

# Saint Louis University Public Law Review

---

Volume 32

Number 1 *Control of Police Misconduct in a Post-Exclusionary Rule World: Can It Be Done?* (Volume XXXII, No. 1)

Article 3

---

2012

## Foreword

Patrick Eckelkamp  
eckelkpj@slu.edu

Lindsay L. McClure-Hartman  
lmclur1@slu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/plr>

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Eckelkamp, Patrick and McClure-Hartman, Lindsay L. (2012) "Foreword," *Saint Louis University Public Law Review*: Vol. 32 : No. 1 , Article 3.  
Available at: <https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/plr/vol32/iss1/3>

This Foreword is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Saint Louis University Public Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholarship Commons. For more information, please contact [erika.cohn@slu.edu](mailto:erika.cohn@slu.edu), [ingah.daviscrawford@slu.edu](mailto:ingah.daviscrawford@slu.edu).

## FOREWORD

In order to ensure a thriving society, it is imperative that those in power do not abuse their position and are held accountable for their actions. Specifically, police officers are often a symbol of protection. They are there to protect innocent victims from the unlawful actions of bad actors. However, sometimes these officers, a universal symbol of ensuring the safety of citizens, become the bad actors.

For years, in the context of criminal law, the exclusionary rule for Fourth Amendment violations was considered an essential tool in maintaining police accountability. Generally, the exclusionary rule provides that evidence obtained in violation of the Fourth Amendment must be excluded from trial. It was intended, in part, to protect citizens from the unconstitutional actions of rogue police officers. The belief was that the exclusionary rule was necessary to prevent such rogue officers from becoming bad actors. However, recent Supreme Court decisions, most notably *Hudson v. Michigan*, have cast a shadow on the future of the exclusionary rule's applicability. Specifically, some justices theorized that other more effective remedies protected citizens—thus allowing for the narrowing of the exclusionary rule. These other suggested remedies include increased police training, civilian review boards, and civil rights lawsuits. This issue of the *Saint Louis University Public Law Review* provides thought-provoking analysis on the effectiveness of these potential remedies, and surveys what other actions can be taken to further increase police accountability. This issue provides an in-depth discussion on uniquely public interest topics, the importance of police accountability among them. Ensuring police accountability is a topic that affects every individual and is a much-debated area of public policy reform.

Additionally, this issue contains two student articles that deal directly with topics related to public interest: community prosecution and public education. Nicholas W. Klitzing's Comment on a new type of prosecution—community prosecution—discusses how a new approach to prosecution can help solve the crime epidemic in East St. Louis. His Comment details the roots of community prosecution, discusses how community prosecution has been used in other communities, and examines the ways community prosecution could alleviate some problems found in East St. Louis. Finally, his Comment details how the current prosecuting attorneys are utilizing the tenants of community prosecution to enact change in the troubled region. Lindsay L. McClure-Hartman's Note examines the recent decision by the Missouri Supreme Court

in *Turner v. Clayton*. The outcome of the court case was hotly debated because it allowed students from unaccredited urban districts transfer rights to accredited suburban districts nearby. Specifically, she examines Missouri's mandatory open enrollment statute, compares the statute to other states' statutes, and examines possible "fixes" to the controversy surrounding the mandatory open enrollment statute.

The *Public Law Review* would like to express our deepest gratitude to Professor Roger L. Goldman for his help in planning the Symposium. Neither the Symposium nor this issue would have been possible without his invaluable expertise regarding the Fourth Amendment and his assistance in obtaining speakers for the Symposium. Moreover, we would like to thank all of our authors for their time and willingness to present at our Symposium and author an article. We are extremely grateful for each of their contributions. It was an honor to work closely with such respected experts. We also want to thank our editors and staff for their excellent work and their dedication to the *Public Law Review*. They have spent numerous hours ensuring the *Public Law Review* continues to produce a top-flight publication. The *Public Law Review* would also like to thank Professor Sam Jordan for his invaluable advice and guidance throughout the preparation of this issue. Lastly, we would like to give a big thank you to Susie Lee and Denise Murnin for their help and expertise. Without them, this issue would not be possible.

PATRICK ECKELKAMP  
MANAGING EDITOR

LINDSAY L. MCCLURE-HARTMAN  
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF