

Force Science does not teach tactics and obviously does not train police to kill. Mr. Mulroy's description of our course is so disconnected from our documented teaching that it would be laughable if the accusation were not so serious. Mulroy attributes positions to us that we have expressly and repeatedly rejected, including the false claim that officers may shoot unarmed people, or even armed people, merely because they are within 21 feet. He relies on discredited academics, unsourced quotations, and long-disputed controversies while bypassing the nuance, context, and scientific discussion those subjects require.

We teach hundreds of officers and other professionals each year, and we understand that comments can be taken out of context, shorthand can be misunderstood, and even experienced instructors can sometimes be inartful in style or delivery. We do not claim perfection. We do, however, maintain processes intended to ensure the quality and accuracy of our research, curriculum, and instruction, and our published positions on these issues are clear and well documented.

At least three students who attended the same course have expressed that Mr. Mulroy's description did not match what was actually taught. They report that some of the subjects he describes were not discussed as he claims, while others were materially misrepresented. One student stated plainly that Mulroy was "blatantly lying about what was discussed in that class." That same student emphasized that the course was not about teaching tactics, but about identifying human-performance issues and evaluating force encounters. We have also been told that Mr. Mulroy was frequently absent and did not attend the final day of training, which may help explain portions of his flawed account. We are reviewing attendance records and the specific quotations he attributes to instructors.

The Force Science certification course remains the preeminent course of its kind. It teaches perception, attention, decision-making, reaction time, memory, and performance under stress. It does not exist to declare particular uses of force justified or unjustified, and it is not a tactics course. We provide state, federal, and local investigators, prosecutors, courts, and communities with the human-performance considerations they should understand before making those judgments.

Mr. Mulroy holds a political position that understandably shapes his aspirational goals for police training. Even giving him that grace, his conclusions are so divorced from our curriculum, our stated positions, the recollections of other students, and the actual purpose of the course that they are hard to take seriously. We welcome criticism and scrutiny, but it must begin with accurate facts. Mr. Mulroy's opinion piece does not.

Force Science will publish a fuller response to Mr. Mulroy's oddly timed recycling of previously rebutted allegations. Several of the positions he attacks are, in fact, the opposite of what Force Science teaches. Ironically, that means he may agree with our actual positions while setting himself against straw man positions of his own creation.

As an attorney, Mr. Mulroy will have to contend with the professional and ethical consequences of publishing unsubstantiated and distorted claims about a course he attended. In the meantime, Force Science will continue working with agency leaders, elected officials, investigators, attorneys, and community members to provide the highest level of training and consulting on the application of human-performance principles in force encounters, and continue to support honest accountability.

?

Von Kliem

MCJ, JD, LL.M

Chief Consulting & Communications Officer

FORCE SCIENCE®