Policing and Society

Robert R. Friedmann

Georgia State University

GLOSSARY

Community Policing A new approach to policing developed in the early 1980s to open up the police for improved collaboration with the community to better combat crime.

Crime Control Traditional view of policing as a crime control agent; a view that does not necessarily match realities of policing to reduce crime.

Crime Prevention A host of programs and approaches attempting to reduce crime through education, information sharing, and target hardening.

Proactive Policing One of the key elements of community policing that views the police and the community as entrepreneurial in changing the conditions under which crime emerges.

Reactive Policing The traditional and pervasive policing approach that reacts to crime after it happens.

Sir Robert Peel Founder of the London Metropolitan Police.

THIS ARTICLE EXAMINES POLICING as a formal social control institution in society. It explores the history of and development of policing and identifies some of the major phases in the policing movement. Attention is given to the role of policing as a traditionally reactive societal force; reference is also made for viewing police as a proactive element that not merely reacts to crime but actively seeks to reduce crime causing conditions. Policing is examined in several countries and historical developments serve as a basis for offering future prospects for policing.

I. HISTORY

Policing roots are often traced back to 11th-century England. However, the first known direct reference to police officers can be found in Deuteronomy 16:18: "Judges and police officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates." Gates were posited in the wall that typically surrounded the city. The Hebrew word (used to date) for police officers has the same root as the word "govern-

ment."[1] Officers played mostly a regulatory role enforcing trade and commerce laws (such as measuring and verifying proper weight and content of merchandise and overseeing monetary exchange). City gates provided strategic points to control the in-and-out traffic of people and merchandise and to allow the apprehension of perpetrators and their on-the-spot trials.

Following the Norman Conquest of 1066, the "frank-pledge" was established, based on a community model where groups of people (a tything) formed the earliest version of community-based (nonpaid) policing. One hundred tythings were directed by a constable who reported to the shire reeve (sheriff). This system disintegrated by the 13th century when the role of the Justice of the Peace was introduced over the sheriff. In 17th- and 18th-century colonial America, the government system of control followed the English system where the sheriff (paid position) collected taxes, the mayor was the chief law enforcement officer, and constables and marshals served warrants and made arrests. The period was characterized by growing decentralization— where each colony developed its own law enforcement system—coupled with increased puritanism (emanating out of New England) where strong emphasis was placed and enforced on conformity to laws and the state.

The Industrial Revolution was characterized by a loss of formal control. As cities expanded and populations grew (mostly under, and creating, difficult conditions for needy population masses) crime increased. Against growing urbanization the old community-based system was no longer sufficient or effective. Following calls for the establishment of a police force composed of persons who would dedicate their time to preventing crime, the London Metropolitan Police Act resulted in the establishment of the first modern police force. Police, known as "bobbies," were highly centralized and were considered civil servants. American policing modeled itself after the London police. Following serious social unrest and rioting in the Northeastern industrial cities, the early "independent" police jurisdictions were established where each city had its own police system run by its mayor and police positions were filled by appointments highly dependent on political patronage.

American policing grew rapidly between 1860 and 1890. Officers were not paid well, had little job security, and high turnover occurred with every new elected official, who would rush to get rid of the officers in place and appoint his own. Police work was unsupervised and there was large-scale corruption as police often looked the other way as long as they got to share in the criminals' profits. In some instances police officers initiated criminal acts, such as burglarizing residences, to supplement their low income. During the period of 1890–1920, the reform movement at the time demanded shifting more power from the mayor to the chief; hiring better selected, better trained, and more disciplined officers; and giving up activities unrelated to crime. The focus of police activities changed somewhat and the overall quality of officers improved, but it is safe to say that to date, political power is still in the hands of the mayors and it is only a matter of degrees of independence and exercise of control, depending on leadership style, personalities, or the possibility of rivalry, that determines mayor–chief relations.

A second reform movement shaped up between 1920 and 1960. The two best known reformers of this period were Richard Sylvester, the President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, who identified the need for professionalism and called to separate police from politics and to make police professional as any other occupation and to accept technology. The second reformer, August Vollmer, the chief of police of Berkeley, California, developed college level police education programs and the first forensic laboratory for crime investigations. During this time the chief acquired more power and authority but to date remains a political appointee. Technology in the form of two-way radio and the patrol car enhanced both supervision and officers' response time.

The 1960s were times of civil disturbance and unrest. The population increased as WWII "baby boomers" matured along with an increase in crime that police could not keep up with. The period was characterized by increasing police brutality along with police being ordered to suppress civil rights demonstrations. Following the shooting death of a Black teenager by a White police officer in New York, on July 16, 1964, Black leaders demanded justice and marched to precinct headquarters and rioting broke out. President Johnson appointed the Kerner Commission (The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders), which concluded that police conduct was brutal, abusive, and racist; that training and supervision were inadequate; and that police–community relations were at an all-time low.

These turbulent times set up the next 30 years of policing. However, increased police professionalism distanced and alienated police from administrative staff, police were still not trusted by communities, police

---

[1] Police officer in Hebrew is *shoter*. The root of the word *shoter* (*shin.tet.resh*) is also the root of the terms government/order/regime/ administration (*mishtar*) and police (*mishtara*)

officers nurtured a culture of "us against them," and with the increase in crime police were blamed for not handling it well. Increasing social unrest resulted in some of the worst rioting occurring in countries such as England and Israel. In England, for example, the Brixton riots were assessed in the Scarman Report with conclusions similar to those of the Kerner Commission.

II. CURRENT STATE OF POLICING IN THE UNITED STATES

The police professionalism model created several problems for police. The preoccupation with management has led to a decline in handling the serious crime problems of a community. Agencies became so concerned with management that officers were often not adequately trained to understand current crime problems and trends. This was coupled with a general lack of awareness by police of conditions and needs of the community. Despite the police mandate to offer preventive patrol, most policing has been reactive and not very successful at preventing crime. The switch to and growing dependence on the patrol car and improved radio communication eliminated the foot patrol and has spurred reactive policing in many western countries. The professional policing model values responding to every call as fast as possible, with police departments following this to date. The introduction of and the promotion and emphasis on 911 has increased the reactive responses from police as well as its load and ability (or lack of) to be as responsive to the public as expected.

Reactive policing tended to ignore the community despite its potential as being a helping resource to the police. Against this backdrop and with increasing administrative demands, workloads, and decreasing budgets, policing in several countries (particularly Canada, England, and the U.S.) returned to Sir Robert Peel's notion that people need to police themselves not only in formal ways (foot patrol) but in informal ways as well. Proponents of the emergent community policing model argued that cities need to possess a greater sense of community and that if a community allows itself to deteriorate, residents will reduce efforts to maintain homes and control unruly conduct, which could then result in more serious crime and further decay.

While it was recognized and understood that police must improve relations with poor and minority groups in the community, focus was also placed on the ineffective use of rank-and-file officers who are managed without much flexibility of judgement and operation. Many

officers complained that police management ignores individual talents and intelligence. For changes to occur in policing adjustments in organizational structure and in policies must be made. Despite the growing saliency of community policing, officers' performances are still often rated on number of arrests, ticket writing, and the number of calls they handle. Police leadership needs to reward the proactive and preventative actions of officers as well and construct coherent plans that are implemented departmentwide.

Herman Goldstein, a key proponent of community policing, argued that the professional model allows for officers to handle incidents efficiently. However, he perceives these incidents as symptoms of a larger problem. Therefore the underlying solution of "problem-oriented policing" involves moving beyond just handling incidents and actually taking into consideration its precursors or underlying factors such as location, persons involved, crime committed, and general community behavior. Goldstein maintains that frequently reoccurring incidents in a community take up the majority of police time and become "substantive problems." Therefore, problem-oriented policing is a major change in policing because it shifts the focus from internal police management to effectively dealing with substantive problems. It also increases proactive responses as officers are not just responding after the incident has been reported but actively trying to remedy substantive problems. Problem-oriented policing calls for developing the skills, procedures, and research techniques to analyze problems and to evaluate police effectiveness as an integral continuing part of management. For example, problem-oriented policing programs implemented in Baltimore and Virginia led to a decrease in residents' fear of crime.

III. COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING AND COMMUNITY POLICING

Another key proponent of community policing, Robert Trojanowicz, argued that "Community Policing requires a department-wide philosophical commitment to involve citizens as partners in the process of reducing and controlling the contemporary problems of crime, drugs, fear of crime and neighborhood decay; and in efforts to improve the overall quality of life in the community." His work acknowledges that all community policing incorporates problem-oriented policing but not all problem-oriented policing is community policing. Community policing has also the added dimension of decentralization and greater involvement of commu-

nity members. A key component in community policing is that the power is shared inside the police force. Strong hierarchical management techniques are put aside in favor of incorporating more from the police officers on the street who actually know and handle the "substantive problems." It offers more personalized policing as well as diminishes notorious bureaucracy.

The key differences between community policing and traditional policing evolve around random patrol, rapid response, and follow-up investigation, which characterize traditional reactive policing, while community policing involves a philosophy that aims to bring police and community closer, to decrease community fear of crime, and to increase the sense of community and community cohesion. Community policing is, therefore, proactive. Some even "fortify" the concept of community policing by promoting "total community policing," which is characterized more by (citizen-based) informal social control and less by (police-based) formal social control. The assumptions of this approach are that crime is ultimately controlled by the public and that therefore a mere increase of police presence in neighborhoods that lack a sense of community will produce only a marginal decrease in crime. Informal crime control can be created through the use of community boundaries. Police can implicitly or explicitly define community boundaries by interacting with communities. Once boundaries have been formed, increased community cohesiveness is possible. Police should assist, then, in creating neighborhood crime prevention groups, as these informal social control networks will result in long term declines in community crime and disorder. A strong community is expected to deflect crime from outsiders who will see a decrease in criminal opportunity. The problem with this expectation is that it neglects the often "home-grown" criminals and the fact that many communities lack a sense of community and cohesiveness and those characteristics provide the backdrop against which crime is produced and nurtured. It is appropriate to mention that an implicit assumption of policing (traditional or community) is that it handles street and/or violent crime; white collar crime or political crime (often with more far reaching consequences in damage to property and life) are rarely addressed.

A. Types of Community Policing and Its Precursors

1. Team Policing

The first form of community policing was tried in the late 1960s with team policing units assigned to long-term beats, guided by the need to get closer to the community and become more effective. However, due to ineffective implementation, team policing never worked as suggested and was discredited by the end of the 1970s and considered a failed strategy.

2. Foot Patrol

This is clearly among the most popular and common forms of community policing. Foot patrol aims to bring back the beat cop so that increased, personalized police presence and visibility in the community will decrease community fear of crime and improve police–community relations. Officers are not only responsible for monitoring the community but are also expected to attend community meetings, identify problems, and make referrals to social service agencies. Extensive research on foot patrol indicates that the most positive change that foot patrol brings about is in the community's perception of crime. However, in most instances it did not significantly decrease incidents of criminal activity.

3. Ministations and Community Centers

Ministations are decentralized police stations in shopping malls and other visible and accessible places in the community. With the help of local volunteers ministations are mostly used to assist walk-in clients, hold crime prevention meetings, and respond to policing needs for that specific community. Detroit developed 52 ministations in neighborhoods throughout the city. Although formal research has not been conducted, the Detroit ministations were known to have had implementation problems associated with decentralization and officers were labeled as social workers and not police. In Houston, storefront community centers were found to have decreased residents fear of personal crime and their perceptions of the amount of crime in the area.

4. Bicycle Patrol

An increasingly popularized mode is found in many U.S. city police departments, campus police departments, and in countries such as Canada, England, and Israel and on the European continent. The different transportation means offer officers greater visibility and accessibility which is often accompanied with more "friendly" uniform and it enhances positive interaction with the public.

B. Issues in Community Policing

1. Legitimation

Without legitimacy police cannot be effective. Community policing provides advantages in "opening doors"

to gain support from the public for police actions. Legitimization is an important part in social control especially in times when relations between minorities and police have a lot to be desired. Through community policing, police are able to improve relations with residents and further legitimize their purpose for being in the community.

2. Change in Control

For community policing to succeed there must be a change of police control from city hall to precinct stations and community meeting halls along with an expanding decentralization process that must be supported from the top of elected officials through appointed officers to community members. City leaders who understand the complex problems in a neighborhood are more likely to make police address various crime-relevant issues of the community. Elected officials who believe all communities are the same are more likely to keep police officers in their traditional roles. However, decentralization cannot happen without the change in political powers and policies. A strong commitment from all involved must occur to change the level of control in the police force and in the community.

3. Deployment

Programs must be started that link the police to the community. Community policing tactics such as foot patrol and bike patrol are geared to decrease crime and fear of crime. Officers must not be assessed merely on number of arrests but also on the number of households visited, community meetings attended, and overall proactive initiatives in a neighborhood.

4. Implementation

Several problems can arise when trying to implement community policing programs. Police departments are highly complex, and gaining the consensus needed to start community policing is difficult. Community policing incorporates fundamental changes in policing design, and whole precinct consent to the program is unlikely without significant preparatory work. Choosing a method of community policing can be difficult, therefore research done with the community (clients) and street officers (service providers) enhances the understanding of what they recommend for the community as well as the likelihood of incorporating their input. Oftentimes, shortages in resources can derail a community policing program or not even put it on track. A measurement for success should be clearly defined so that the community can clearly understand the impact the new policing has on the neighborhood. In this sense, organizing community residents is a key component, as without community support the idea of community policing is impossible to implement. While this seems to be self evident, the "community" part is typically missing in the community policing equation as it is more convenient and comfortable to focus on the traditional known elements of reactive police work, which are more easily measurable.

Internal police changes conducive to successful implementation of community policing include breaking down the barriers in the police department so that change can be discussed and promoted, educating the leaders and rank-and-file officers on community policing and its augmenting advantages on traditional policing, reassuring officers that community policing is not something that the higher political forces are demanding but an improvement of programs already in place, and providing on-going training in an attempt to reduce the fears of change. Once the program has been chosen, clearly defining the new police roles is mandatory so there is no confusion throughout the transformation to community policing; keeping the officers consistently updated with the progress of change is essential for success. Finally, an often-mentioned but less-often-upheld key component is the development of partnerships.

C. Possible Negative Consequences of Community Policing

There are several potential risks and negative consequences with community policing. For example, highly organized communities with little crime get little policing. There is also the separation of police officers into "community police" and "incident-handling police." As communities are more likely to look down upon incident-handling police this can increase tension between police officers. In their corner, incident handling police do not consider community police as "real officers." This could further create conflict in the community as well as in the precincts. While community policing may have been underimplemented it also has been oversold as every city wants it to perform miracles for crime reduction and when the results are not occurring fast enough, cities are giving up.

The development of community policing in the west is by no means automatically replicated or copied in other parts of the world. It would therefore be helpful to examine several countries that represent different traditions, structures, and approaches to policing to evidence the complexity of policing.

IV. POLICING IN CHINA

From the 1920s until the emergence of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the communist regime in the late 1940s, the country was ruled by the Nationalist Government (Guodindang), which operated the police force. Police were corrupt and local governments had inconsistent laws and enforcement practices. Each town could have a separate set of laws depending on what the Nationalist's regime determined. In large cities like Shanghai, the government lost control and a high crime rate existed. Crimes such as gambling, prostitution, and murder were commonplace and the offenders usually got away with their crimes without punishment.

After the Communist Revolution in 1949, the People's Republic abolished all Nationalist laws. From 1954 to 1957, police in China went through a similar professionalization process as police in the United States. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) aided local governments in gaining control in cities. Courts, police, and laws became more uniform and less corrupt with an emphasis on constitutional procedure. The CCP wanted police to be highly trained and educated in the communist laws to serve as control agents in the local communities and as enforcers of the communist ideology. The Cultural Revolution's (1966–1976) supporters rioted and demonstrated, claiming that new law enforcement and the PLA were too controlled by the state.

Following Mao Tse Tung's death (in 1976) the professional police model shifted the police role from teaching communism to maintaining public order. The police and the PLA had similar uniforms and police were seen as a direct product of the state. In 1984, policing in China changed with the establishment of the Ministry of Public Security, which was a division of the Ministry of State Security. It was led by Ruan Chongwu, who believed the role of the Ministry was to be in charge of law and order, traffic safety, and fire control. Twenty-five divisions of the PLA were transferred to the Ministry of Public Security and by 1996 the Chinese police force was composed of 1.2 million security personnel and 600,000 armed policemen with a police : population ratio of 1.7 police for every 1000 citizens.

The Chinese leadership under Deng Xiaoping and Ruan Chongwu emphasized the importance of education and initiated plans to have all law enforcement college educated. The Ministry has an emphasis on chains of command, is run by the State Council, and controls the Social Security Bureau, which trains officers in criminal investigations and forensic science. Each city has Social Security Bureau representatives who train local Public Security Bureaus, which, in turn, run the local police departments.

The huge size of China (about 7% of the world's land), its huge population (about 20% of the world's population), its ethnic structure (many languages, dialects), and its peasant/rural character (about 80% of the population are peasants) place a formidable challenge on policing and social control. While the Chinese governmental and police hierarchies are still intact there has been a recent change in command and China is attempting to open its doors to trade with the outside world. Yet the likelihood of developing anything that resembles community policing as it is espoused and practiced in the west is not likely as long as a dictatorial regime is in place that exerts strong centralized control over the country.

V. POLICING IN INDIA

Prior to 1609, India had two distinct types of police systems. Traditional rural village-based policing dates back to the first days of Indian civilization and has remained constant throughout history. The headman in the village was responsible for policing and he could hire a special police helper to assist him. The headman was responsible for the village security as well as the detection and capture of villagers who committed crimes in other villages. The headman was also responsible for paying the other village the damages from any act by a member of his village. However, a dominant landowner would stand above the headman and the two would work together in securing the village. The second type of policing was that carried out by the Imperial power of the time, which was responsible for policing the large cities. The villages were considered self-sufficient and rarely experience pressure from the Imperial power as to how to police a village.

The western influence in India is several centuries old and was brought into India by the British. Given that much of western policing emerged from or was heavily influenced by the British model of policing and given that the British exported their policing system to their colonies and mandatory territories, the impact of the British approach should not be underestimated. Captain Hawkins brought England to India in 1609; in 1792, Lord Cornwallis changed policing there. Under the Darogha system an appointed British official (Darogha) would replace the headman in the village. The Darogha would be responsible for overseeing the headman and the village. This system was inefficient

due to the centuries of tradition in the villages. The citizens were not very cooperative with the new police. In the 19th century the British attempted to police India like England. Due to cultural, environmental, and geographic differences, the use of England's criminal law code was destined to fail.

The Indian Police Act of 1861 is still the basic mandate for the Indian police. The Indian police follow the hierarchical patterns of British police. The police exist under the Royal Irish Constabulary, which is under an Inspector General of Police, who answers to the state government and is responsible for the internal administration in local police departments. The existence of armed and unarmed police also developed in this time. Unlike in the United States, where police are always armed, or in England, where police are never armed, the Indian police have armed officers who go to those situations that are known to be violent and unarmed officers take care of any nonviolent policing needs.

At midnight, August 14, 1947, India was no longer under British rule and became an independent nation. The first Home Minister of India, Sardar Vallahbai Patel, did nothing to change the 1861 Indian Police Act. The police did change its name to the Indian Police Service (IPS), yet despite the change in name and the replacement of British police by Indian police the basic structure of the British policing model remained in place. In 1979, the Indian Police Act was updated with the introduction of 12 responsibilities (under police mandate) such as public safety, investigations of crimes, apprehension of criminals, stopping crime before it happens, usage of crime preventative patrols, increasing the sense of security in the community, providing appropriate services to the community (including relief in distress situations), and resolving conflicts.

In modern-day India crime is of utmost importance yet police are highly underpaid and do not have the skills or equipment to properly apprehend criminals. Also no legislation to modernize the police system has existed since the end of British rule. The Indian police force is fraught with corruption and inefficiency and is overly controlled by the state. Calls for police reform in India focus on the reduction of state control, increasing the strength of the unarmed and civilian police, and, most importantly, modernizing the police policies with respect to technology and management.

VI. POLICING IN ENGLAND

England is transitioning from its traditional model of policing, which looked more like what the U.S. is now striving to achieve, into the modern model, which is more of what the U.S. has. Under the traditional model few police have great control due to community support and police are close to the community and have general consent from the public. The public, in turn, dictates what it wants in policing as expressed in changes in social attitudes. The public supports police because they are not oppressive and that allows police to maintain social control without force and excess policing staff. Police do not have more legal powers than a regular citizen although this was challenged in the 1950s (also known as the Golden Era of policing) when police were at the peak of their popularity.

Under the modern model, and due mostly to increased crime, not to systematically and carefully planned public policy, police are no longer low in numbers. Police have more legal powers now, as the Public Order Act of 1986 gave police more powers in search, seizure, arrest, and detention. Since the Police Act of 1964, police governance is divided among local police, chief constables, and the Home Secretary. Local police have the responsibility of maintaining control, the chief constables organize and oversee the local police, and the Home Secretary is a higher power that has "shareholders" authority, as the Home Office controls 51% of the constabularies budget. Public consent for police declined steadily in the 1980s. Much like in the United States, policing in England has become very bureaucratic with a complex hierarchy. Despite the recommendations found in the Scarman Report, England still has a disproportionate amount of minority police; this was not very conducive for an efficient handling of racial tensions between the Afro-Caribbeans and predominately White police. English police are currently moving toward specialized units, which includes police work in the community.

VII. POLICING IN FRANCE

Under an authoritarian model, police are controlled by executive power and are heavily involved in the political arena. France also experienced a professionalism movement, which started in 1941 at the *Ecole Nationale Superieure de Police*. In 1967, the police were centralized and became officers of the state. France has a national civilian police, which is responsible for policing the cities, and the National Constabulary, a military force responsible for policing rural areas. In addition, France has separate specialized forces for different crimes. Paris police are an exception, as they are grouped under a

single authority associated with the city and not with the state.

France experiences problems with centralized policing as the gap between civilians and police is wide. The strongly centralized structure of the French police is prohibitive to the introduction of decentralized community policing, which urges a nonauthoritarian command.

VIII. POLICING IN ISRAEL

Despite its small size, Israel provides a social laboratory to students of policing. Upon its establishment in 1948 the country adopted British policing and British law and through the years it modified both. As of 1974 Israel is looking more at legal precedents in the U.S. than relying on British rulings. Israel's police system is centralized and its policing system makes sense for the smallness of the country. In Israel the key responsibility of the police is security and public order and it gives terrorist threat and postincident management the highest priority over "traditional" crime. However, unlike France, centralization has advantages. In the mid-1990s a decision was made to adapt community policing forcewide and extensive efforts are made at the station and community levels to implement this strategy. Considering various organizational changes it remains to be seen whether such plans will survive routine leadership changes.

IX. POLICING IN THE FORMER SOVIET BLOC

One of the most fascinating policing transitions is currently taking place in the former Soviet bloc countries as they move from a continental and communist police model to postcommunist policing. The continental model was influenced by the German idea of *rechtsstaat* (rule-of-law state). With the expansion of the Soviet entity the colonial model was introduced as a way to enforce the law of the state in the Eastern bloc, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The Soviet colonial method was different from the Anglo-Saxon method in that the Soviet colonial police were operated from Moscow, whereas in England the colonial police were operated from outside the home country. The Soviet militia in the new colonies were responsible for maintaining social and political control and were instructed to arrest anyone who defied the new authority. Traditional customs to those areas were outlawed and punishable by law yet

police corruption was rampant and the law often favored the Soviets over the native people.

The communist model was a combination of colonial and continental policing and its role was to enforce the laws of the state. Under communist rule, the state had authority over religious beliefs, private property, and every action of the citizens in enforcing the communist ideology. Under postcommunist policing a more careful balance in controlling the rule of law and criminal behavior is being struck. Until some stabilization is reached in the new capitalist economy, the role of the police will be in constant flux. It is already apparent that the postcommunist police officer has lost much of his or her power and authority, which paradoxically makes it more difficult for him or her to carry out what has become a more limited crime control approach of policing. Some interesting developments, such as the abolition of the death penalty in Hungary as unconstitutional, provide almost a contradictory approach to that of the U.S., particularly in times when crime is rampant in the former Soviet bloc countries and when police departments are expected to adhere to smaller budgets with increasing demands. Despite the narrowing of the police mandate to control crime police appear to be weaker and less well equipped to provide an adequate professional and legal response to the rising crime problem.

Professional police developments are increasingly characterized by a cooperative initiative with the west. The Dutch–Hungarian partnership, the Swiss assistance to the Hungarian police, and the establishment in Budapest of the FBI's International Law Enforcement Academy to serve as a regional training facility to the former Soviet bloc countries are but a few prominent examples.

X. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Policing has undergone several major transitions and despite some tendencies to view community policing today as closing a full circle by returning to the old days of the beat officer, the fact remains that the policing movement has not truly completed a full circle but is progressing in a "linear" fashion. It has not really ever returned to where it was because the innovations in technology, organizational, and political power and the division of labor have not allowed that to happen. It may be easier to accept community policing innovations by stating that "we have always done that," but being a foot patrol officer 100 years ago had very little to do with the principles and applications of community policing today that are geared toward developing part-

nerships, utilizing community resources, and solving problems in a concerted, proactive effort to reduce the level of crime production.

Traditionally, the key role of policing in society has been crime control and the provision of formal social control. Yet despite the spurious attribution of that responsibility to police and police being blamed for increases in crime (or taking the blame when it increases), the fact remains that police are not the crime producers in society. They are at best street administrators and managers of crime statistics. This is not to say that it is not possible for police to manipulate some crime statistics up or down. The point is that for crime statistics to show a significant shift they must reflect a corresponding shift in crime causing conditions. That element was missing from traditional, reactive policing and it became part and parcel of the latest development in the policing movement, namely, community policing. Hence there needs to be a better understanding among police (and other social service delivery agencies as well as the policy-making bodies) of what affects crime and to recognize the limitations of formal control and reactive policing.

Despite the advent of community policing, for over a decade since the emergence of modern community policing there was no definition provided for it. There were the 10 guiding principles originally proposed by John Alderson in England and the 10 principles offered by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux in the U.S. In 1992 Friedmann suggested the following comprehensive definition:

> *Community policing* is a policy and a strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved police services and police legitimacy, through a *proactive reliance* on community resources that seeks to change crime-causing conditions. It assumes a need for greater accountability of police, greater public share in decision-making, and greater concern for civil rights and liberties.

According to this definition, for community policing to be effective as a social control mechanism in any society, it needs to be much larger in scope than the definition and mandate that traditional reactive policing has allowed for. Therefore, to obtain successful implementation of community policing, several organizational changes are required.

A. Intraagency Organizational Change

The organizational structure of police departments needs to be decentralized and community policing adapted forcewide and not into (or by) specialized units only. Emphasis is to be placed on flattening rank structure and increasing civilianization and civilian involvement. Communications need to be improved not only as two-way radios are employed between officers and command/control centers, but also among officers so they are more aware of the dynamics of the community they serve. Supervision requires increased interaction between officer and supervisor and between the officer and the community. Officers are limited in exercising their power and mandate and in many departments an arrest cannot be made without a supervisor's presence; hence, officers' discretion needs to be widened, officers need to feel empowered, and departments should encourage more operational flexibility.

Many would-be officers apply for positions in law enforcement because of thrill-seeking and adventurism and many departments screen in these action-oriented personnel. Community policing requires that police recruitment emphasize mediation and defusion of conflict over action, that it recognize interpersonal skills, and that departments seek to increase the level of education of their personnel. Training needs to expand on community-oriented elements as well as on interpersonal skills. At the same time officers' performances need to be assessed on the basis of being community oriented, on being measurable, on having quality in the nonlaw enforcement aspects of job performance, and on matching expectations with standards and agency values. With that comes the provision of a matching reward signifying to officers that if they do what is expected they will be appropriately rewarded. Hence rewarding proactive activities and providing tangible raises and promotions as well as intangible recognition are of key importance. *The New York Times Magazine* featured a story on officer Kevin Jett, who found that his community policing assignment was at a dead-end in terms of promotion and raises.

B. Interagency Change

Even if police undergo a complete transition toward community policing it is still impossible for it to control crime alone. A neglected aspect of traditional policing is the formation of partnerships and improved coordination (and prevention of duplication) with other social services. Interaction with other agencies needs to be flattened, increased in scope, and to encourage inter-

agency planning and cooperation. Different agencies have different responsibilities, roles, and needs and so do the professionals that are employed by them. Therefore, understanding working definitions and professional expectations can make a difference in life-saving situations, in criminal prosecution, or in caring for needy groups. Agencies also have different needs and resources and therefore understanding them is crucial for functioning in a cooperative environment. Yet, the shift from defined (and closed) to ambiguous (and more open) organizational/agency boundaries will not take place without some anticipated resistance to change. Hence agencies should assess potential problem areas for friction and conflict as well as identify potential (and actual) sources of support in an increasingly interdependent world. Agencies should reward cross-agency cooperation and reassess the existing division of labor. Agencies should provide incentives for cross-boundary (departmental) cooperation and encourage comprehensive cooperation. Police and other public service agencies as well as private organizations and civic groups should establish a coordinating body (such as the Super-Agency, as suggested by Friedmann, 1992) to oversee the identification of problems in the community and the extent to which adequate solutions are provided in a timely manner.

C. Mapping the Community: Taking Inventory

The most neglected element in traditional policing, and to some extent also in community policing, is that of the community itself. Often officers are very familiar with their beats (streets, shops, citizens) but much less often are they aware of the problems and needs of the community as is reflected by official data and by citizens perceptions. Even the picture of crime is not commonly distributed to residents or even police officers. An increasing effort is evident in many police departments to provide crime analysis by using crime mapping and more of it needs to be done in an on-going comprehensive fashion. This applies not only to mapping crime trends but also in profiling neighborhood and community characteristics and identifying the social networks that underline a given community. This will allow the identification of real and perceived problems as well as the identification of the resources and leadership to manage them in cooperation with the police. Police agencies need to enhance proactive planning and facilitate comprehensive solutions. This can be achieved if the key element of community policing, that of building partnerships, is done. Therefore, creating and enhanc-

ing a climate conducive to partnership and encouraging broad-based community activities is highly relevant. The partnership with the community is part of the increase of and internalization of informal social control mechanisms. These could be best facilitated by giving a more prominent role to the family, school, church, civic associations, private and public advocacy groups, and volunteers. Finally, two elements of technology ought to be considered: the mass media should disseminate positive stories about community policing and the increase of Internet usage has the potential of enhancing communication and knowledge among various partners (agencies and individual residents alike) in this effort.

Community policing cannot and should not be considered a panacea to the crime problem. Yet it offers (if implemented well) the best hope that along with (the necessary) reactive policing it could have an impact on the production (and minimization) of crime in the community. Some preliminary evidence of success is reported in cities such as Boston and Chicago. The irony of community policing is that with the decentralization of policing, it risks the return to the political sphere from which police have never fully shied away. Also, given the tendency to come up with new names ("total community policing" is already available), that rather than investing in a long-range strategy, police (and other agencies) may fall into the trap of reinventing the wheel.

Also See the Following Articles

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARD • CRIMINOLOGY, OVERVIEW • LAW AND VIOLENCE • SOCIAL CONTROL AND VIOLENCE

Bibliography

Alderson, J. C. (1979). *Policing freedom: A commentary on the dilemmas of policing in western democracies*. Estover, Plymouth, UK: Macdonald & Evans.

Bayley, D. (1969). *The police and political development in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bailey, W. G. (1989). *The encyclopedia of police science*. New York/London: Garland.

Braiden, C. (1992). Community Policing: Nothing new under the sun. In *Community oriented policing and problem solving* (pp. 17–22). Sacramento, CA: Crime Prevention Center, Office of the Attorney General.

Brewer, J. D., Guelke, A., Hume, I., Moxon-Browne, E., & Wilford, R. (1996). *The Police, Public Order, and the State*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Burns, I. M. (1995). Perspectives on the British model of policing in an open Europe. In J.-P. Brodeur (Ed.), *Comparisons in policing: An international perspective* (pp. 166–175). Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

Curry, J. C. (1977). *The indian police*. New Delhi, India: Manu.

Das, D. (1993). *Policing in six countries around the world*. Chicago, IL: The University of Illinois at Chicago, Office of International Criminal Justice.

Deakin, T. J. (1988). *Police professionalism: The renaissance of American law enforcement*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Diaz, S. M. (1994). Police in India. In D. Das (Ed.), *Police practices: An international review*, Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.

Dunham, R., & Alpert, G. (Eds.) (1989). *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Eck, J. (1993). Alternative futures for policing. In D. Weisburd & C. Uchida (Eds.), *Police innovation and control of the police: Problems of law, order, and community*, (pp. 59–79). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Evans, R. (1993). *Deng Xiaoping and the making of modern China*. New York: Viking.

Fielding, N. (1991). *The police and social conflict: Rhetoric and reality*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone.

Fijnaut, C. (1995). International policing in Europe: It's present situation and future. In J.-P. Brodeur (Ed.), *Comparisons in policing: An international perspective* (pp. 115–135). Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

Friedmann, R. (1992). *Community policing: Comparative perspectives and prospects*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Funk, A. (1995). The German police system in a European context. In J.-P. Brodeur (Ed.), *Comparisons in policing: An international perspective* (pp. 69–86). Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Horton, C. (1995). *Policing policy in France*. London, UK: Policy Studies Institute.

Jackson, P. (1989). *Minority group threat, Crime and policing*. New York: Praeger.

Kappeler, V. E. (Ed.) (1995). *The police & society*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Kratcoski, P., & Dukes, D. (Eds.) (1995). *Issues in community policing*. Highland Heights, KY: ACJS/Anderson Monograph Series.

Lasley, J., Vernon, R., Robert, R., & Dery, G. M., III (1995). Operation Cul-de-Sac: LAPD's "Total Community" Policing Program. In P. C. Kratcoski & D. Dukes (Eds.), *Issues in Community Policing* (pp. 51–69). Highland Heights, KY: ACJS/Anderson Monograph Series.

Manning, P. K. (1989). Community policing. In R. G. Dunham & G. P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings* (pp. 395–406). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Mastrofski, S. (1993). Eyeing the doughnut: Community policing and progressive reform. *American Journal of Police, 12*, 1–17.

Monjardet, D. (1995). The French model of policing. In J.-P. Brodeur (Ed.), *Comparisons in policing: An international perspective* (pp. 49–69). Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

Nalla, M., & Newman, G. (1994). Is white collar policing, policing? *Policing and society, 3*, 303–318.

Normandeau, A., & Leighton, B. (Eds.) (1991). Police and society in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 33*, 241–585.

Rawlings, P. (1995). The idea of policing: A history. *Policing and Society, 5*, 129–149.

Reiner, R. (1995). Community policing in England and Wales. In J.-P. Brodeur (Ed.), *Comparisons in policing: An international perspective*. Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

Rosenbaum, D. P., & Lurigio, A. J. (1994). An inside look at community policing reform: Definitions, organizational changes and evaluation findings. *Crime and Delinquency, 40*, 299–314.

Ruan, C. (1986). Minister on social order in China. *Beijing Review, 29*, 34.

Saville, G. (1994). *Crime problems, community solutions: Environmental criminology as a developing prevention strategy*. Port Moody, British Columbia: AAG.

Shelley, L. (1994). The sources of Soviet policing. *Police studies, 17*, 49–65.

Silverman, E. (1995). Community policing: The implementation gap. In P. C. Kratcoski & D. Dukes (Eds.), *Issues in Community policing* (pp. 35–49). Highland Heights, KY: ACJS/Anderson Monograph Series.

Skogan, W. G. (1995). Community policing in the United States. In J.-P. Brodeur (Ed.), *Comparisons in policing: An international perspective* (pp. 86–112). Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

Smith, D. (1991). The origins of Black hostility to the police. *Policing and Society, 1*, 1–15.

Sparrow, M., Moore, M. H., & Kennedy, D. M. (1990). *Beyond 911: A new era for policing*. New York: Basic Books.

Tonry, M., & Morris, N. (1992). *Modern policing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Trojanowicz, R. C. (1990). Community policing is not police community relations. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 59*(10), 6–11.

Trojanowicz, R. C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson.

Trojanowicz, R. C. (1994). *Community policing: How to get started*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Wakeman, F. R. (1995). *Policing Shanghai 1927–1937*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ward, R., & Bracey, D. H. (1985). Police training and professionalism in the People's Republic of China. *Police Chief, 52*, 36–38.

Weisburd, D., & Uchida, C. (1993). *Police innovation and control of the police: Problems of law, order and community*. New York: Springer Verlag.