

# Policing Terrorism: A Threat to Community Policing or Just a Shift in Priorities?

John Murray

*The events of September 11 and the subsequent concern for national security have justifiably shifted the priorities of policing. However, in the so-called 'war on terror' police services might be tempted to abandon (or diminish) community policing and revert to the traditional model of policing with its emphasis on paramilitarism. To do so would not only be counterproductive but would also arrest the progress policing has made over recent decades which has taken it to the high level of societal acceptance it now enjoys. In their haste to give public reassurance, politicians might expect a traditional model and as police commissioners face the challenge of retaining community policing there will be further tension from within the ranks as mainstream police culture is action oriented and likely to prefer a paramilitary approach. Rather than moving away from community policing, police services should look to its qualities and apply its fine principles which ultimately will be more effective than the traditional model. The traditional model of policing will, in fact, distance police from the rest of the community whereas a community policing relationship that is built on trust and mutual respect is much more likely to provide early warnings about terrorists acts.*

**Keywords:** *Community Policing; Police Culture; Paramilitarism; Terrorism*

## Introduction

The introduction of community policing has been heralded as the most significant and progressive change in policing philosophy and there are good reasons for this claim. Having a distinctly proactive emphasis, community policing has proven to be a dramatic improvement to the traditional model of policing that is essentially reactive.

---

Correspondence to: John Murray, Adjunct Professor, School of Law, University of Canberra, Australia. Email: john.murray@wynnmacau.com

Characteristically, traditional policing almost invariably depends on a paramilitary structure that tends to distance police from the rest of the community. Community policing, on the other hand, relies on a cooperative community arrangement which when working effectively reduces not just the incidence of crime but also the fear of crime.

It has been frequently said that the terrorist events of *September 11* have changed the world forever. To some observers, so too has the public profile of policing. In many countries now there have been signs of police reverting to (or in some cases simply reaffirming) paramilitarism, which is more in line with the traditional model of policing and clearly at odds with community policing. The threat of terrorism that exists today will test the resolve of police commissioners who choose to retain community policing as a dominant policing philosophy. In this new environment, there is no doubt the effectiveness of community policing will be challenged and some will rationalize it away as being too soft to match the so-called 'war against terror.' While some police forces/services will continue to rely on the community policing model, others will be tempted to return to a traditional model and varying degrees of paramilitarism. Williams (2003, p. 119) notes already in the USA, that the 'effort to incorporate the community policing model into traditional policing operations is faltering.'

Another pressure on community policing is governmental influence: in the context of the drive for effectiveness and efficiency and the election value of law and order, some governments will promote the view that police should concentrate on core business which will be interpreted as requiring police to focus on crime fighting. In this paper I examine, then contrast traditional policing with community policing and in particular critique the paramilitarism of the former to challenge its relevance to policing generally.

Another major consideration in the maintenance of community policing as a dominant philosophy is the prevailing police culture. I comment on the cultural change that was needed in the transition to community policing and while many police forces/services have ostensibly managed the cultural change to accommodate community policing I warn of the underlying tension that probably still exists in police culture which is likely to prefer the traditional model of policing. Put another way, operational police are likely to consider community policing inappropriate to police terrorism. Consequently, for those police commissioners who would seek to retain community policing, this presents a real challenge especially in a climate which tends to demand a more visible and aggressive force against terrorism.

Though trite, it has been frequently pointed out that police alone cannot successfully achieve crime control and that the support of the community is critical—the same principles clearly apply to the prevention of terrorist acts (and prevention should surely be the emphasis). While threats against national security have justifiably shifted the focus of policing priorities to meet this critical demand, I argue that any shift in policing strategies overall should be in emphasis only and not an abandonment of community policing and a total return to the paramilitarism of the traditional model. The shift in focus to counter terrorism will quite rightly involve placing more resources in paramilitary units and providing front-line officers with the necessary skills.

However, to do so by abandoning community policing as an overall philosophy will be counterproductive since it takes away the critical facility of prevention and community cooperation which are inherent in community policing. The two policing philosophies of paramilitarism and community policing can (and in this current environment should) coexist, but under the umbrella of community policing.

### **Transition from Traditional/Paramilitarism to Community Policing**

For much of the developed world, the origins of the modern police service can be traced to the creation of the Metropolitan Police in London in 1829 (Reith, 1975). Introduced by Sir Robert Peel, the Bill to proclaim the *Metropolitan Police Act* in England was accompanied by a set of principles for policing which I consider to have equal relevance today.

The organizational structure and managerial philosophy that accompanied the establishment of this earliest police organization were consistent with the literal definition of paramilitarism (Auten, 1981; Reith, 1975). The paramilitary stamp was firmly put in Peel's police, evidenced by the fact that: (i) Peel ensured the police must be stable, efficient, and organized along military lines (Waters & McGrath, 1974, referred to by Auten, 1981); (ii) there was virtually no organizational model other than the military to emulate; and (iii) there was a conscious decision that the inaugural leader of the Metropolitan Police should be a military person (Auten, 1981). In fact, the authors of the first manual of instruction adapted their text from the 1803 military manual of the Irish Constabulary Police, entitled *Military training and moral training* (Reith, 1975).

The move from a traditionally reactive, action-oriented style of policing to a service-oriented community policing model, which occurred over the last three decades, has arguably been the most significant positive change in policing philosophy. To Bayley (1994, p. 104), for example, 'community policing represents the most serious and sustained attempt to formulate the purpose and practices of policing since the development of the 'professional' model in the early twentieth century.' The introduction of community policing followed what were seen as the limitations of traditional policing and the need for change. Moore (1994, p. 285) neatly summarizes this:

[Referring to the Community Policing Movement] It is not hard to understand the attraction of the new ideas about policing. They seem to recognize and respond to what have come to be seen as the limitations of the 'reform model' of policing: its predominantly reactive stance toward crime control; its nearly exclusive reliance on arrests as a means of reducing crime and controlling disorder; its inability to develop and sustain close working relationships with the community in controlling crime; and its stifling and ultimately unsuccessful methods of bureaucratic control (Sparrow, Moore, & Kennedy, 1990). In contrast the new ideas point to a new set of possibilities: the potential for crime prevention as well as crime control; creative problem solving as an alternative to arrest; the important of customer service and community responsiveness as devices for building stronger relations with local communities; and 'commissioning' street-level officers to initiate community problem-solving efforts. (Sparrow et al., 1990)

Researchers and commentators have found police services that have embraced community policing refer to its cornerstone as the collaborative partnership between the community and the police, engaged in a process that identifies and solves problems

of crime and disorder (Bayley, 1994; Goldstein, 1990; Rosenbaum, 1988; Sherman et al., 1998). While there appears to be no single definition of community policing, Oliver and Bartgis (1988, p. 491) note there is a constant theme in the literature:

The majority of definitions focus on an increase in police and community interaction, a concentration on 'quality of life issues,' the decentralization of the police, strategic methods for making police practices more efficient and effective, a concentration on neighbourhood patrols, and problem-oriented or problem-solving policing.

Public attitudes to the police will also be a determinant in the success of community policing. A hostile or fearful community, for example, will be disinclined to cooperate with police (Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998). Police, as Roberg (1994, pp. 251–252) notes, may not be unduly concerned about that since many line officers have been 'recruited, trained and socialized in a traditional law enforcement orientation and may have a stake in preserving the status quo.' Oliver and Bartgis (1988) found line officers had the capability to ignore, circumvent, or sabotage the desires and expectations of the community.

Since the transition from traditional policing required a substantial change in police culture it is appropriate to examine what the cultural traits of traditional policing are, and how, or to what extent do they contrast with those of community policing?

### **Police Occupational Subculture: A Bias Towards Traditional/Paramilitary Policing?**

There is no doubt that given the extensive authority and discretion held by police that they have the potential to have a dramatic impact on the lives and liberties of citizens. Reflecting on the importance of maintaining a keen interest in policing, Van Maanen (1978, p. 311) thought policing to be 'possibly the most vital of our human service agencies ... too important to be taken-for-granted, or worse, to be ignored.' It certainly follows, therefore, that the ideology, values, principles, and preconceptions which are generally held by police and which consequently determine police culture, are of critical consideration. Unlike most other vocations, discretion in policing is strongest at the lowest level of the organization and while decisions to arrest are open to scrutiny, *most* police decisions involve actions other than arrest, and are therefore, largely without scrutiny or control.

Occupational police culture has been the subject of regular examination by many theorists, the most prominent of them being Manning (1977) and Skolnick (1966, 1985) in the USA; Cain (1973) and Reiner (1992) in Britain; and Chan (1996, 1997, 1999) and Prenzler (1997) in Australia. Many definitions and descriptions of police culture have followed which include: 'developed recognizable and distinct rules, customs, perceptions and interpretations of what they see, along with consequent moral judgements' (Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993, p. 90); 'an identifiable complex of common culture, values, communication symbols, techniques, and appropriate behaviour patterns' (McBride, 1995, p. 214); and Reiner (1992, p. 21) equates it with the 'values, norms perspectives and craft rules' that inform police conduct.

Skolnick (1966) refers to the 'working personality' of police which is associated with the police task and is characterized by suspiciousness, internal solidarity, social isolation, and conservatism. Reiner's (1992) subsequent work resulted in similar conclusions. He

found that a ‘central feature of cop culture is a sense of mission [and that to police themselves] policing is not just a job but a way of life with a worthwhile purpose’ (Reiner, 1992, p. 111). He also noted that the ‘core of the police outlook is this subtle and complex intermingling of the themes of mission, hedonistic love of action and pessimistic cynicism’ (p. 114). Pertinent to this paper, he found that ‘most policemen are well aware that their job has bred them an attitude of constant suspiciousness which cannot be readily switched off [accompanied by a] marked internal solidarity, coupled with social isolation’ (pp. 114, 115). These findings have been supported to varying degrees by Fitzgerald (1989), Goldstein (1976, 1990), Skolnick and Fyfe (1993), and Wood (1997).

The most interesting aspect of the general findings about operational police culture, as outlined above, is that when summarized they are almost diametrically opposite to what I (Murray, 2002) have identified as the appropriate/ideal characteristics of a community police officer which include: a genuine belief in community consultation and problem solving; commitment to the notion of equal partnership with the community; creativity and innovation; freedom to exercise discretion at the lowest level of policing; excellent communication skills so as to be able to develop a rapport with the community, and in turn, win trust and respect. Table 1 contrasts these ‘ideal’ characteristics for a community police officer with the cultural traits identified in research.

I suspect, however, the research findings are not as stark as they appear since they tend to ignore the positive aspects of police culture. Chan (1997) in making this point believes police culture has become a convenient label for a range of negative values, attitudes, and practice norms among police officers; and Prenzler (1997) notes that judicial and scholarly references to police culture have been almost universally pejorative. James and Warren (1995, p. 4) suggest this to some extent can be explained by the fact that:

The origins of cultural explanations for police behaviour can be traced to attempts by sociologists in the 1960’s to explain an enduring anomaly in policing: the breaking of rules by the people whose primary occupation and sole purpose is to enforce rules.

**Table 1** Competing Police Profiles

‘Ideal’ profile for community police officer	Research profile for operational police
Commitment to community consultation and problem solving.	A sense of mission about police work but a distancing from the rest of the community.
Open and accessible in the provision of a service.	Suspiciousness.
Creative and innovative in promoting solutions to problems and crime prevention.	A pragmatic view of police work which discourages innovation and experimentation.
Freedom to exercise discretion at the lowest level of policing so as to incorporate a problem-solving mentality as an alternative to arrest.	A preference for action orientation and arrests.
Excellent communication skills so as to be able to develop a rapport with the community, and in turn win respect and trust.	An isolated social life coupled with a strong code of solidarity with other police officers. A cynical or pessimistic perspective about their social environment.

Despite studies repeatedly showing that most police work involves situations where no crime has occurred, there is a preference by police for action orientation rather than service provision (Feltes, 1994; Reiner, 1992, 1994; Scott, 1988; Skolnick, 1985; Waddington, 1999). At the same time, some governments place a heavy reliance on response-based performance measures such as the number of arrests as indicators of police effectiveness since quantitative targets are easy to define and present a more convenient solution to political demands (Redshaw & Sanders, 1995).

### **Subculture and its Alignment to Models of Policing**

Traditional policing which places a heavy emphasis on paramilitarism and community policing which is founded on a more democratic model give rise to quite different cultures. Many police services have successfully managed the cultural transition from action to service orientation that accompanied the shift from the traditional to the community policing model, while others have experienced resistance arising from the preference within police culture for crime fighting rather than problem solving. This tension becomes pertinent in the light of outside pressures today such as the imperative to address terrorism and national security. Some services have preferred to retain the traditional model of policing, albeit in modified form. As police services around the world address national security, an examination of the differences in police culture that tend to be aligned to traditional vs. community policing is appropriate.

### **Craft or Professional Culture?**

Proponents of traditional policing tend to regard policing as a craft or trade, which is best, learned 'on the job.' It is assumed in this model that it is best to have the majority of training/mentoring undertaken by experienced officers in a master/apprentice arrangement. Certainly in former times, 'outside' help was neither requested nor respected. For community policing an open approach is adopted for recruitment, training, and development, interpreted by some as a move towards policing being a 'profession.' What profession means is, of course, open to different interpretations but has generally thought within policing circles to include the development of a body of knowledge, a strict code of ethics, and working to values rather than rules. In cultural terms, with traditional policing there is a strong preference for the status quo, where seasoned officers perpetuate existing culture resulting in insularity and an 'us' (police) and 'them' (community) mentality. With community policing a culture develops which places a great deal of reliance on community expectations and a willingness to join with, and learn from, experts outside policing.

### **Paramilitarism or Democratic Managerial Culture?**

Traditional policing, as Auten (1981, p. 68) notes, promotes a paramilitaristic managerial style which will exhibit at least some of the following characteristics:

- a centralized command structure with a rigidly adhered to chain of command;
- a rigid superior–subordinate relationship defined by prerogatives of rank;
- control exerted through the issuance of commands, directives, or general orders;
- communications being primarily vertical—from top to bottom;
- initiative being neither sought nor encouraged;
- an authoritarian style of leadership;
- an ‘us–them’ division between senior officers and the rest; and
- discipline being rule based and punitive.

Traditional policing relies heavily on these characteristics not only to ensure effectiveness and efficiency through command and control but also to maintain discipline. Proponents of community policing have never denied the need for command and control but point out that occasions where it is required are relatively few and that its emphasis in the traditional model is disproportionate and counterproductive. With community policing there is a more democratic style of management which relies on personal credibility rather than rank-based authority.

With the traditional model, the culture typically manifests an expectation of unquestioned acceptance of direction from a senior officer and one-way communication. This culture assumes that subordinate ranks need to be told what to do, that rank decides the ‘right’ decision and those down the ladder will have little to offer. The more democratic style in community policing allows empowerment to be devolved to the lowest possible level so as to allow greater decision-making at the operational level. This gives rise to a culture which allows initiative and problem solving. The culture inherent in community policing also recognizes the need for command and control for those occasions where it is required and will adapt for the occasion.

### **Authoritarian or Problem-Solving Culture?**

With traditional policing there is an emphasis on arrests and the strict enforcement of laws, little consideration of prosecutorial discretion, limited interest about the causes of crime, less emphasis on crime prevention, and a general assumption that police will know what is best for the community at large. Community policing on the other hand is founded on the primacy of crime prevention and a conscious commitment to joining with the community in problem solving. The cultural expectations for these two models are dramatically different. Skolnick (1966) and Reiner (1992) whom I refer to above, found with traditional policing that police culture demonstrates a tendency for action orientation and a general distancing from the community. With community policing the culture will show a tendency for openness, innovation, community interest, service orientation, and a spirit of problem solving.

### **Compliant or Adaptive Culture?**

The traditional model of policing tends to have: (i) a centralized structure with headquarters as the source of orders, rules, and regulations; (ii) standardization and



uniformity; (iii) measurement of performance based on quantitative criteria such as the number of arrests; (iv) excessive specialization; and (v) a narrow definition of the duties of a patrol officer being limited to attending complaints and working to predetermined rules and practices. This relatively compliant model meets with problems when confronted with situations not readily covered by existing directives, general orders, or policy and procedure.

Community policing adopts a more adaptive approach through (i) a decentralized structure with the aim to bring the police closer to the community with headquarters being the source of support direction, norms, and values; (ii) encouragement and support for flexibility; (iii) measurement of performance-based not just on quantitative but also qualitative criteria such as the achievement of community goals or solving problems; (iv) a move from specialization to a balance between versatility and specialization; and (v) the patrol officer is a generalist responsible for attending complaints, solving problems, activating the community, preventing crime, and undertaking preliminary crime investigations, where the discretionary powers of the patrol officer are recognized and developed.

With traditional policing, officers are trained to work to established rules and regulations. The culture, therefore, tends to be regimented to act on direct orders with the assumption that the rank-based authority ensures not just compliance but also efficiency and effectiveness. With community policing there is a more flexible structure and a culture develops which is more conducive to recognizing that there is usually no single solution to problems/issues and that by recognizing the valuable contribution from those in the field a more practical resolution is likely. At an operational level, officers will have more confidence to deal with community issues.

### **Recognizing the Appropriate Model**

A shift from traditional to community policing needs a major transition in both managerial and cultural terms. Plainly the characteristics of traditional policing are not suited to community policing. Table 2 highlights differences between the two models.

As the 'world changed' after *September 11*, the question that now has to be asked is, 'Are we seeing a reversion to the paramilitarism of the traditional policing model or has there been merely a shift in priorities?'

### **The Threat of Terrorism and Impact on Community Policing**

Prior to *September 11*, many countries in the developed world had lapsed into a *laissez-faire* approach to national security. The terrorist attacks in the USA on domestic soil would bring that complacency to a dramatic end, and priority for 'homeland security' would become a catchcry, not just in the USA, but also in many countries. This required strategic consideration about how military and civil services would reconfigure to address this fresh challenge. While defence forces would obviously feature in the reassessment, policing would also have increased responsibilities. In many countries the changes have been dramatic and have plainly been much more than tightening up



**Table 2** Transitions between Traditional and Community Policing

Traditional policing and links to paramilitarism <sup>a</sup>	Community policing and democratic management	Culture—contrasting and comparing
<p><i>Policing as a craft</i> Traditionally policing was regarded as a craft/trade which was best learned ‘on the job.’</p>	<p><i>Policing as a profession</i> There has been a conscious drive for policing to be accepted as a ‘profession.’</p>	<p><i>Culture developed on the job</i> With traditional policing there is a strong reliance on the status quo and learning from experienced officers. With community policing a more ‘open’ culture develops which places a great deal of reliance on community expectations.</p>
<p><i>Paramilitary management style</i> Traditional policing incorporates a managerial style which is based either entirely on military lines or at least draw on their principles.</p>	<p><i>Democratic management style</i> While command and control is necessary, these situations are relatively few and management allows contributions from all ranks as to how the job is done.</p>	<p><i>Empowered or disempowered culture</i> A paramilitary culture assumes that authority is linked to rank. With a democratic style of management the culture is one which empowers all officers.</p>
<p><i>Authoritarian approach to policing</i> Traditional policing promotes strict enforcement of laws, little concern about the causes of crime, limited prosecutorial discretion, and there is less emphasis on preventing crime.</p>	<p><i>Problem-solving approach to policing</i> Here there is an understanding what causes crime and there is a conscious commitment to joining with the community to prevent crime.</p>	<p><i>Linking culture to the philosophy</i> In traditional policing there is a tendency for authoritarianism, defensiveness, cynicism, and action orientation which together result in a general distancing from the community. In community policing the culture is open, consultative, and geared to solving problems.</p>
<p><i>Inflexible structure</i> In the traditional model, there tends to be a rigid, centralized bureaucracy with officers working to predetermined rules and practices.</p>	<p><i>Flexible structure</i> Community policing devolves authority and decision-making which encourages initiative. Officers work to values and standards.</p>	<p><i>From compliant to adaptive culture</i> With traditional policing, the culture tends to be regimented and compliant. Community policing is adaptive recognizing that there is usually no single solution to problems/issues.</p>
<p><i>Blame culture</i> The paramilitary model of policing assumes that police officers will inevitably do something wrong and when they do they should be punished.</p>	<p><i>Learning culture</i> A learning culture recognizes the failure of the punitive model and educates/corrects minor and understandable breaches rather than punish.</p>	<p><i>From institutional to personal discipline</i> The punitive model creates apprehension, anxiety, defensiveness, and denial. An ‘us–them (management)’ culture results. In a learning culture officers work to values and minor breaches are regarded as curable mistakes—a move from threat to incentive.</p>

**Table 2** *Continued.*

Traditional policing and links to paramilitarism <sup>a</sup>	Community policing and democratic management	Culture—contrasting and comparing
<p><i>Insularity and defensiveness</i> In traditional policing there is a tendency towards the notion that police are the only ones who knew anything about policing. Academics or other commentators are not appreciated.</p>	<p><i>Openness and consultation</i> In community policing other expert advice is invited and individual police contributions are considered worthwhile.</p>	<p><i>Move towards transparency</i> With traditional police there was a defensive culture—a tendency towards craft secrecy. Inherent in community policing is that police are part of the community and a desired culture is one which recognizes and works to a model that allows the public to know how and why the police operate the way they do.</p>

<sup>a</sup>In listing the characteristics of traditional policing and the link to paramilitarism I have drawn largely from those identified by Auten, J. H. (1981). The paramilitary model of police and police professionalism. *Police Studies*, 4(2), Summer.

existing practices. De Guzman (2002, p. 8), for example, described the reaction in the USA as the ‘fortification’ of the country. Policing across the world, to the average observer, became visibly different. It was not just the fact there were more police about, but police had also assumed a more aggressive style of dress and manner.

Prior to *September 11* some writers had already expressed concern about the shift in policing towards paramilitarism. Weber (1999, p. 2) referring to the USA, for example, expressed alarm at the ‘spawning of a culture of paramilitarism in American law enforcement [with] local police officers ... increasingly emulating the war-fighting tactics of soldiers.’ McCulloch (2001a) also prior to *September 11* considered the threat of terrorism in Australia had been used to justify significant changes in the role of the police and its shift towards paramilitarism. To these writers the civil–military separation was breaking down and the lines that traditionally separated the military mission from the police were becoming distinctly blurred. Moreover, as Weber (1999, p. 5) contends:

Over the last century police departments have evolved into increasingly centralized, authoritarian, autonomous, and militarized bureaucracies, which has led to their isolation from the citizenry.

If Weber is correct, what she is describing is either a shift from community policing back to the traditional model or that police have not made the transition at all. It should be remembered she made this comment prior to *September 11*. I am concerned that post *September 11* there seems to be a move which would see community policing and all its fine principles undermined by a reversion to the traditional model of policing, rationalized by the need to counter terrorism.

McCulloch (2001b, p. 4), referring to Australia, is more cynical as she describes ‘community policing [as] the ‘velvet glove’ covering the ‘iron fist’ of more military

styles of policing.’ This is certainly not my observation. While McCulloch and I both accept that paramilitary policing and community policing are actually complementary (McCulloch, 2001b, p. 4) we do so for different reasons. She considers references by police to community policing are ‘rhetoric [and] well published strategies designed to counter the negative image and public antipathy arising from the use of coercive paramilitary tactics.’ I, on the other hand, believe the complement between paramilitary policing and community policing in Australia to mean the maintenance of a capability to counter extreme acts of violence but within a genuine community policing model.

As we face the ‘war on terror,’ rather than moving away from community policing, police commissioners should look to its qualities and specifically note how this policing philosophy can be used to their advantage. To abandon or diminish it would be counterproductive and would undo the conscious drive over the decades which has taken policing to the high level of societal acceptance it now enjoys. It follows, therefore, that I cannot accept comments like those of de Guzman (2002, p. 11) who believes that, ‘[in] the context of war against terror, some tenets of community policing appear to be inconsistent with the implementation of these new police roles.’ He continues, ‘The events of *September 11* threaten the utility as well as the continued existence of some community policing ideals on several grounds’ (see below). While he concedes community policing should ‘probably not be abandoned,’ it is appropriate, to examine the four points he suggests support the fact that community policing in its present form would be unable to meet the demands introduced by the threat of terrorism.

First, de Guzman (2002, p. 11) states the philosophical ideal in community policing of winning the hearts and minds of the community will not be effective against terror since one cannot reason with terrorists. It is futile, he continues, for police to try, and patrols should be made aware that they should not deter but detect and prevent violent terrorist acts. I consider this an extremely narrow point of view. Community–police partnerships work best when they are structured to encourage information sharing from all parts of the community. This *especially* includes groups which tend to be unwilling to assist the police. For de Guzman to refer to this fundamental aspect of community policing as ‘futile’ in the context of prospective terrorism is unproductive. To exclude or isolate any subgroup from a community policing service amounts to more than failing in a civic duty—it also ignores a most important source of information for police to gauge what they are up against (Bayley & Bittner, 1984). Today, a more thoughtful initiative would be to rebuild trust with specific ethnic/cultural communities, through a genuine commitment by police to protect them and their neighborhoods, workplaces, and places of worship (Lyons, 2002). Community policing when working well will deflect rumours and reduce misinformation and distortion.

Second, de Guzman (2002, p. 11) believes the introduction of strategies against terrorism will negate assumptions of community cooperation and trust that are implicit in community policing. Terrorists are constantly employing deceit, and therefore, he argues, police should be reluctant to invest their trust on such unidentifiable forces. I take a contrary view. Successful detection and prevention of terrorism

depends on information. From experience we know terrorists can successfully occupy a position within a conventional community. A community–police relationship that is based on mutual trust is more likely to uncover matters that are helpful in identifying prospective terrorists. A more formal or authoritarian police–community relationship would distance police from the rest of the community and only reports of actual law breaking are likely to be reported. However, a good community–police relationship would encourage general dialogue and is more likely to uncover valuable suspicious information and this can only be brought about by trust and mutual respect. Enlisting the community in its own defence encourages it to take control of its own destiny.

Third, de Guzman (2002, p. 11) points out that the partnership of community policing where both parties have to reach a consensus about strategies of crime prevention and police operations will fail in today's environment since police will not be able to reveal their strategies to the community. He considers that if in their preparation of counter-terrorism strategies, the police decide to hold back, the community will sense this and consequently trust will be breached and such partnerships will inevitably wither away. Again, I take a distinctly different view on this point. In existing community policing partnerships, the community has never expected that police confide confidential information about investigations or give specific information about operational tactics. So there is nothing essentially different when dealing with terrorism. Further, to take a position that police will decide what is best for the community could be interpreted as arrogant and in breach of a fundamental tenet of public accountability. The community has a right to certain information, and in the context of terrorism, for example, should be made aware of the level of threat so that individuals can make decisions about their own disposition. A basic assumption of community policing is that police are part of the community (as civilians) and that collaboration should exist in how crime, terrorism, and other community problems are addressed. The contribution community policing can make in this area is extremely positive. In terms of prevention it can allow the community to focus on the importance of notifying early warnings/signs, consistent with the spirit that it is in everybody's interest. The community should feel comfortable about coming forward with information no matter how slight they believe its connection to terrorism.

De Guzman's (2002, p. 12) fourth point is that parochial policing is promoted in community policing but the 'war on terror' necessitates broader collaborative policing. The level of collaboration, he contends, should not only be within the department but should include other local departments, federal or state agencies since in the war on terror the planning space may be distant from the target phase. Thus, efforts to make communications and collaborations among and between police departments should be a constant undertaking. In my view, community policing when working effectively is not parochial and in fact is multidisciplinary on the basis that police by themselves seldom have the answer for all community problems. Community policing, therefore, uses a broad rather than a narrow (parochial) approach. Police regularly work with specialists at a local and national level and in the context of the threat of terrorism they also work at an international level.

## Conclusion

The traditional model of policing relies on paramilitarism characterized by rank-based authority and command and control. In this model, the organizational structure is hierarchical and inflexible making it difficult to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing environment. Policing here is predominantly reactive and unable to develop and sustain close working relationships with the community in controlling crime. Community policing is eminently sensible since it concentrates on crime prevention.

The transition to community policing has not been easy for most police services since the prevailing culture of operational police has shown a distinct preference for action orientation and a lack of interest in 'soft' policing with which community policing has been identified. Even for those services which have successfully made the transition it is likely that the tension within the culture still exists and that moves or even suggestions to revert to the traditional paramilitary style would meet with a great deal of support from the rank and file.

The world has certainly changed after *September 11* but there is no need to move away from community policing as the prevailing philosophy. Clearly, there has to be a shift of priorities which allows policing strategies to focus on national security. To assume, however, that paramilitarism as an overarching model is best suited to do this is a serious miscalculation. A reversion to a traditional model of policing will undo the decades of great work that has placed modern community policing as an exemplar of public service in a civil and democratic society.

Using the principles of community policing is a much more sensible and effective way of dealing with terrorism. It has been accepted that police cannot fight crime alone and must rely on the community. The same principle applies to terrorism. A community-police relationship that is built on trust and mutual respect is much more likely to give early warnings about terrorist acts. Rather than move policing away from community policing it should be reinforced especially in light of the cultural traits in operational police that tend to indicate a preference for action. The commitment of police commissioners over the years to make the necessary transition to achieve this cultural change must not be forgotten. Moreover, as they reconfigure policing strategies to meet the threat of terrorism (as they must) they should be alert to the likelihood that operational police might prefer to move to an action-oriented style of policing characterized by paramilitarism. In their eagerness to give public reassurance, politicians might prefer this model too. The road ahead will be demanding for police leaders. What must be resisted is the temptation to fall back to the methods of policing which ignore the profound and ethically based principles of community policing.

## References

- Auten, J. H. (1981). The paramilitary model of police and police professionalism. *Police Studies*, 4(2), 67-78.
- Bayley, D. H. (1994). *Police for the future*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bayley, D. H., & Bittner, E. (1984). Learning the skills of policing. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 47(4), 35-39.

- Cain, M. (1973). *Society and the policeman's role*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Chan, J. (1996). Changing police culture. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36(1), 109–134.
- Chan, J. (1997). *Changing police culture: Policing in a multi-cultural society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chan, J. (1999). Police culture. In D. Dixon (Ed.), *A culture of corruption*. Sydney: Hawkins Press.
- de Guzman, M. C. (2002, September/October). The changing roles and strategies of the police in time of terror. *ACJS Today*, 8–13.
- Feltes, T. (1994). New philosophies in policing. *Police Studies*, XVII(2), 29–48.
- Fitzgerald, G. E. (1989). *Report of a Commission of Inquiry Pursuant to Orders in Council*, Brisbane Commission of Inquiry into Possible Illegal Activities and Associated Police Misconduct. Queensland Government Printer.
- Goldstein, H. (1976). Improving the police: A problem-oriented approach. *Crime and Delinquency*, 25, 236–258.
- Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem oriented policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- James, S., & Warren, I. (1995). Police culture. In K. Bessant, K. Carrington, & S. Cook (Eds.), *Cultures of crime and violence: The Australian experience*. Bundoora: La Trobe University Press.
- Lyons, W. (2002). Partnerships, information and public safety; Community policing in a time of terror. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 25(3), 530–542.
- Manning, P. (1977). *Police work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- McBride, R. B. (1995). Discrimination. In W. Bailey (Ed.), *The encyclopaedia of police science* (2nd ed.). New York: Garland.
- McCulloch, J. (2001a). Paramilitary surveillance: S11, Globalisation, terrorists and counter-terrorists. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 13(1), 23–35.
- McCulloch, J. (2001b). *Blue army*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Moore, M. H. (1994). Research synthesis and policy implications. In D. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *The challenge of community policing*. London: Sage.
- Murray, J. (2002). Police culture: A critical component of community policing. *The Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 34(2), 57–71.
- Oliver, W. M., & Bartgis, E. (1988). Community policing: A conceptual framework. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 21(3), 490–509.
- Prenzler, T. (1997). Is there a police culture? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 56(4), 47–65.
- Redshaw, J., & Sanders, F. (1995, January 11). What does the public want? *Policing*, 56–60.
- Reiner, R. (1992). *The politics of the police* (2nd ed.). Brighton, UK: Harvester.
- Reiner, R. (1994, March 10). What should the police be doing? *Policing*, 151–157.
- Reisig, M. D., & Giacomazzi, A. L. (1998). Citizen perceptions of community policing: Are attitudes toward police important? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 21(3), 547–561.
- Reith, C. (1975). *The blind eye of history: A study of the origins of the present police era*. Montclair, NJ: Paterson Smith.
- Roberg, R. R. (1994). Can today's police organizations effectively implement community policing? In D. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rosenbaum, D. (1988). Community crime prevention: A review of the literature. *Justice Quarterly*, 5, 323–395.
- Scott, J. (1998). Performance culture: The return of reactive policing. *Police and Society*, 8, 269–288.
- Sherman, L. W., Gottfredson, D., Mackenzie, D. L., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. D. (1998, July). *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising*, Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Skolnick, J. H. (1966). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society*. New York: John Wiley.
- Skolnick, J. H. (1985). Suspicion, danger and isolation. In W. Terry (Ed.), *Policing society: An occupational view*. New York: John Wiley.

- Skolnick, J. H., & Fyfe, J. (1993). *Above the law: Police and the excessive use of force*. London: Free Press.
- Sparrow, M. K., Moore, M. H., & Kennedy, D. M. (1990). *Beyond 911: A new era for policing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). On watching the watchers. In P. K. Manning & J. Van Maanen (Eds.), *Policing: A view from the street*. Santa Monica: Goodyear.
- Waddington, P. A. J. (1999). Police (canteen) sub-culture. *British Journal of Criminology*, 39(4), 765–797.
- Weber, D. C. (1999). Warrior cops: The ominous growth of paramilitarism in American police departments. Retrieved from [www.cato.org/pubs/briefs/bp50.pdf](http://www.cato.org/pubs/briefs/bp50.pdf)
- Williams, E. J. (2003). Structuring in community policing: Institutionalising innovative change. *Police Practice and Research*, 4(2), 119–129.
- Wood, J. (1997). *Royal Commission into the New South Wales Police Services: Final report (Vols. 1–3)*. Sydney: Government of the State of New South Wales.