

The State of the Art in Community Policing: an International Perspective

Professor David Bayley
University at Albany
State University of New York
United States of America

This topic is appropriate, because community policing has become the major movement of change and strategic reformation in policing in the 1980s. In most police forces, it is the only innovation game in town. Everybody is talking about it; every police force will tell you that it is doing it; there are books and articles about it; and there are conferences all over the world, like this one, discussing it. In fact, it has now begun to generate what I think can be described as sacred writing. A little bit of that was unearthed recently in one Australian Police Force:

In the beginning was the word and the word was 'community policing' and darkness fell upon the face of the police force.

And it came to pass that a task force delivered unto the Commissioner a plan and the plan began restructuring and there was much rending of garments and gnashing of teeth among the Constables, for they comprehended it not and were sore afraid.

And the Constables spake unto their Sergeants saying, 'Verily it is a heap of shit and it stinketh!'

And the Sergeants went unto their Superintendents and said, 'Truly it is a pile of dung and none may abide the odour thereof!'

And the Superintendents spoke unto the Assistant Commissioners saying, 'It is a mound of fertiliser and none can abide its strength'.

And the Assistant Commissioners went unto the Deputy Commissioners and said, 'It is that which promotes plant growth and it is very powerful'.

And the Deputy Commissioners spake unto the Commissioner saying, 'This powerful new plan will actively promote growth and efficiency within the police force'.

And the Commissioner looked upon it and smiled and saw that it was good. And it came to pass that community policing was implemented.

In this paper three topics will be addressed. First, a review of what is being done in some of the notable experiments in community policing in several developed nations. Second, comments about the movement as a whole. Third, specific lessons that police forces have learned about implementing community policing successfully.

Examples of Community Policing

Descriptions of some of the major programs in five countries follow—Canada, the United States, Japan, Singapore, and Australia.

Canada

In **Edmonton**, which is one of the major cities of the western provinces, the police department analysed calls for service and came up with what they considered to be the twenty-one major 'hot spots' of crime and disorder, places where there were most requests for police assistance and where most patrol activity seemed to be concentrated. In each of these delineated areas a constable has been assigned to be the primary agent of policing. The police officer is supported by mobile patrols in the traditional way. The officer is responsible for setting up a police office, for recruiting volunteers from the community to help the officer, for diagnosing the problems of the community, and coming up with action plans to meet the problems that residents of those 'hot spots' consider need attention. The community police officers also patrol regularly on foot. They are given a vehicle, but it is really just for transportation from the police station to wherever they work. The 21 beats were set up in 1987 and have been enormously popular.

Montreal, which is Canada's second largest city, is located in the French-speaking part of Canada. Without using 'hot-spot' analysis, the Montreal police have designated certain areas as 'Ilos', a French word usually translated as islands or atoms. These areas have particular disorder and crime problems, a large residential population, lots of pedestrian activity, and often retail shops and markets. Police officers, known as 'Ilotier', are assigned to these areas to work with the local communities. They do not spend a lot of time there. Montreal general-duties police work a 35-day rotation, 21 days of which are on duty, the others being holidays and weekends. During the 21 working days, 'Ilotier' spend 8 hours in their 'Ilos'. This is not very much time. During those 8 hours they walk the streets, talk to citizens, and try to build up knowledge of the community as well as the crime and order and needs of the communities. By September 1990, 297 Montreal police officers had been assigned to 'Ilos'.

Halifax, which is in Nova Scotia undertook community policing in 1986 and it became team policing. They decentralised the CIB, assigning detectives to the same three territorial divisions as general-duties officers. Teams of CIB personnel and general duties officers work together to diagnose the problems of these areas and then determine what mixture of proactive and reactive policing is required. Moreover, when any crime, except sophisticated forms of commercial crime, is committed, two-person teams composed of a uniformed constable and a detective, usually a corporal, investigate the crime. The investigation of crime is not automatically turned over to a specialised CIB detachment. These teams carry to solution about 98 per cent of the crimes that occur.

Finally, the **Ontario** Provincial Police have established a community police program involving at the moment about 100 officers, a figure they plan to double by the end of 1991. The province of Ontario is very much like an Australian state, its police force numbers about 4,000 and it covers a very large amount of territory. One hundred areas have been designated for community policing areas, encompassing 700 local government jurisdictions. Each community police officer is required to set up an office and establish a citizens' advisory committee to advise the officer about what the citizens of the area want and to

assist him/her in carrying out problem-solving programs. Because the Ontario provincial police work largely in rural areas, the community police officers do very little foot patrolling.

United States

First, **Detroit**, Michigan, a city just under one million people, has what is probably the oldest community policing program in the United States. It began in 1976 and it involves the creation of ninety-three mini-stations that now very nearly cover Detroit. These ninety-three stations are dedicated to community crime prevention and the officers there do not answer calls for service. Instead, they work with the community to promote crime prevention programs, notably Neighbourhood Watch. The mini-stations rely heavily on volunteers from the community to help in the work of implementing or promoting community crime prevention.

New York City has a program called C-POP, Community Police Officer Program, involving 900 officers out of a patrol force of approximately 16,000. In each of New York's seventy-five precincts, there are about ten C-POP officers, each of whom has been given a territory that they are responsible for policing, supported by an overlay of rapid response patrol vehicles. C-POP officers do more or less what they want. Their injunction is to get to know the community and to find out how police resources might be used in order to meet policing requirements, not as generated by the Police Department, but as suggested by local communities. This is a very popular program, begun in 1986, which shows no sign of flagging.

In **Houston**, Texas, community policing has involved two programs: the establishment of nine store-front police stations and a program called DART, (Directed Area Response Team). DART is similar to Halifax's team-policing. Patrol teams have been set up involving detectives working with general duties officers to diagnose the matters of concern to communities, to be responsible primarily for both reactive and proactive policing, and to carry through the majority of criminal investigations in those area.

Santa Ana, California, is a city in Orange County south of Los Angeles, with a high concentration of Hispanic people. Its community police program involves the creation of four community police stations, staffed by uniformed police officers, who patrol from there, and by civilian community-service officers. Although not armed, the community-service officers wear uniforms very similar to sworn officers, but with a distinctive shoulder patch. They do not carry weapons. Their role is to handle the vast amount of social service work which is connected with policing, including encouragement of citizen crime prevention. The regular police officers in these community police stations do a great deal of problem solving and patrolling, mostly on foot.

Japan

Japan created modern community policing but did not call it that until very recently. The Japanese are like the startled Frenchman who took a literature class and discovered that he had been speaking prose all his life. The Japanese system, reformulated after World War II but resting on older traditional elements, is based on 15,500 koban, or mini police stations, scattered all over Japan. There are 6,500 of them in cities and towns and 10,000 in rural areas. There is a neighbourhood police station of this sort within six or seven blocks of every urban resident in Japan. It is still the case that just under 50 per cent of all people requiring police service come to the police in person rather than calling over the telephone.

Personnel in these koban and chuzaiso do several things. They regularly patrol on foot and respond to citizen requests for service. They also make twice yearly visits to every home and business in their area, knocking on doors and asking what problems people have. They use these occasions to promote crime prevention and to offer security inspections.

Although this appears to be the most wall-to-wall community policing system in the world, the Japanese are not complacent about it. They are now involved in fine-tuning their

system—two aspects in particular. The Japanese police have never developed programs of systematic liaison with the community. As a consequence, they are now asking all of their koban to create formal community advisory boards in order to obtain feedback. Furthermore, they are now adopting a more problem-oriented approach. Previously, although the police were deployed pervasively, their emphasis was on discretionary law enforcement—impounding improperly equipped bicycles, enforcing laws against speeding motor vehicles, catching drunk drivers, and generally keeping the streets orderly. Now they are changing their priorities to emphasise matters the public is concerned with, as opposed to the matters of concern to police.

Singapore

Singapore is the most dramatic instance of a major police force deciding in a very short period of time that it wanted to change its fundamental system for delivering of police services and successfully doing so. Until 1983 Singapore was policed very much like Birmingham, Liverpool, and other major cities of Great Britain. The system was largely reactive and based on the deployment of a large number of patrol vehicles. There was also a strict division between the CID and general duties officers. Singapore had copied the British model exactly. In 1983, however, they decided to emulate the Japanese and brought off a complete conversion to their system between the years 1983 and 1989. As the Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew, said forthrightly, 'We have nothing more to learn from the West, it is time we began to learn from the East'. As a result, there are now copies of Japanese koban throughout Singapore, altogether about 100, doing exactly the same work as Japanese koban. The Singapore police have at the same time de-emphasised random motorised patrolling. Perhaps most interesting of all, these changes were all made within six years, without expenditure of resources beyond the normal budget.

Australia

Community policing in Australia is primarily an add-on crime prevention program. Hardly any attempts have been made to have community policing penetrate general duties patrol work, with one major and exciting exception. At the same time the crime prevention programs of Australian police forces are very rich, varied, and represent improvements in some instances over similar programs in other countries. For example, the Victorian Police sent officers to the United States to study Neighbourhood Watch, who liked what they saw but found ways for maintaining the activity and enthusiasm of members, a problem that had bedevilled and undermined American efforts.

In addition, Australia has school liaison programs, Blue Light Discos, and Safety Houses. By and large these programs are managed by new specialised units devoted to crime prevention, often based in headquarters or some of the larger police stations. There has also been a renewed emphasis on foot patrol, but it is still very slight in relation to total patrol resources. There are hardly any shop-front police offices in Australia. Broadmeadows in Melbourne was one of the few, and it was recently closed. Shop-fronts have not been a popular form of community policing in Australia.

It seems that the only instance in Australia of a serious attempt to change the delivery of police services by general duties officers, has been in New South Wales. There, Commissioner John Avery and his staff created community policing 'beats', starting in Surry Hills, Sydney. There are now over 200 community police officers assigned to such beats in many larger towns in New South Wales. Each officer is responsible for their own area where they establish community liaison, discover persistent order problems troubling to the community, and construct solutions to those problems. In effect they are to become the 'village bobby' for their areas.

Observations on the Community Police Movement

These are some examples of what is going on in many different places around the world under the rubric of community policing. Several things should be noted about the movement that has sparked these developments. First, it should be quite apparent that community policing is not a single program. It is all sorts of things—not just the usual apples and oranges, but grapefruit, guavas, and bananas. Referring to community policing, people often say, 'How do we implement it'. The answer often is, 'I haven't got a clue, until you tell me what it is you want to accomplish in community policing'. Community policing is not an 'it'. Community policing is not one of several cans up there on the shelf that you can neatly take down, take the top off, and feed to police forces.

Community policing is sometimes only pure rhetoric, a new kind of public relations that commissioners use because it sounds wonderful and makes a police force look progressive. In other forces, community policing labels are applied to quite traditional, reactive, enforcement-oriented programs. In some Canadian forces, plainclothes squads have been created to keep habitual criminals under surveillance and this has been called community policing, as also are anti-burglary patrols and heightened enforcement of traffic regulations against speeders and DUIs. It is truly amazing what community policing is made to cover. Fortunately, however, community policing also describes many really creative, new developments in policing, where imaginative officers are taking great risks and working courageously against a climate of entrenched opinion that makes it very difficult to accomplish community policing goals.

Secondly, it is important to note some of the elements of variation in the range of community policing experiments.

- **Personnel.** The major choice here is whether community policing is carried out by new specialists or by traditional police workers, such as patrol officers and detectives, in ways that are reflective of the new philosophy and ethos.
- **Organisation.** In some forces community policing is a new command, often based in headquarters; it is a new unit of specialisation within the police. In others, it is a function that is integrated into the existing command structure. This is rarer than the first, and is more difficult to bring off, although some police forces have succeeded in it, such as New South Wales.
- **Functions of community police officers.** Some forces require community police officers to handle calls for police service, many do not. Almost all community police officers are responsible for community crime prevention one way or the other. Some do foot patrolling, many do not. Some are given responsibility for diagnosing the needs of communities and coming up with solutions, utilising police and non-police resources. Others are simply responsible for delivering traditional police services but are enjoined to do so in a more responsive and community-oriented way.
- **Basing.** Community policing personnel may be located at headquarters, in police stations, or in disbursed offices created, often, with material or financial contributions from communities.
- **Community consultation.** There are two models. The first is ad hoc community liaison, where a community police officer goes out into the community and tries to find responsive people who are on the side of the police. The second is systematic, where police departments lay down policy concerning the

membership of advisory boards, how often liaison committees are to meet, what their functions are, and so forth.

- **Volunteers.** The question here is whether community policing is strictly done by the police themselves or whether the community is to be enlisted, especially in the form of volunteers, to work with the police.
- **Funding.** Some community police programs have been established only after new levels of funding have been secured. In these cases, police executives have gone to the politicians and said that in order to do community policing, new resources would have to be generated. Other departments have taken a riskier approach and created community policing out of existing budgets.

These are some of the elements that vary in successful community police programs. The point is that police forces have got to figure out the answers to most of these questions if they hope to implement community policing successfully.

Thirdly, never forget that all that glitters is not community policing. There is a tendency now for everybody who has a hot idea to try to pass it off as community policing. As a result, a lot of time is being wasted justifying programs as being community policing. Sometimes it seems that the phrase 'community policing', should be forgotten because so much time is spent trying to define it when there are all sorts of changes that policing needs in order to accomplish its objectives better. There is no need to try to gild all needed innovations by calling them community policing. It appears that 'community policing' should be kept for reforms which represent genuinely new programs, rather than reforms that improve the effectiveness or efficiency of established programs.

Fourthly, there is a great deal of discussion about the sorts of localities where community policing is most needed. Community policing is an urban police invention that was designed initially in the United States and Great Britain for urban communities where a gap had emerged between police forces and the communities that were being policed. Community policing was viewed as a way of closing that gap and bringing the people back on side with the police. Furthermore, so far, most of the community police ventures mentioned above have worked best in relatively affluent, ethnically homogeneous, middle class areas of cities.

There are a few wonderful exceptions to this, however. Edmonton, New York City, Detroit, and the inner-cities of Japan have shown that community policing does not necessarily work only in relatively affluent and ethnically homogeneous areas. It can work in ghettos too, where non-white, chronically unemployed, badly educated, and very poor people live.

But what about community policing in rural areas? When community policing is discussed with Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) officers, State Police of New York, and sometimes Australian officers, who patrol vast tracts of lands with relatively sparse populations, the response is one of a lot of ho-hums and sleepy gazes. 'This has very little to do with us?' Curiously, however, the other stock response from rural police officers is, 'Oh, but we have been doing this all along!' They cannot have it both ways. It's either necessary and they should pay attention or it's not necessary and they should not take pride in having done it well already.

In fact, they are often right about knowing a good deal about community policing already. In some of the bush police stations in Australia and Canada, we have to take seriously the claim that the quality of relationship between the police officers and the communities in many of these stations is different from that which exists in the large cities. Police officers in rural areas are able to take more time in interactions with the public; they do not have to rush from one call to another call; they spend more time on social service activities; and they have better communication with other government agencies when it is necessary to coordinate activities.

Rural police officers have a great deal to tell us about community policing. Police forces in Australia, like the RCMP and the Ontario Provincial Police in Canada, have many officers who have been unaware that they were practising community policing. Police forces should be prepared to learn from these people how qualitative aspects for community policing may be brought to urban communities. How it might be possible to bring the experience of Katherine to Darwin, of Hawker to Port Augusta, or Menindi to Surry Hills. Australia, in particular, has expertise within its own forces that is being under-utilised as they plan for community policing.

At the same time, policing is not beyond improvement in the rural areas in any of these countries. Rural police officers, too, can learn from the movement. They can learn about how to liaise in a systematic and structured way. Too often the community liaison that happens in bush police stations depends upon networks of people that particular officers know. It is very ad hoc and depends too much on the personalities of existing personnel. One officer has miserable community contacts, another has wonderful ones. Rural policing needs to learn how consultation can be done in a systematic and responsive way.

Furthermore, rural police stations also do problem-solving in very ad hoc ways. They need to learn from the community policing movement how to reconnoitre a community's problems systematically and how to choose the best targets for problem solving.

Fifthly, community policing worldwide, despite the popularity of the rhetoric, is not yet institutionalised. In five years from now, it is an open question whether we would be able to say community policing had come to be more than a brief flash in the pan. The bureaucratic corner has not been turned in any police force mentioned in this paper, not even in those examples cited. When police chiefs and commissioners change, senior staffs change and community policing can go out the window. It seems that it is not yet part of the fabric of policing in any of the English-speaking countries. It appears to be so in Japan; the Japanese will never go back to a reactive, non-dispersed system of policing. But in our countries, the paradigm of policing is still up for grabs.

One of the reasons the future of community policing is uncertain is that despite the popularity of the concept and all the activity mentioned, whether it is more effective than past forms of policing is not certain. At the same time, of course, we do not know whether most programs in policing are working either. There is a curious impracticality in police management, in the sense that it does not really know whether what it is doing is achieving the objectives it wants. There is hardly any evaluation of whether different programs for the management and delivery of police services are really accomplishing desired ends. If institutional corners are to be turned in policing, whatever is being done in the delivery of police services should be evaluated to determine whether the objectives for which they were devised are being achieved. In this process of evaluation police forces need to develop quick and dirty measures of whether what they thought they were getting out of particular programs was achieved. Until that is done, policing will always have an unreal, impractical quality about it. Time and again community policing is being hampered because police forces are being told, in effect, to change everything, that past programs are thoroughly discredited, that community policing is the only way to go. It is too much to expect police forces to change so dramatically. Community policing will come, more assuredly, through studying a few places carefully, designing community-oriented programs for them, putting some resources into them, and trying things out. As the advertising slogan said, 'Try it, you'll like it!' It is also possible you will not like it. That is fine too. Police management must learn to be more experimental. The mind-set of managers in policing is not like the mindset of people in business. Business people do not try a new model without market research and field-testing. They test for several months and if something does not work, they go back to the drawing boards and try again. In policing, however, the practice has been with new schemes that either it is adopted forcewide or not at all. What is needed, instead, is a mindset that encourages systematic attempts at evaluation of new programs.

Moreover, Australian police forces, like the police forces of Canada, present marvellous opportunities to do this because they cover huge jurisdictions and have many personnel. As a result, Australian forces can experiment selectively, trying different

programs in different places to see if they worked. The United States, by contrast, cannot do that because it has minuscule police departments. The average police department in the United States has twelve people in it. Twelve! If one police force does an experiment, other forces say the experience is too limited, too idiosyncratic, too unrepresentative. But Australia has large police departments where organisational climate, training, incentives, pay, etc. are the same across a vast area. Because all the organisational variables are constant, Australian forces, along with the RCMP and the OPP in Canada, can study the effects of different programs in different places. But the mindset in policing is not favourable to this. It is an odd thing to say, but police managers do not seem to care whether programs succeed. They do not continually ask for feedback from their field operations about whether programs are working or not.

Lessons in Implementing Community Policing

The following are the lessons that police departments in the English-speaking world—Britain, Canada, the United States and Australia—have learned about making community policing work. There will be 11 of them. It would have been nice to have laid down the Ten Commandments of Community Policing, but that might have been presumptuous.

Lesson 1. Police forces have to decide programmatically what they want community policing to do

Community policing must be transformed from a philosophy into a program. People are saying, 'community policing is a philosophy, it is not a program'. They mean that community policing can take different forms in different circumstances. It is an approach, an orientation, that must be flexible and adaptive. But if it does not become more than a philosophy, if it does not change the behaviour of police officers who are doing the work at the coal face, then it is only rhetoric. So the first step in implementing community policing is to figure out programmatically which of the elements of community policing are going to be adopted and then develop a concrete implementation plan. If this is not done, community policing is talk in a vacuum.

The remaining lessons are lessons that police departments have discovered when they have tried to create community policing in a particular form, namely, when they tried to involve all general duties officers in it, making it part of the standard activities of all patrolling field personnel, when they tried to make community policing more than an add-on crime prevention specialty.

Lesson 2. Community policing must be managed

It cannot be just talked about and ordered; senior managers must develop plans for bringing community policing about. This involves more than standing up before audiences like this and saying how much the Commissioner is in favour of community policing. Managers must determine what is required in terms of supervision, incentives, training, supervision, and evaluation in order to make it real. Community policing cannot be done solely by preaching, which is what happens all too often. All of this requires a lot of activity on the part of senior managers. It means changing the standard processes by which business is normally accomplished; it means changing an institution. Management of community policing requires hands-on management. It is time-consuming.

Lesson 3. Community policing must be staffed

Forces must devote human resources to it, which means that designated people must be made responsible for doing it. There are two ways that human resources are given to community policing. One is through the establishment of a centralised crime prevention or community policing unit. The other way is to turn it over to front-line troops. There are, in turn, two ways of doing this. First, by creating specialised community police officers within general duties commands. Examples would be the C-POP program in New York City and the Edmonton and Ontario Provincial Police programs in Canada, where general duties officers in uniform are given turf and told to be community police officers. The second way is to tell existing patrol personnel to do what they have done all along but give them extra time during their tour of duty to do community policing kinds of things. This is the model that is being practiced in Montreal and Houston. The problem is that too many commanders look upon community police personnel as an under-utilised reservoir of talent. Every time they become hard pressed to meet some of their responsibilities, they reach down for the community policing officers, jerking them out of what they are doing and assigning them all over the map. The point is that community policing personnel and their time must be protected. If senior managers will not do this, community policing will be only words.

Lesson 4. Community policing will not occur if forces wait for additional resources

Yet operational commanders demand this before they can seriously consider implementing community policing. In none of the countries mentioned in this paper are new resources likely to be allocated to community policing. Consequently, the only way community policing is going to become a reality is if commanders learn to use existing resources to achieve new purposes. In other words, it is not a case of doing more with less, commanders must learn to do more with the same. And, again, it is up to senior managers to show the people who are responsible for policing in the field how they can do this.

New resources are not needed for community policing because a lot of time is being wasted in current dispositions and procedures. Traditional allocations of manpower in policing are not cost-effective. If personnel are taken away from those traditional deployments, the roof is not going to cave in. In the wise words of Patrick Murphy, a former Commissioner of Police in New York City, Senior officers can rest assured that nothing they do is going to make things worse'.

Lesson 5. Community policing works best when the people who are allocated to it are given responsibility for a particular area and told to be responsible for policing within those boundaries

In this way they develop a sense of ownership and of pride. Furthermore, they must be allowed to roster themselves to some extent according to the needs of their patches. This is difficult because scheduling is very rigid in most departments. I often see frustrated community police officers who have been sent out to areas and told to get to know the community, find problems, and solve them, but have been locked into fixed rotating shifts, or given only two days every two weeks on their ground, or allowed time-out from normal duties only when it fits the convenience of a sergeant. When police forces give community police officers responsibility for an area, they must also be given flexibility in the way they are allowed to serve them.

Lesson 6. Community police officers must also handle some calls for service, at least emergency ones that are near-at-hand

If they do not, community policing will be perceived, especially within police circles, as being exclusively 'soft' policing. By handling some readily accessible calls for service, they will be seen as doing 'real police work' and sharing the frontline burden of policing. This will also keep them involved with the reactive exigencies of the patrol personnel among whom they work.

Lesson 7. Community policing is a new set of means, not a new set of ends in policing

This has to be said because one of the sad things about community policing is that it is being proposed in a way that sometimes denigrates much of the traditional work of policing. Crimes have to be solved; emergency needs have to be responded to. In selling community policing, proponents often seem to imply that officers who have given twenty or thirty years of dedicated service have failed, that there is no future for them in policing. That is a mistaken impression. Community policing does not substitute a new set of objectives; the traditional objectives of safety and order are still important. Community policing is a new approach to accomplishing the same objectives. As one young community police officer in Canada said to me, 'You know, I love being a community policing officer, but I can never forget the fact that I think my primary responsibility is to be a pillar in the night'. He is right. Advocates of community policing must bring on board people who have been doing traditional police work, showing them that it is not a threat to what they have been trying to accomplish. It is a new set of procedures for making sure that traditional objectives are accomplished better.

Lesson 8. New criteria for evaluating the performance of police officers must be developed if they are assigned to community police work

Police personnel cannot be sent out to do something utterly new and then evaluated in the same old way. They are not stupid. They learn very quickly what they have to do to please the sergeant, the inspector, and the superintendent. If those expectations do not change, police behaviour will not change.

Lesson 9. Middle rank managers must facilitate community policing and not simply supervise it

Traditionally, middle rank managers in policing do not encourage new departures. Often quite the reverse. Community policing is bottom-up policing, which requires a new form of supervision. It is more than bean counting and checking off who is on the roster. It is making sure that the kinds of institutional supports and resources that the constables say are needed actually come to the constables and to the programs they have devised in cooperation with communities.

Lesson 10. Senior commanders need to discover what community policing is all about in operational terms

Although they talk about it all the time, their own experience does not equip them to understand what this new form of policing is about. What is needed is for community police officers—the constables at the bottom—to be brought into headquarters where the brass must listen to the constables explaining what their activities involve and how they spend their

time. Unless commanders understand this, they will not be able to provide the kind of support that community policing requires.

Lesson 11. Community police personnel must be brought together at regular intervals, to share trade-craft and for psychological support

Community police officers are the odd-men/women-out in police forces. They know they are not well regarded by the rest of the force. It is necessary for them to hold hands every now and then and realise that they are not quite as alone as they frequently think.

Conclusion

Something new, vital, and substantive is going on in policing in all our countries. The time is ripe for community policing for three reasons. First, most people in policing know that what has traditionally been done is not working. Go out for a beer with police officers who are doing the work and they will tell you how the system is failing, why they are frustrated, and how tired they get responding to problems without solutions. It does not really take much to convince them that something new is needed.

Second, the only way that new resources are going to be made available for policing is through the mobilisation of the human resources of the community. Financial resources in the current economic climate are not going to come to police. The only available new resources are represented by the immobile civilian populations of your jurisdictions. That is the only way you are going to augment your resources in the decade of the 1990s.

Third, community policing is the only strategy that begins to meet the major fear that is in the minds of police managers in all the English-speaking countries, namely, collective violence by disadvantaged groups in urban communities often stratified by race and ethnicity. That is a dominant worry in the United States, in Canada, in Australia, and in Britain. Community policing, appears to be the only strategy which allows police to reach into those communities and to do something ameliorative and helpful, to build bridges before the only response these people have to conditions of modern life is violence. The other strategies of community policing do not do that.

For all of these reasons, then, the future is with community policing. Let us get on with it. We do not really have a choice.