
The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission

*The Knapp Commission Report On
Police Corruption By Knapp
Commission*

Downloaded from
www.everybodystreet.com by Morris &
Harvey

INTRODUCTION: THE KNAPP COMMISSION AND ITS ENDURING RELEVANCE

When we talk about landmark investigations into police misconduct, few reports carry the historical weight and analytical clarity of "The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission." Officially titled the **Report of the Commission to Investigate Alleged Police Corruption**, this document emerged from a period of deep crisis in New York City during the early 1970s. It remains a foundational text for understanding how systemic corruption takes root within law enforcement agencies, and its core concepts continue to shape reform efforts today. The report did not simply list individual bad actors; it dissected an institutional culture that allowed corruption to thrive, making it a must-read for anyone interested in criminal justice, public administration, or ethics in policing.

The commission was formally established by Mayor John V. Lindsay in April 1970, following explosive allegations made by

whistleblower police officer Frank Serpico and his colleague David Durk. Their claims pointed to widespread bribery, graft, and the protection of illegal enterprises across multiple precincts. The commission was tasked with investigating the extent of corruption within the New York Police Department and, more importantly, recommending systemic changes to prevent future abuses. The final report, published in 1972 and later as "The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption" in book form, documented a deeply entrenched system of payoffs and silent complicity. Its analysis of how honest officers are pressured to conform—or else leave the force—remains startlingly relevant to modern discussions of police culture.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT: NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS

To fully appreciate "The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission," one must understand the environment in which it was produced. New York City in the late 1960s and early 1970s was a place of fiscal strain, rising crime rates, and growing public distrust of authority. The NYPD itself was a massive, notoriously insular bureaucracy operating under tremendous pressure. Within this setting, opportunities for illicit

income were abundant. Officers accepted payments from **gamblers, narcotics dealers, and owners of illegal bars and after-hours clubs** in exchange for protection or advance warning of raids. This was not the work of a few rogue officers; the commission found that corruption was often organized at the precinct level, with a system of "pads" (regular payoffs) managed and distributed according to rank.

What made the commission's work groundbreaking was its legal authority to subpoena witnesses, grant immunity, and compel testimony. Over the course of two years, investigators conducted hundreds of public hearings that captivated the nation. Officers, former officers, and criminal figures testified about the routine nature of corruption. The hearings were televised and covered extensively in newspapers, shattering the NYPD's public image and forcing a national conversation about police ethics. The resulting report provided a rare, unvarnished look inside a closed institution.

The Role of Frank Serpico and David Durk

No discussion of this report is complete without acknowledging the courage of Frank Serpico and David Durk. Serpico, in particular, became a symbol of resistance against corruption. He repeatedly reported bribery and shakedowns to his superiors, only to be ignored, transferred, and isolated. His testimony before the commission was electrifying. He described how honest

officers were often treated worse than the corrupt ones, and how those who refused payoffs were ostracized. Serpico's willingness to speak publicly, at great personal risk, gave the commission the evidence it needed to justify its existence. It is no exaggeration to say that without Serpico and Durk, "The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission" might never have been written.

KEY CONCEPTS FROM THE REPORT: GRASS-EATERS AND MEAT-EATERS

The most famous and widely cited concept from "The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission" is the distinction between two categories of corrupt officers: "**grass-eaters**" and "**meat-eaters**." This simple but powerful typology helped explain how corruption could become widespread without every officer being a hardened criminal.

Grass-Eaters: The Silent Majority

According to the commission, grass-eaters were officers who passively accepted small gratuities and bribes as part of their daily routine. They did not actively seek out opportunities for corruption, nor did they engage in serious criminal enterprises. Instead, they accepted free meals, small cash payments from parking lot attendants, and occasional gifts from local businesses. While these acts might seem minor individually, the commission

argued that grass-eaters created an environment where corruption was normalized. They demonstrated that bending the rules was acceptable, and their silent acceptance made it difficult for honest officers to resist. Worse, grass-eaters rarely reported the meat-eaters, because doing so would expose their own minor violations. This created a code of silence that protected the most serious offenders.

Meat-Eaters: The Active Corrupt

In contrast, meat-eaters were officers who aggressively exploited their positions for financial gain. They actively sought out opportunities to extort money from criminals, demand protection payments, and engage in direct criminal activity such as burglary, drug trafficking, and theft. The commission found that meat-eaters were fewer in number but had a disproportionate impact on department culture. They were often the most aggressive and intimidating figures in a precinct, and their behavior set the tone for what was considered acceptable. The report noted that in some precincts, meat-eaters effectively ran the operation, deciding who got which assignments and who was excluded from the "pad."

This typology was crucial because it showed that corruption was not simply a matter of a few "bad apples." The system was sustained by a large number of officers who tolerated and enabled the worst behavior. The report argued that **any**

effective reform must address both the grass-eaters and the meat-eaters, targeting not just individual criminals but the culture that allowed them to operate.

SYSTEMIC FINDINGS: HOW CORRUPTION WAS ORGANIZED

"The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission" went beyond individual behavior to describe the institutional structures that facilitated corruption. One of its most disturbing findings was the existence of a formalized "pad" system. In this arrangement, officers assigned to certain units, such as gambling squads or vice units, would collect regular payments from illegal establishments in their jurisdiction. The money was then pooled and distributed according to rank, with sergeants and lieutenants taking a larger share.

The report also documented how corrupt officers used their knowledge of police procedures to avoid detection. They knew exactly how to accept money without witnesses, how to falsify reports, and how to use the statute of limitations to their advantage. The commission found that the NYPD's internal affairs mechanisms were woefully inadequate. Investigations were often conducted by officers within the same precinct as the suspects, leading to whitewashes and cover-ups. The department had no effective early warning system for identifying problematic officers, and supervisors were rarely held accountable for corruption in their units.

The Role of Supervisors and Commanders

A major focus of the report was the failure of leadership. The commission found that many high-ranking officers were aware of corruption but did nothing to stop it. Some were actively involved in covering up investigations or warning corrupt officers about impending probes. The report described a culture of **command responsibility**, arguing that supervisors who turned a blind eye were just as culpable as the officers taking bribes. This finding was controversial at the time, as it implied that corruption was not just a problem of individual officers but a failure of the entire chain of command.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORM

The Knapp Commission did not just diagnose the problem; it offered a detailed set of recommendations for change. These proposals were designed to break the code of silence, increase accountability, and replace a culture of corruption with one of integrity. Many of these recommendations were groundbreaking and remain central to modern police reform efforts.

Strengthening Internal

Affairs

The commission called for the creation of an independent, centralized internal affairs unit that would report directly to the police commissioner, not to precinct commanders. Investigators should be rotated frequently to prevent the development of local loyalties, and the unit should have the authority to conduct undercover operations and use informants. This recommendation was a direct response to the failure of existing complaint mechanisms, which the commission found to be slow, secretive, and biased.

Whistleblower Protection

Another critical recommendation was the establishment of formal **whistleblower protection policies**. The commission recognized that honest officers who came forward faced retaliation, ostracism, and even physical danger. It called for the creation of an anonymous reporting hotline, legal protection for whistleblowers, and guaranteed transfers for those who reported corruption in their units. These protections were essential to breaking the code of silence.

Reducing Opportunities for

Corruption

The report also recommended significant changes to police operations. It suggested rotating officers between assignments more frequently so that they could not develop long-term relationships with criminals or business owners. It called for stricter oversight of vice squads and gambling units, where corruption was most prevalent. The commission also recommended that officers be prohibited from accepting any gratuities, no matter how small, to prevent the normalization of bribery. This put the department on a slippery slope: once an officer accepts a free cup of coffee, the argument goes, it becomes easier to accept a \$100 bill.

Prosecution of Corrupt Officers

Finally, the commission urged that corrupt officers be **prosecuted criminally, not just disciplined internally**. At the time, many officers who were caught taking bribes were merely transferred or forced to resign, allowing them to continue their careers in other jurisdictions or even in other units. The report argued that criminal prosecution was essential to deter future misconduct and to demonstrate that the department was serious about reform. This recommendation led to a wave of prosecutions in the years following the report.

THE IMMEDIATE IMPACT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The publication of "The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission" caused an immediate political storm. Mayor Lindsay faced intense pressure to implement the recommendations, and the NYPD was forced to take action. The department created the Internal Affairs Division, which became a model for other police departments across the country. Whistleblower protections were strengthened, and the department adopted a zero-tolerance policy toward gratuities. The New York State Legislature also passed laws making it easier to prosecute police officers for corruption.

However, the implementation was far from perfect. Many of the recommended structural changes were resisted by the police union and by middle management. The code of silence proved difficult to break, and corruption investigations remained slow and bureaucratic. Some critics argued that the report focused too much on low-level corruption and not enough on systemic issues like racial profiling and excessive force. Nonetheless, the report had a lasting impact on how police departments approach internal discipline.

LONG-TERM LEGACY AND MODERN RELEVANCE

More than 50 years after its publication, "The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission" remains a touchstone for scholars, reformers, and journalists. Its distinction between grass-eaters and meat-eaters is still used to describe the continuum of police misconduct. The report's emphasis on institutional culture, rather than individual bad actors, has

influenced modern theories of corruption prevention.

In the decades since, New York has faced several more corruption scandals, including the Mollen Commission investigation in the 1990s, which found that corruption had persisted despite the reforms prompted by Knapp. This suggests that while the Knapp Commission's recommendations were necessary, they were not sufficient. Corruption is a recurring challenge that requires constant vigilance, independent oversight, and a willingness to confront the institutional culture that enables it.

Today, as debates rage about police reform, defunding, and accountability, the Knapp Commission report offers valuable lessons. It shows that meaningful reform requires more than just firing a few bad officers. It requires changing the incentives, breaking the code of silence, protecting whistleblowers, and holding supervisors accountable. It also shows that corruption feeds on secrecy and discretion—the more independent and opaque a department is, the more opportunities there are for abuse.

Lessons for Modern Police Reform

Current reform efforts can draw several key lessons from the Knapp Commission. First, independent oversight is essential. Police departments cannot investigate themselves effectively, at least not without robust external scrutiny. Second, small acts of corruption matter. The report showed that gratuities and minor favors create a culture in which serious corruption can flourish. Third, holding the entire chain of command responsible for corruption is more effective than focusing only on the offenders. Finally, protecting whistleblowers is not just a nice idea; it is the single most important tool for breaking the code of silence.

CONCLUSION: A LASTING CALL TO ACTION

The Knapp Commission Report On Police Corruption By Knapp Commission stands as a landmark document in