborate (e.g., "because the youths have failed to comply with an order and it is necessary to arrest them"). All justifications of interest and should be mentioned. Of special interest are justifications that link an action to something happening in the situation (these have been called "causal" justifications) and justifications that link an action to its objective (these have been called "teleological" justifications).

For each of the above points, direct quotes can and should be included in the report, especially when they are particularly revealing in terms of the way that the officers approach the scenario.

In addition to the above, each team may want to provide a more general discussion of the focus group, in terms of, for example:

- Was there a shift in the content of the FG from legal to non-legal or formal to informal language over the course of the session?
- Were there any overall themes that seem to emerge from the conversation, e.g., the self-image of the police, the tension between rules and situational exigencies, the construction of authority, force as punishment?

The analysis is presented below. Divided for the three stages, actions and justifications (divided into "causal" and "teleological") have been given, using as much as possible the wording used by focus group participants. Letters behind quotes indicate from which focus-group the quote was (A = Amsterdam, D = Doetinchem, H = Horst, L = Leeuwarden, G = Gorinchem).

Following that, rules (divided into formal and informal) are summarized. These are not divided into the three stages, as similar rules seemed to play a role in the different stages. However, a division was made between several types of dimensions/ factors, e.g. behavior of suspect, familiarity with suspect, circumstances, behaviour of/ relationship with fellow officer, values and norms.

Please note that in the Dutch scenario, two types of questions were asked

- what would you do in this situation?
- (after an action by the fellow officer in the scenario) do you think this is acceptable? (& why or why not)

Two themes were dominant in the discussions of all focus groups:

1. the way in which untactical behaviour may actually provoke escalation and should be avoided
2. the dilemma of what to do if a fellow officer behaves in a way that is considered unacceptable: go along, address him, address him later?

It was generally agreed that, once a suspect takes aim at oneself or a fellow officer, he should be shot to take him out (with some discussion about possible risks for bystanders). Before that point was reached, there was great reluctance to even draw the fire-arm

The Encounter

1. What would you do in this situation?

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
Have a chat		- See what they do (L)
Control, check number plate	- If I think they are smoking a joint. (G, L) - They are known to police (H)	- Establish identity (L) - See if narcotics are present (G)

Your colleague indicates that he suspects the car might be stolen.

2. What would you do?

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
Check, check number plate with dispatcher		- Let's have clear whether or not it is stolen (D, L)
Look in car, get keys		- Assure tht car acannot leave, create safe work environment (A)
Have a chat		- Get information (H)
Arrest	- If it turns out car is stolen (H)	
Ask fellow officer about his suspicion		- Get clear what is basis for suspicion of fellow officer (H)

Your colleague goes over to the car and demand the men to provide identification

3. Is that acceptable? Explain why or why not

→ Some groups find this action acceptable (A) , some not (D, H, L, G)

Acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(Demand)	- If you see car is short-circuited (A)	

Not acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(Demand)	- No indications in situation to start like this	- By using this approach you will get less information (L) - By using this approach they won't cooperate(G)

Comments here generally:

- you have to do it differently, talk them out of the car
- you do not start in this way
- keep the conversation amicable and don't play the strict officer
- use your powers only if things turn unpleasant
- not tactical
- it is the tone that makes the music

The youths ignore the officers' demands and verbally abuse both of you

4. What would you do?

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
Check everything, demand identification	- Dependent on people in the car (shape, demeanour etc) (L)	- Try and effect an arrest (A)
Arrest	- Dependent on words used (D, L, G) & perceived intent (powerlessness or threat) (L)	
Become more directive (tell passenger: stay in car; tell driver: out of the car and hands on the roof)	- they should not get personal (H) - if other people pass by, my threshold will be lower (H)	- Police remains in control (G)
Stay calm	- As long as the situation doesn't call for it, there is no reason to put on more pressure (H) - Do not see every abuse as an insult (L)	- Avoid getting into a negative spiral (H) - Remain professionally and treat people respectfully
Address your fellow officer	- situation doesn't call for demands (D)	- Officer is accountable (D) - Use proper tactical approach (D) - Avoid escalation
Address fellow officer and remove from scene	- Officer is punishing youth for what officer himself provoked (D)	

Your colleague opens the door on the drivers' side and in a loud voice orders the driver to get out of the car. At the same time he pulls the drivers' arm to get him out of the car.

5. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

→ Some of these actions are considered acceptable (L, G), others not (A, D, H)

Acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(Colleague orders driver and pulls his arm)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maybe he saw sth I did not (L) - They started using abusive language.. (L) - If they do not behave normally, then "My way or the High way" (G) - If you can motivate why it's always OK (L) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You want to get the suspects out and away from the driving wheel asap (L) - Remain in control at all costs (G)

Comments:

- it is the tone that makes the music
- you go along, but will get into conflict with yourself (L)

Not acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(Colleague orders driver and pulls his arm)		If you want to arrest, it has to be done in an acceptable way (A)
Go along anyway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You see it from a distance, you do not know what happened exactly (D) 	
Address colleague come on, relax (H)	Normally you ask them to get out and wait a few seconds, if they do not make a move, only then do you get hold of them (D)	

Comments:

- Maybe he had a bad night or an argument with his wife and he is frustrated (D)
- Colleague too tight (D)
- Knowing your colleague is important (H)
- Over here we do not do things like that (D)

The driver starts the car

6. What would you do?

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
Dive into car (not across passenger), get keys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These fellow react quite fanatically, use abusive language and apparently want to get away quickly, perhaps they have sth to hide (D) - (doubting) only because of abusive language... (G), there is no cause yet (H) - because of their behaviour your intentions change (from not using force to using force) (L) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The car won't ride away (A, G) - Guarantee safety (G) - Always ask yourself what your goal is en what kind of risks you are prepared to take (G)
Call for backup		- Try and close in car (G)
Pull driver out	- Maybe not completely according to the rules, but that is of later concern (H)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoid dangerous situation with a chase (G) - Let them know where we draw the line (H)
Go along with colleague	Doubt: colleague provoked the situation	Doubts: what for?
Pull back		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety of self, colleague and bystanders (L) - Is it worth it? You must always ask yourself: why do I want him

The Chase

The car speeds away into a residential area.

7. What would you do?

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
After it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Absolutely, no doubt (A,D,G,H,L) - Dependent on your own perception of the situation (D) - You have suspicions that they have sth to hide, this is not a normal reaction (D,L) - Until it becomes dangerous, depending on circumstances) (D,G) - It is late in the evening (making it safer) (D,G) - "Known" to police (D) - You have to balance: you don't know whether car is stolen, you have insult against possible fanger of giving chase (D) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do'nt lose the car, avoid that it gets several kilomeres away (G,H) - Absolutely get these guys (G)
Relay location of car and ask for backup		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make a block with help of other cars (G)
Stop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In a dangerous situation (D) - Maybe a moment arrives that you have to stop (G) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To avoid negative consequences (D) - Guarantee safety: not try to get them at all cost (D) - Are you someone who does not ant to back down? (L)

Your colleague gets into the car and the both of you pursue the car, using flashlight and sirens. You report to the desk that you are pusing a car

8. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

→ Actions are considered acceptable by some (A, D, H, L, G) and not acceptable by others (D, L)

Acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(pursuit with flashing lights and sirens)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fellows do not want to cooperate, avoid a police control (H) - Things build up: stop sign, honk, bluelights (L) - Depending on location, this is not the city centre (L) - Their behaviour is sufficient cause to take action (A) - They can be under the influence, they were smoking a joint (A) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bluelights and sirens good for safety civilians (A, D, G) - See that you block the car (A)
Inform operator		

Not acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(pursuit with flashing lights and sirens)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have nothing, not a real offense 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is egging them on and will only lead to more erratic behaviour (D) - Irresponsible (D)

The car comes to a halt after crashing into a street light pole. The youths are still in the car and do not appear to be hurt. **9. What would you do?**

Actions	Justification (causal)	Individueel	Justification (teleological)
Arrest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - And not gently (H) - Not with use of weapon (D) - When they flee like that, I consider them to be suspects (D) 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevent them from getting away again (A)
Pull them out of car and put handcuffs on			
Stop your car at a safe distance with your lights shining on them			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guarantee safety (D)
Test driver for alcohol	When you cause an accident, you have to blow (D)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possibility for extra conviction (D)
Call for backup			

Comments: in A. a second car would have been there already, one operator is informed (half the city would have been giving chase (A)

You get out of the car and your colleague approaches the car with his fire-arm drawn. He shouts at the youths to get out of the car with their hands up. **10. Is that acceptable?**

Why or why not?

→ Actions are considered acceptable by some (H) and not acceptable by others (A, D, H, L, G)

Acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(Approach car with gun drawn)	You don't know why fire-arm is drawn (G), depends on personality fellow officer	

Not acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(Approach car with gun drawn)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Just 2 snotnoses smoking a joint... (H) - There is no info about the car, no weapon... (A, D, H) - If i don't see anything, do not draw fire-arm, only hinders me (H) - Use of fire-arm only in response to sth, what happened so far? They just drove away (A, L) - It is dependent on the personality of you coll (H) 	This only creates an unsafe situation (G), avoid creating an unsafe situation (G)

Comments

- Address colleague: "Put that thing awayr" (D)
- On the street you cannot say "put your fire-arm away" (A, G)
- I will not argue with my coll, need all my attention for the youths
- You go along, but it is not acceptable

Finale

As the both of you approach the car, the two young men get out and start to run away. There are several pedestrians in the immediate vicinity

11. What would you do?

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
Give chase		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That's our job: catching criminals (D) - But I will not stop these fellows at all costs (G)
Kick him down	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Now it's been enough 	
Call for coll to holster fire-arm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presence of bystanders (D) - Find personally not acceptable, need to know more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hope that coll holsters weapon (L) - Brandishing a gun almost leads to using it as a next step (L)
Inform operator and follow/ give chase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Door steegjes waar allemaal voetgangers lopen? (twijfel) (H) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Try to encircle (A)

Comment:

Before giving chase, coll should holster weapon to avoid shooting himself in the foot (H)

As the two men are running away, you observe that one of them appears to be carrying a handgun

12. What would you do?

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
Inform operator and keep running	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In spite of him having a fire-arm (G) - Keep monitoring situation & adjust you actions accordingly (H) - Presence of others does not mean you always have to stop (H) - instinctivelu 	
Decide whether or not to draw fire-arm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presence of bystanders (A) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draw weapon for your own safety (H) - Do not draw weapon for safety bystanders (A)
Take cover/ pull back	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If there are shoppers around (H) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Think of your own safety (D, L, H) - Also think of safety for surroundings (D)
Maintain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Geen vest aan dus 	

distance and follow	gevaarlijk (D) - Afhankelijk van de omgeving, de huizen, gebouwen, rondlopende mensen (D)	
Shout that there is a firearm		- Safety for oneself, coll and bystanders (H)

Your colleague shouts "Stop, police" and fires a warning shot

13. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

→ Actions are considered acceptable by some (A, H, L) and not acceptable by others (A, D, G)

Acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(Coll fires a warning shot)	- Suspect carries a gun (H) - He runs away (L) - But: you do not know number of bystanders (L), in how far they are known (A), you do take certain risks	- Firing to affect an arrest (A)

Not acceptable

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(Coll fires a warning shot)	- If there really are a lot of people about...(A, D, G) - What have they actually done? Smoke a joint, drive away (A) - Suspect did not threaten anyone (D) - Maybe in a big city (D)	- You provoke things: suspect will turn round, and... you need to think ahead a little bit further (D) - Not logical to prevent further mischief (D)

Comment:

You need to point out to your colleague that he cannot do this

The man with the handgun turns and points it at your colleague.

14. What would you do?

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
Draw fire-arm		
Shoot him/ kill him	- Situation changes because he aims at a coll (D)	- Avoid further mischief(G) - Incapacitate suspect (H)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fellows who do sth like that are no small fry (D) - At such a time, bystanders are less important (D) - In an emergency situation shots will be fired G, H) - Even though there are a few people in the street (L) - Who does not want to hear has to feel it (D) - It is your colleague (D) - It's a reaction "baff" (L) - Keep thinking about the moment you aim and fire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not on the legs, go for the torso (G)
--	--	---

Comment

Still, I have doubts about the whole situation: a fellow officer operating untactically, you get irritated by him, he has gotten away with a lot already, you feel (D)

Your colleague fires multiple shots in the direction of the man with the handgun

15. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

This action is considered acceptable (A, D, H, L, G)

Actions	Justification (causal)	Justification (teleological)
(colleague fires multiple shots)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is dangerous because of pedestrians, but acceptable) (H) - If he keeps aiming (A, L) - There is no other option, unless you can dive for cover (G) - As long as he did'n throw away his weapon (A) - Maybe he is wearing a vest, so keep shooting until he falls down (D) - I would shoot as well (G) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If only he hits him (H, L) - Take him out (D) - Saving your life (H)

Rules

Behaviour of suspect: formal rules

- the policy at the moment is "using abusive language means arrest
- when a suspect resists arrest, the police is justified in using force
- when a suspect evades arrest, an officer has the authority to use pepperspray
- when a suspect is aggressive and violent, police is forced to use force
- when a suspect draws a firearm, an officer is justified in drawing his firearm

Behaviour of suspect: informal rules

- name calling should remain within limits
- do not take every insult as an insult
- you act professionally and treat people with respect, and expect the same in return
- when a suspect flees, you give chase
- catch a fleeing suspect, if need be by using force
- a suspect does not flee for no reason, there must be something behind that
- first try to solve conflicts with your mouth (if that doesn't work, use force)
- if the risk for your own life (or for the life of others) becomes too great, retreat

Familiarity with suspect: informal rules

- if you know a suspect is aggressive and may become violent, you will use your authority to use force more quickly

Circumstances: formal rules

- if the situation is such that shooting is authorized, you can shoot

Circumstances: informal rules

- you should always pay attention whether there are any bystanders
- my own life is more important than possible bystanders

Behaviour of / relationship with fellow officer: informal rules

- fellow officer can be too tight (happens to everyone once in a while) and may respond more keenly
- for starters you follow what your fellow officer does
- knowing your fellow officer plays a role in what you do
- you should be able to completely rely on your fellow officer

Safety of civilians and oneself: formal rules

- in a situation of self-defence one is justified in drawing one's weapon

Safety of civilians and oneself: informal rules

- guaranteeing the safety of bystanders is important in using or not using force
- don't try to get suspects at all costs, if that means jeopardizing the safety of bystanders
- in a self-defence situation, formal rules are of less interest
- my own life is more important than that of bystanders
- it is him or me

- one is responsible for one's fellow officer and he/ she is responsible for you

Personal experiences and intuition: formal rules

- you act according to learned procedures and practical experiences that are applicable to these procedures

Personal experiences and intuition: informal rules

- you decide on the basis of your experience and knowledge
- negative experiences with the use of force may lead to holding back on future occasions
- as a result of experiences you learn to put fear and emotions aside and procedures, knowledge and the urge to survive take over
- police discretion allows an officer to act on the basis of his intuition

Goal: formal rules

- force may be used to effect an arrest, to guarantee safety, to stop a violent suspect, etc.

Goal: informal rules

- an officer should always ask him/herself what the goal of his actions are

Values and norms: formal rules

- as a police officer it is your responsibility to aid those who need it
- as a police officer you must be prepared to take certain risks

Values and norms: informal rules

- you act professionally and treat people with respect
- police should be treated with respect, if not, suspects will be dealt with more harshly
- everyone should be treated in the way you should want to be treated yourself
- if civilians do not want to cooperate in a normal fashion, they will be dealt with more harshly
- if a fellow officer acts, you go along
- one is responsible for one's fellow officer and he/ she is responsible for you
- you have to take risks

Personal characteristics: informal rules

- if the size of an officer may lead him to be at a disadvantage in a confrontation or fight, he/ she can use pepperspray to gain control of the situation
- if an officer is in a bad mood, he/ she might get frustrated more easily and this can lower the threshold for the use of force

9. Any additional comments, qualifications, reservations, matters to be further discussed within the group?

No

Appendix: Dutch scenario, Dutch version

“Het is vroeg in de avond. Het begint al donker te worden. Twee collega's zijn in een herkenbaar politievoertuig op surveillance in de buitenwijk van een grote stad. Aan de kant van de weg zien ze een auto geparkeerd staan met twee armoedig geklede jonge mannen erin, die zo te zien een stickie roken. De jonge mannen komen de collega's voor als "bekenden van de politie", al kunnen ze niet direct plaatsen in verband daarmee.”

Vragen bij de casus:

- 1) Wat zou je zelf in de aangegeven situatie doen?
- 2) Je collega geeft aan dat hij vermoedt dat de auto gestolen is. Wat zou je doen?
- 3) Je collega gaat naar de auto toe en vordert de mannen zich te identificeren en uit de auto te stappen. Is dat acceptabel ja/ nee? En leg uit waarom wel of niet.
- 4) De mannen negeren de vorderingen en schelden jullie uit. Wat zou je doen?
- 5) Je collega opent het portier aan de bestuurderszijde en commandeert de bestuurder met luide stem om uit te stappen. Tegelijkertijd trekt hij aan de arm van de bestuurder om hem uit de auto te krijgen. Is dat acceptabel ja/ nee? En leg uit waarom wel of niet.
- 6) De bestuurder start de auto. Wat zou je doen?
- 7) De auto rijdt met hoge snelheid weg, de wijk in. Wat zou je doen?
- 8) Je collega stapt het surveillancevoertuig in en jullie zetten de achtervolging in, met gebruikmaking van zwaailicht en sirene. Jullie geven aan de meldkamer door dat jullie een auto achtervolgen. Is dat acceptabel ja/ nee? En leg uit waarom wel of niet.
- 9) De auto met de twee mannen erin komt tot stilstand tegen een lantaarnpaal. De mannen lijken niet gewond te zijn. Wat zou je doen?
- 10) Jullie stappen uit en je collega nadert de auto met getrokken wapen. Hij roept naar de mannen dat ze met hun handen omhoog uit moeten stappen. Is dat acceptabel ja/ nee? En leg uit waarom wel of niet.
- 11) Als jullie de auto naderen, stappen de mannen uit en rennen weg. In de straat zijn diverse voetgangers aanwezig. Wat zou je doen?
- 12) Terwijl de mannen wegrennen zie je dat één van de mannen een vuurwapen in zijn handen heeft. Wat zou je doen?
- 13) Je collega roept “halt, politie” en vuurt een waarschuwingsschot af. Is dat acceptabel ja/ nee? En leg uit waarom wel of niet
- 14) De man met het vuurwapen in de hand draait zich al rennend om en richt het vuurwapen op je collega. Wat zou je doen?
- 15) Je collega schiet meerdere malen in de richting van de man met het vuurwapen. Is dat acceptabel ja/ nee? En leg uit waarom wel of niet.

Appendix: Dutch scenario, English version

It is early evening and beginning to get dark. Two officers are on routine patrol in a patrol car in a built-up urban area. They observe two rather poorly dressed young adult males sitting in a car parked on the roadside, apparently smoking a joint. The two young men look familiar to the officers, although they cannot tell exactly in connection with what.

1. What would you do in this situation?

Your colleague indicates that he suspects the car might be stolen.

2. What would you do?

Your colleague goes over to the car and demand the men to provide identification

3. Is that acceptable? Explain why or why not

The youths ignore the officers' demands and verbally abuses both of you

4. What would you do?

Your colleague opens the door on the drivers' side and in a loud voice orders the driver to get out of the car. At the same time he pulls the drivers' arm to get him out of the car.

5. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

The driver starts the car

6. What would you do?

The car speeds away into a residential area.

7. What would you do?

Your colleague gets into the car and the both of you pursue the car, using flashlight and sirens. You report to the desk that you are pusuing a car

8. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

The car comes to a halt after crashing into a street light pole. The youths are still in the car and do not appear to be hurt.

9. What would you do?

You get out of the car and your colleague approaches the car with his fire-arm drawn. He shouts at the youths to get out of the car with their hands up

10. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

As the both of you approach the car, the two young men get out and start to run away. There are several pedestrians in the immediate vicinity

11. What would you do?

As the two men are running away, you observe that one of them appears to be carrying a handgun

12. What would you do?

Your colleague shouts "Stop, police" and fires a warning shot

13. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

The man with the handgun turns and points it at your colleague.

14. What would you do?

Your colleague fires multiple shots in the direction of the man with the handgun

15. Is that acceptable? Why or why not?

Appendix: Terminology related to use of force (Source: focus group transcriptions)

Question 1

BB “**controleren**”. [check]

BB “Ik zou ze zo wie zo helemaal controleren, op het moment dat zij een stickie zitten te roken, in de auto, hebben we nogal wat bevoegdheden op grond van de Opiumwet, dat zal inhouden dat zij...eh uit de auto gehaald worden, gevraagd worden om uit de auto te komen...”.

CC “Ik zou ze controleren”.

CC “Ik zou contact maken, het zijn bekenden, maar we weten niet precies waarvan, dat zou ik willen weten”.

DD “Controle, controle van het voertuig enne van de twee personen die er in zitten”.

EE “**Praatje maken**” [have a chat]

Question 2

AA “**Je zorgt gewoon dat de auto niet meer weg kan rijden**” [you see to it that the car cannot drive away]

AA “Belangrijkste is toch dat de auto stil blijft staan en de bestuurder **er uit trekt**”.
[pull out]

AA “Je zult proberen om die sleutel te **bemachtigen**”. [seize]

BB “...ik wil dus dat kentekenbewijs en dat soort dingen”.

BB “Ik zal in ieder geval zorgen dat ik zodanig kom te staan met die gasten, dat zij er niet in een keer tussenuit kunnen gaan”.

DD “...dan worden ze **aangehouden**”. [formally arrested]

DD “Waar baseer je dat vermoeden op. Ik zou mijn collega bevragen over dat vermoeden. Is het buikgevoel offe zijn er andere omstandigheden”.

DD “mmmja...je **vraagt** om de papieren en je scant die auto vaag, je ziet de verbanden en noem maar op en zo bouwt zich het langzaam op...”. [ask]

Question 3

AA “Als je ziet dat het contact is doorverbonden, dan trek je hem er uit”.

AA “Neen, het kentekenbewijs **vorderen**, die **bevoegdheid** hebben we wel”. [demand]
[authority/ power]

BB “In eerste instantie zou ik het vragen. Je kunt altijd nog vorderen. Als je gelijk gaat vorderen, dat komt gelijk zo **dwingend** over”. [coercive]

CC “Eerst vragen, dat is altijd heel laag drempelig. Als het nou vervelend wordt, maak je gebruik van je bevoegdheden. Dat heeft met **proportionaliteit** te maken.”
[proportionality]

CC “Dat vorderen, zo begin je niet.”

CC “...identiteit vorderen, het rijbewijs vorderen”.

CC “...dan trek je hem de auto uit”.

DD “...je zult moeten beginnen met te zorgen dat die motor afgezet wordt”.

DD “nooit alleen doen, als je met z'n tweeën bent vind ik het stom om het alleen te doen”.

- DD “...gewoon de **procedure volgen** en **elkaar dekken**”. [following procedures] [cover one another]
- DD “Hij **onderneemt de actie** en jij dekt hem”. [take action]
- DD “Vorderen, vorderen, **het is de toon die de muziek maakt**, het gaat om de verwoording er van”. [it's the tone that makes the music]
- EE “Nee, niet acceptabel. Het is gewoon **ontactisch**. Op deze wijze kun je verwachten dat je een **konflikt** krijgt”. [untactical] [conflict]
- EE “Het kan niet in de vorm van een vordering”.

Question 4

- AA “**Dan gaan ze in elk geval door de mangel, worden ze helemaal nagetrokken. Dan moeten ze alles afgeven**” (?) [then they will be taken through the mangling-machine, they will be checked completely, they will have to hand over everything]
- BB “Dan word ik **dwingender**”. [more coercive]
- BB “Dwingender betekent dat ik iemand heel **directief** [directive] benader en **zeg wat ie gaat doen** [tell him what to do] en over het algemeen werkt dat.” “Dat betekent dus...eh uitstappen, even de **handjes op het dak leggen** [put his little hands on the roof], dat ik zeker de handen kan blijven zien, ook als ik daar geen bevoegdheid voor heb....dus dat betekent dat ik niet alleen in de auto kijk, maar ook even snel de personen **aftast** [search] op grond van de Opiumwet, ik ga dus heel directief doen”.
- BB “Directief, dat uit zich door bijvoorbeeld te zeggen tegen de passagier “U blijft zitten” “Bestuurder, nu uit de auto stappen”. Ik ga dus **vertellen wat er gaat gebeuren**”. [tell what will happen]
- DD “**Professioneel handelen** [act professionally], **respectvol optreden** [act with respect], **tot er geen ...eh geen andere weg meer is** [until there is ... eh, no other way] ja, en dan ga je **meer druk op de ketel zetten** [put more pressure on the kettle] en **wat meer de taal van hun spreken, om het maar positief uit te leggen**”. [speak their language more, to say it positively]
- DD “Ik denk dat ik gewoon rustig blijf, **want als je meteen er tegen in gaat... dan kom je in een spiraal**”. [if you go against it straight away... you will come into a spiral]
- DD “Als zij beginnen te schelden, **waarschuw ik een keer en dan is het prijs**”. [I warn once and after that it's bingo]
- DD “Ik ben niet altijd in de stemming om uitgescholden te worden dusseh dan heb ik hem al bij zijn lurven voordat ie een woord verkeerd gezegd heeft”.
- EE “**Als ze gaan schelden, houden we ze aan**”. [if they become abusive, we arrest them]
- EE “**Momenteel is het beleid uitschelden is aanhouden** [the policy right now is: being abusive means arrest]
- EE “Ik zou hem niet aanhouden. Kijk, als ik met iemand op weg ben die zich zo gedraagt, dan rij ik even weg. Dan zeg ik tegen hem: Dat is het gevolg van jouw optreden. Kijk, want als je ze gaat aanhouden, dan ga je ze bestraffen voor iets wat je zelf hebt uitgelokt.”

Question 5

- AA “**je doet de handboeien om**.....” [you put on the handcuffs]

- BB “...dan help je hem er uit”. [you help him out] “Je vordert zelfs dat ie er uit komt”.
- BB “Je trekt hem er uit”.
- BB “...als wij niet op een normale manier ons werk kunnen doen, ja eh...my way or the high way...”.
- BB “Ik wil kost wat het kost de regie houden”. “Als ik vraag om uit te stappen en hij stapt niet uit, dan help ik hem een handje”. [I give him a hand]
- CC “...En dan is het deur open enne eruit..., zo snel mogelijk achter het stuur weg, [out, as soon as possible away from the steering wheel] anders zit je dadelijk met een levensgevaarlijke achtervolging.”
- CC “Wij hebben de regie”.
- CC “Aanhouden, dus uitstappen, dat gaat meestal gepaard met...dan pak je hem al...uit voorzorg bij de schouder of waar dan ook”. [getting out of the car is usually accompanied by ... then you take him ... out of precaution by the shoulder or wherever]
- DD “Nee, maar het is inderdaad zo dat als die collega overhaast te werk gaat, die gaat recht als een of andere lompe stier tegen an, dan zeg ik, doe effe kalm aan, dan zou ik ingrijpen waarschijnlijk”.
- DD “Je collega neemt op dat moment de beslissing, daar zou ik in eerste instantie toch wel even achter staan. Je laat hem niet zitten met een...”.
- DD “We kennen allemaal de collega’s die er als een idioot op zouden vliegen. Dan zeg je, ‘doe effe kalm aan’.
- DD “In eerste instantie volg ik daarin toch mijn collega. Totdat...tenzij echt zeg maar hier een stukje gedrag is wat gewoon niet passend is, dit kun je niet maken, dan is dat inderdaad, dan corrigeer je je collega.”
- DD “Hij kan ook iets gezien hebben”
- DD “Maar als hij een wapen ziet of zo iets, dan moet hij een gil geven”.
- EE “Normaal gesproken zou je eerst even vragen van uh... wil je uitstappen en dan wacht je uh een paar tellen, maar als hij geen aanstalte maakt, dan kun je dus zeggen van uh..ik pak hem vast”.
- EE “Nee, dit zij geen normale reacties. Nee, zoals wij in Doetinchem hier mee omgaan. Kan zijn dat, ’t is natuurlijk vooral in de grote stad, dat ze misschien een ander geweldsspiraal hebben en iets sneller....beslissen”.

Question 6

- AA “Ik duik de auto in” [dive into the car]
- AA “Hij gaat niet rijden, dat zeker niet”
- BB “Proberen de sleutels er uit te trekken”. [try to pull out the keys]
- BB “Ik ga niet over de passagier heen om de sleutel er uit te krijgen”.
- BB “...zijn passagier heeft een probleem als die auto gaat rijden, want ik heb hem vast en dan gaat hij dus de auto uit”. “Ik ga niet onder de auto liggen, ik duik de auto niet in, maar ik trek hem absoluut uit de auto”.
- BB “Hij rijdt niet weg, neen, ik wil absoluut voorkomen dat er een gevaarssetting komt met een achtervolging. Dus, dan gaat hij in een keer met grof geweld de auto uit”. [then he immediately comes out of the car by violent means]
- CC “Je probeert in een reflex hem er uit te trekken en of dat lukt, ik weet het niet”.
- CC “Ik zou proberen zo snel mogelijk die sleutels te pakken.”

CC “Ik zou niet meer aan de sleutel komen, niet in de auto duiken”.

CC “Ik zou hooguit proberen hem aan z’n oren er uit te trekken”. [I would try to get him out by pulling his ears]

CC “Je gaat dus door het gedrag van de tegenpartij, je mening bijstellen”.

CC “Je gaat dus dingen invullen, en dat zijn we hier ook aan het doen, of te veel invullen of te weinig invullen en daar pas je je bevoegdheden op aan.”

CC “Je wilt ze controleren, het gevolg kan zijn dat je ze door rood, over de kruising achtervolgt en die gasten plat rijdt”.

CC “Ik wil altijd graag weten waar je risico’s voor neemt”.

CC “Dus laat maar gaan, nu even niet”.

CC “Je komt ze wel weer tegen”.

DD “Dan gaat ie er uit” “Ja, op de IBT-techniek”. [using standard techniques]

DD “Het kan ook een manier zijn om de spiraal te doorbreken. Die anders alleen maar stapelen en erger wordt. Een keer een korte actie, nou dan weet ie meteen waar de grenzen zijn”. [a short action, well he knows right away where the limits are]

DD “Ik heb meegemaakt: een vent die zat in de auto en hield gewoon het stuur vast en een collega kreeg hem er niet uit. Ik zei: je kan nu uitstappen en dat wilde hij niet. Knevelketting 1 keer draaien, daar gaat ie, kwam los van de grond en zwevend de auto uit”. [one turn with a chain, here he comes, away from the ground, floating out of the car]

DD “Welk voorschrift er overtreden wordt, dat zien we achter af wel. Je moet handelen. Dan maak je een keuze en dat doe je dan”. [you have to act]

DD “Veel van die dingen is ervaring en intuïtie. Daar zijn geen boeken voor”.

DD “Ik neem wel het initiatief, maar hij maakt uit of ik links of rechtsaf ga, want ik beweeg met hem mee. Wil hij kwaad, prima, pats boem, dan is het weer mis”.

EE “Ik was al lang gestopt, ik was al weg geweest”.

EE “Ja, hij trekt hem er uit, ja dan ga ik ook uh... Dan moet je meegaan denk ik”.

EE “Dan denk ik dat ik mee ga en zeg van nou he duik de auto in, trek de sleutel er uit en pak die vent vast en gooi hem buiten op straat”.

EE “Als je collega zegt van je bent aangehouden en begint te trekken, dan ga je mee”.

EE “Kijk, ook al word je beledigd op dat moment en als dan wordt gezegd je bent aangehouden op grond van belediging dan kun je achteraf praten over of je het zelf hebt uitgelokt en of het terecht is ja of nee. Maar dan heb je in ieder geval duidelijkheid. Maar wordt niet gezegd aangehouden, voor een..... voor niks in feite, daar komt het gewoon op neer.

EE “Aan de andere kant zeg ik van, die gasten reageren wel fanatiek, ze schelden, en willen er kennelijk gelijk al vandoor, misschien hebben ze wel meer dingen te verbergen. Dus ik denk van uh... ik heb iets, dan pak ik ze aan en...”. [I deal with them...]

EE “Ik ga dus gewoon met die collega mee en ik zal achteraf zeggen van ik vind dat optreden niet tactisch”.

Question 7

AA “.... En de auto in de klem rijden en dan halleluja”. [jam the car and then hallelujah]

BB “Je gaat er absoluut achteraan”.

- BB “...in eerste instantie met andere voertuigen bij wijze van spreken een soort...eh afzetting maken”. [form a kind of block]
- BB “een beetje insluiten of wat dan ook, maar niet als een kip zonder kop er achter aan gaan lopen scheuren”. [enclose the car a bit]
- BB “We gaan er achter aan, we willen die auto niet kwijt en we nemen dus meer risico dan we eigenlijk zouden moeten nemen”.
- BB “Ik wil absoluut die gozer pakken”.
- CC “Maar wij rijden er natuurlijk achteraan”.
- CC “Je gaat er achter aan, je wilt weten waarom, je laat je ook niet kennen”.
- CC “Wanneer haak je af”.
- CC “Ik denk in eerste instantie er achter aan, omdat je tijdens de rit op een gegeven moment zegt: stop, dit wordt te gek, stoppen...”.
- DD “Ik vraag om assistentie”. [I ask for backup]
- DD “Ik ga er in elk geval achteraan”
- DD “ja, en proberen een kringetje te trekken en dat je hem niet de kans geeft dat hij kilometers weg rijdt”.
- EE “Dan rij je er achteraan tot het punt dat het te gevaarlijk wordt en dan haak je af”.
- EE “Op een normale manier er achter aan”.

Question 8

- AA “... Zorg dat je de auto klem rijdt, en geef het door en probeer op andere wijze die auto zo snel mogelijk aan de kant te krijgen”.
- CC “Ik zou het eerst met het stopteken [the stop sign] proberen, en niet, dan ga ik weer een stapje hoger, dan bouw je het weer op”. [then I take a step up, build it up]
- CC “Ik denk niet met toeters en bellen”.
- CC “stopteken is een vordering van de wegenverkeerswet”.
- DD “Hij kan best wegrijden. Dat kun je nooit zeggen. Als ik iemand vastpak, laat ik niet snel los. Ik kan niet zeggen dat dat nooit zal gaan gebeuren”.
- DD “Ik trek het raam er af”. [I pull off the window]
- DD “Hij komt niet weg. Wij doen gemeen. Wij hangen aan de haren”. [We act mean. We pull hairs]
- EE “Ik vind het niet acceptabel. Je hitst die gasten alleen nog maar meer op en ze gaan alleen maar gekker doen, ja en waarvoor, onverantwoordelijk”.

Question 9

- AA “Maar als die auto tegen de lantaarnpaal zit, dan ga jij niet staan schijnen en wachten op die tweede auto (assistentie PdP), dan trek je die gasten de auto uit en worden ze geboeid”
- AA “...dan zou ik ze geheel gecontroleerd, met een beetje overkill desnoods [if need be with a bit of overkill] uit de auto halen en dan gecontroleerd in de handboeien en afvoeren”. [controlled in the handcuffs and then transport]
- BB “Ze worden allebei aangehouden. Alleen denk ik, niet zo zachtzinnig als...”. [not gently]
- BB “ze gaan absoluut mee”. [they will absolutely go along]
- BB “Verdachte dat zijn zij zo wie zo, ze hebben jou...bevel....eh genegeerd”.
- BB “waar heb je het recht van een bevel vandaan”.

BB “Je kan niet iemand vorderen de auto uit te stappen, daar heb je geen bevoegdheid toe”.

BB “Ze worden absoluut aangehouden. Klaar”. [they will absolutely be arrested. Finished]

BB “Ik ga niet vragen “Wilt u uitstappen meneer, die tijd is geweest, ze worden er uit getrokken”. [I am not going to ask]

CC “Wij gaan aanhouden”.

CC “Gelijk door een dokter laten onderzoeken. In het cellencomplex, want ze zullen maar...eh in de cel gekwakt worden en een of andere hersenbeschadiging hebben opgelopen...eh, dan is het helemaal niet meer gezellig”.

DD “Aanhouden. Eruit”.

DD “Uit de auto, platleggen, afboeien, klaar”. [Out of the car, down, coughs, ready]

EE “Dan hou ik ze aan”. “Gelijk een blaastest doen”.

Question 10

AA “Er is geen aanleiding toe”

AA “Nou er is op geen enkele wijze sprake van of indicatie van een vuurwapen, dus dat doe je niet”.

AA “Het wegrijden...is niet terzake dienende voor een getrokken vuurwapen”.

AA “In dit geval moet je natuurlijk kijken of het schietwaardig is of niet natuurlijk en dan ook het theoretische deel erbij. Maar ik denk ook dat je, al zou je het doen uit veiligheid, dat je misschien dan toch al wel inderdaad nu al een stap te ver zou maken, ja, dus inderdaad, je...” “.... Als je elkaar effe aankijkt zou je roepen van ‘He, stop dat ding effe weg”

AA “Berg hem op, ja, dat zou ik zeggen”.

AA “Dat het allemaal heel professioneel is en dat het niet kan “alla” maar op het moment dat het allemaal gebeurt, ga ik niet twisten met mijn collega, want je hebt je aandacht voor die twee gasten nodig. Dus op dat moment laat ik hem maar begaan”.

BB “Ik ga er in mee, want ik moet wel. Maar het is niet acceptabel”.

BB “Ik kan daar op straat niet zeggen: “Berg je pistool weg”. “Op dat moment niet, dan ontstaat er een onveilige situatie. En een collega die onzeker wordt, dat wil ik dus niet, maar spreek hem na afloop daar wel op aan”.

BB “Ik zou meegaan en achteraf zou je inderdaad het er over hebben, Was dat wel ...eh”.

BB “Je weet in eerste instantie ook niet de reden waarom er een wapen getrokken is. Wie weet kan hij iets gezien hebben of wat dan ook”.

BB “Als je het niet met elkaar eens bent dan ga je niet eerst met elkaar vechten. Dat doe je op het bureau wel”.

CC “vuurwapen gebruik je pas als reactie op, nou wat is er tot nu toe gebeurd, ze zijn alleen maar weggereden”.

DD “Je pistool trekken, daar heb ik geen moeite mee”. [drawing your gun]

DD “Nee, voor mij niet. Vroeg in de avond en twee van die snotneuzen, armoedig geklede mannekes in een auto die toevallig wegrijden en een stickie, ik heb geen wapen gezien. Er is geen info op het kenteken, geen wapen, geen wapen”.

DD “Allebei aan een kant, we trekken die lui er uit. [each on one side, we pull these fellows out] Ik heb dat pistool binnen handbereik. Als ik iets zie van een wapen, dan is

het gelijk: trek pistool. Met dat pistool in de hand word ik belemmerd. Ik moet dat gereedschap niet in de hand hebben.

EE “Weg met dat ding”.

EE “Ja effe weg, er zijn ook geen aanwijzingen dat er iets met wapens aan de hand zou zijn, dus ik zou gewoon even zeggen ‘stop maar even in je holster’”.

Question 11

AA “Ja en doorgeven waar je je bevindt en proberen in te sluiten. Niet schieten hoor”.

BB “Neen, ik ga dus niet, koste wat het kost proberen die gasten tot stoppen te dwingen”. [I won't try and stop these fellows at all costs]

BB “Ik zou er wel achter aan lopen”.

CC “Je rent, je gaat er achter aan, ja, schop hem neer”. [You run, you chase them, you kick them down]

CC “zo zie je al dat machteloze gedoe van dat zwaaien met dat pistool dat lokt bijna uit dat je dus gaat schieten... omdat je zo'n collega naast je hebt die...”.

CC “Ik vind het geen situatie om je pistool te trekken”.

CC “Dan zeg ik ‘stop, doe dat ding aub weg’”.

CC “Ik zou wel willen weten waarom, misschien heeft hij een pistool gezien”.

DD “Te paard, achteraan”. [On horseback, after them]

DD “Het wordt tijd dat collega zijn vuurwapen opbergt. Voor dat hij zich in zijn poot schiet”.

DD “Ja, dat kan dus absoluut niet met dat wapen er achteraan rennen. Maar er wel achteraan”.

EE “Er achteraan”

EE “Dat is je werk”.

EE “Boeven vangen”.

Question 12

AA “Gelijk doorgeven en er achteraan blijven rennen”.

AA “In dit geval ..eh.. ben je gerechtigd om je eigen vuurwapen te trekken” “Ik trek ook mijn vuurwapen”.

AA “Nee, ik niet. Tijdens het hardlopen. Als die alleen maar loopt, dan doet die verder ook niets natuurlijk. Het is net zo snel om hem eruit (wijst holster aan) te halen dan.” “Er lopen allemaal mensen langs”.

AA “Als hij wel doorrent met een wapen in zijn hand en je wilt hem toch in het zicht houden, dan laat je hem net zo makkelijk in je tas, misschien dat je hem losgooit, die tas, en je hand er op houdt, dan hem je hem ook zo.”

CC “Dekking zoeken en pistool trekken”.

CC “als ik daar loop wel ter hand nemen”. [taking the fire-arm in one's hand]

DD “Roepen dat er een wapen is. En je vuurwapen uit veiligheid ter hand nemen. Gewoon vuurwapen ter hand”. [out of safety, take the fire-arm in the hand]

DD “Er wel achteraan blijven rennen”.

DD “Je krijgt nu wel een gevaar voor gijzeling en zo”.

EE “Ja dat is lastig, want je hebt natuurlijk geen vest of zo, daar heb je niet op gerekend, dus wordt het al heel gevaarlijk”.

- EE “Mijn instinct zegt ik ga maar door uh...”
- EE “Afstand nemen en uh... op dat punt heb je al geprobeerd assistentie te halen. En dan zou ik die vent gewoon proberen op afstand te volgen en proberen te lokaliseren waar hij zit”.
- EE “Doorgeven aan de meldkamer, assistentie, afzetten, proberen in de gaten te houden”.
- EE “Ik zou mijn vuurwapen ter hand nemen”.

Question 13

- AA “Het gaat er om of het schietwaardig is, dat is het allerbelangrijkste”.
- AA “Ik maakte net al de opmerking dat ik mijn pistool wel in de hand zou nemen. Dus ik denk dat het in dit geval misschien wel mogelijk is,...**dus acceptabel vind dat hij een waarschuwingsschot lost**”. [fires a warning shot]
- AA “Ja, maar het ligt er effe aan hoe bekend zij zijn bij de politie. Zijn het bekenden of onbekenden, kijk, daar ga je al”.
- AA “Dat pistool, hij kan eh...(maakt zwaaiende bewegingen met zijn arm alsof hij diverse richtingen op wijst met een pistool) wat die wil, hij kan er een onder schot nemen, hij kan er van alles mee doen natuurlijk. Ik vind...eh, je zit scherp hoor nu, maar dat ook de bedoeling natuurlijk”.
- AA “Ik zal mijn vuurwapen niet ter hand nemen, maar als die collega een waarschuwingsschot lost, op dat moment ja....dat is wel acceptabel”.
- AA “Wat de collega ook zegt, ik zal al lopende geen vuurwapen ter hand nemen, dat zal ik niet doen, ik zal wel...eh.. wel de achtervolging inzetten....mmmmm en pas als de situatie ontstaat, dat de verdachte....stilsthoudt, dan wel anticiperen, maar niet eh....op het moment als de achtervolging gaande is”
- AA “Ik heb het in de praktijk gezien en dit is gebeurd, dan eh....dan ren je er achter aan en eh... en als er iemand met een vuurwapen loopt te zwaaien dan eh...dan, hou me affe ten goede, dan hou ik in de gaten hoe die mensen er om heen lopen, **maar ik kan me goed voorstellen, dat ik ook mijn wapen trek en een keer in de lucht schiet en zeg ‘Nou blijf je staan vriend, nou is het afgelopen’**. [I can imagine drawing my weapon, shooting in the air and saying: now stand still, friend, now it's over]
- AA “Ik zou denk ik gewoon, als ik de keus niet zou maken om mijn pistool ter hand te nemen, zou ik achter een muurtje gaan staan, voor hetzelfde geld draait hij zich om en ...bam. Ik zou hem om die reden ook ter hand nemen”.
- AA “Een waarschuwingsschot mag alleen gegeven worden als ook een gericht schot...”.
- AA “**Je mag schieten ter aanhouding...waarom zou ik niet op zijn benen mogen schieten**”. [you are allowed to shoot in order to arrest ... why wouldn't I be allowed to shoot at his legs]
- BB “Een waarschuwingsschot, dan ben je toch wel van plan om iets meer te gaan doen, denk ik. En dat vind ik op dat moment niet kunnen”.
- BB “Op straat geen discussie, ik denk ‘wat doe jij nou’, maar je gaat door”.
- BB “**Het schot wordt gegeven ter voorkoming van verder onheil**”. [the shot is fired to avoid further mischief]
- BB “Ik zou het niet gedaan hebben, Want ik dus niet zeggen dat hetgeen die collega op dfat moment doet, dat dat fout is, precies, of het verstandig is, gezien de

omstandigheden, neen, dat denk ik niet, Maar het zou een mogelijkheid kunnen zijn om iemand tot stoppen te laten....”.

CC “Hij zal wel niet degene zijn die denkt ‘ik stop’”.

DD “Roepen dat de omstanders plat moeten gaan liggen”.

EE “Is geen reden toe op dat moment, denk ik”.

EE “Je zit nog steeds met je ambtsinstructie”.

EE “Nee, ik vind het niet acceptabel, want je lokt volgens mij wat uit, die vent draait zich om....”.

EE “Ik vraag me af of die man wel hoort van “halt staan blijven” en dan hoort ie alleen de knal, dus denkt ie er wordt op mij geschoten en hij draait zich om en schiet...misschien”.

Question 14

AA “Van mij krijgt ie....(gelach)

AA “Had die vraag maar eerder gesteld”.

AA “Je trekt het vuurwapen”.

AA “gelijk gericht schieten”. [directly aimed firing]

BB “Ik leg hem neer, direct. Het richten van een vuurwapen op enig persoon, of dat nou een politieagent is of een burger, als ik maar enigszins de mogelijkheid heb om verder onheil te voorkomen, dan is dat zijn probleem.”

BB “Ik denk dat je altijd moet blijven nadenken op welk moment schiet je nou gericht op hem, of schiet je over hem heen, of schiet je misschien zelfs in de grond, maar als hij met een vuurwapen op een collega en er zal geen al te grote gevaarstelling zijn voor de omstanders, dan schiet ik toch dat ie gaat...hemelen. Dan is het ook geen gericht schot op de benen, ...duidelijk, denk ik”. [I think you should keep thinking. At what point do I fire aimed at the suspect, at what point do I fire over his head, maybe even in the ground, but if he aims a gun at a colleague and the danger to bystanders is not too great, than I shoot for him to ... go to heaven. Than I won't aim for the legs, that's clear I think]

CC “Omleggen” [put him out]

CC “dan moet je wel schieten”. [then you have to shoot]

CC “het is een reactie, baff”. [it's a reaction, baff]

DD “vuren”. [fire]

DD “Vol op de korrel”. “Niet op de beentjes, neen er midden op”. [then you aim for it. Not at the leggies, no smack in the middle]

DD “Als ‘tie zich omdraait en hij schiet, dan gaattie plat, in elk geval dat is mijn optie”. [if he turns around and he shoots, then he goes down, at least that's my option]

EE “Ik denk dat het eerste magazijn binnen vijf seconden leeg is”.

Question 15

AA “ja”. (meerdere malen ‘ja” PdP)

AA “Hij of ik, in dit geval een collega”. [Him or me, in this case colleague]

AA “Zolang dat wapen niet op de grond gegooid wordt”.

AA “zo lang hij blijft richten”.

BB “ja, slechte zaak, want volgens mij schiet je met z’n tweeën [yes, not good, because according to me, the both of you (should) shoot]

BB “Het vervelende bij dit soort dingen is dat je dus amper de tijd hebt om een waarschuwing te geven”. [it is a pity that in cases like this you hardly have time to give a warning]

CC “ja, als ie blijft richten, dan heeft ie een probleem”. [yes, if he keeps aiming, he's got a problem]

CC “dan schiet je door”. [then you keep shooting]

DD “ja, als tie ‘m maar raakt”. [as long as you hit him]

DD “Ik zou zo wie zo meeschieten”. [I would join in shooting]

DD “Het gaat op dat moment om lijfsbehoud en niks is zo belangrijk als mijn leven”. [at that point it is about surviving and nothing is as important as that]

DD “Misschien sta je daar voor het zelfde geld wel met je broek vol en je ligt achter de auto”.

EE “Net zo lang totdat hij neervalt”. [until he drops]

EE “Ja, uitschakelen, ja want dat is er bij ons toch wel ingestoten”. [yes, take him out, because that's what has been made clear to us]