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The rationale for this conceptual work is to examine the ethical aspects of community policing's inception and practice, as evidenced in America. Historical patterns of ethical issues and reform responses to ethical breaches in conduct are informative for newly democratic countries in the midst of transitional models of law enforcement. Much can be learned from the rich history of American policing.

The history of modern policing in America commenced with what Kelling and Moore (1988) term the "Political Era" in the late 1800s. Spanning several decades into the early 1900s, the Political Era was marked by broad provision of police services (law enforcement, order maintenance, and service), decentralized patrol, an intimate relationship between police and citizens, and ensuing corruption and unethical police behavior brought about by close ties between local politicians and officers. To remedy this growing corruption, policing entered the "Reform or Professional Era." In an effort to break their corrupting ties with politicians and to stem a variety of police misconduct, the primary police function was narrowed to crime fighting, and the relationship between citizens and police became one of professional remoteness. While well-intended, such remoteness eventually culminated in police abuses of authority, power, and discretion. These unethical behaviors were later identified as contributing factors in the riots of the 60s. During a period of transition (late 70s through the 80s) policing strategies such as foot patrol, team policing, problem solving and police-community relations were tested. American law enforcement now finds itself in the midst of the "Community-Oriented Era" in an effort to regain a closer working relationship with the citizenry and to engender increased police accountability to the American public. Although some feared this restored intimate relationship would result in renewed unethical police behaviors, evidence does not support the criticism. To the contrary, community policing has resulted (in many areas) in an increased level of police accountability to American citizens.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between ethics and community policing may be examined from two perspectives. The first perspective is historical, examining the role that unethical police behaviors played in shaping American law enforcement and its eventual transformation into the community era (per Kelling and Moore, 1988). The second perspective is a critical one and examines the charge that community policing sets the stage for increased opportunities for corrupt police practices. In this article we examine the relationship between community policing and ethics from both perspectives with the purpose of presenting the ethical aspects of community policing's inception and practice. It is our belief that historical patterns of ethical issues and reform responses to ethical breaches in conduct are informative for newly democratic countries in the midst of transitional models of law enforcement. Much can be learned from the rich history of American policing.
CORRUPTION, ETHICS, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN POLICING

Community policing is the result of and is best understood within the context of policing’s evolution. As Radelet and Carter remind us, “community policing was not a concept that appeared because it seemed like a good idea” (1994:60). Some researchers believe that community policing grew from roots located within law enforcement’s early attempts to reach the community, such as police-community relations programs of the 1950s and 1960s (Greene, 1987; Gaines, 1994; Carter & Radelet, 1994); team policing programs of the 1970s (Walker, 1993; Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994); and crime prevention units of the early 1980s (Greene cites Skolnick & Bayley, 1986). Many feel community policing’s roots are retroactive to American law enforcement’s early foot patrol days (Greene, 1987). Nelligan and Taylor note Goldstein (1990) who traces the roots to social reasons – the upheaval and turmoil of the 1960s (1994). Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux accept all these possibilities (1990). How to make sense of all this? We proffer the conceptualization of Kelling and Moore’s “Three Eras” to encapsulate our discussion of corruption, ethics, and the development of American policing (1988).

The Political Era

The history of modern policing commenced with what Kelling and Moore term the “Political Era” in the late 1800s. Spanning several decades into the early 1900s, the political era was marked by broad provision of police services (law enforcement, order maintenance, and service), decentralized patrol, an intimate relationship between police and citizens, and ensuing corruption and unethical police behaviors brought about by close ties between local politicians and officers.

Early nineteenth-century American policing was authorized and dominated by local politicians and was notorious for brutality, corruption, and ineptness. Officers were primarily tools of the municipal ward politicians (Dempsey, 1994; Kelling & Moore, 1988). Political patronage ran rampant as politicians determined who would be appointed police officers and who would be promoted in rank. Job security equated to the length of time local politicians were pleased with an officer’s work.

The role of the American, urban police officer in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was varied and often not limited to acting as the law enforcement arm of politicians (Dempsey, 1994). In addition to crime control, protecting private property, and control of rapidly arriving immigrants, early police provided broad social services, among these: running soup kitchens, finding shelter and jobs for immigrants, operating ambulances, providing fire protection, and even sweeping streets and garbage collection (Dempsey, 1994; Kelling & Moore, 1988; Roberg & Kuykendall, 1993).

Although organized in a quasi-military fashion, police were nevertheless decentralized. Local precincts operated as small-scale departments and officers were assigned to beats. Officers were often “recruited from the areas that they would patrol” and shared the ethnic, religious, and moral values of the neighborhood (1993: 59). This combination of decentralization with primitive communication and transportation allowed officers to possess considerable amounts of discretion – discretion that was sometimes abused (Kelling & Moore, 1988).
Outcomes of the political era were political and (in general) citizen satisfaction. Communities benefited from the broad social services provided by police and officers were well-integrated with citizens in the neighborhoods. The downside to the political era was that it "gave rise to political corruption...that strong identification of police with neighborhood norms often resulted in discrimination against strangers," and that lack of organizational control over officers (due to decentralization and political influence) caused inefficiencies and disorganization (Kelling & Moore, 1988:4). As a result, serious attempts to reform the police was evidenced at the start of the twentieth century.

The Reform Era

To remedy this growing corruption, policing entered the "Reform or Professional Era." In an effort to break their corrupting ties with politicians and to stem a variety of police misconduct, the primary police function was narrowed to crime fighting, and the relationship between citizens and police became one of professional remoteness. While well-intended, such remoteness eventually culminated in police abuses of authority, power, and discretion. These unethical behaviors were later identified as contributing factors in the riots of the 60s.

Initial attempts to reform policing occurred during the "progressive era of American government, from 1900 to 1914." These attempts "originated outside the police department by middle-class, civic-minded reformers (Dempsey, 1994:13). For the most part these attempts failed, but with the progressive era began a "shift away from a political orientation to more of a bureaucratic and legalistic approach to law enforcement" (Johnson, 1981:55).

Police agencies began to embrace the legalistic approach and its mission that crime fighting was the primary, if not sole, function of the police. Emerging as "the principle architect of this reform organizational strategy was O.W. Wilson, whose efforts paralleled J. Edgar Hoover's moves to transform the corrupt and discredited Bureau of Investigation into the honest and prestigious FBI" (Kelling & Moore, 1988:4-5). Wilson's texts on police administration also followed Hoover's lead and "began to shape an organizational strategy for urban police" across America (1988:5).

Prohibition (the Volstead Act) added impetus to the rising demand for police professionalism. During prohibition, "organized crime families banded together to meet the demand of Americans for alcohol." When the Volstead Act was repealed, organized crime refocused its attention and monies into other vice operations. Refocusing had two results. First, law enforcement was unable to contain organized crime and, second, many officers cooperated with crime families resulting in further corruption within police ranks (Dempsey, 1994). This contributed to the formation of the Wickersham Commission in 1929, which produced the first national study of the United States criminal justice system (1994). The Commission's two-volume report "blamed the shortcomings of the police on a lack of professionalism" (1994:14) and laid the foundation for the "beginning of a national consensus concerning the direction for the professionalization of police" (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1993:68).

Several elements during the 1930s and 1940s furthered the scope of police professionalism and increasingly narrowed the function of police to crime fighting. First, was the onset of the Great Depression that actually made reforming police easier. The
Depression meant reduced monies, and fewer funds made for reduced opposition to centralizing the police (1993). Second, technology was slowly advancing. Telephones and two-way radios increased the value and use of police cruisers and provided the necessary technology for central dispatch development.

During the 1950s, "...in response to fear about crime and the corruption of law enforcement officers," the Kefauver Committee was convened. The 1950s is considered a turning point in the history of professionalism: "...reformers came to power across the nation and were available (accessible) for the first time. Politicians, facing pressure from an enraged middle class who threatened their (political) livelihoods, opted for police reform" (Johnson, 1981: 121).

During the reform era, politics were rejected as the source of police authorization and civil service was instituted to eliminate the effects of political patronage. Further, where officers were once hired (politically appointed) from the neighborhoods they would patrol, it became illegal for them to live in their work beats. As Kelling and Moore note: "...so persuasive was the argument of reformers to remove political influences from policing that police departments became one of the most autonomous (and centralized) public organizations in urban government" (1988: 5).

Kelling and Moore summarize the reform strategy as impressive and successful. It "narrowed the police function, minimized discretionary excesses that had developed during the political era, and provided a comprehensive, yet simple, vision of policing around which police leaders could rally. Further, the patrol car became the symbol of policing, representing mobility, power, presence, control of officers, and professional distance from citizens" (8). The police had succeeded in making strides toward professionalism, but in doing so they had isolated themselves from their clients. This was to have major ramifications during the transition decades of the 1960s and 1970s.

The Transition Era²

The post-war, relative stability of the (late) 1940s and 1950s provided a favorable backdrop for the success of the reform era. However, the reform era ran into difficulty during the unstable social conditions of the 60s and 70s. Several factors shaped this time of transition that was to herald the community era of policing in America:

- Social unrest
- Federal steps to improve law enforcement
- The crime prevention/community relations movement
- Research regarding police reform strategies

Social Unrest

Social unrest came to a head in the 1960s for several different reasons. First, the marches and demonstrations of the civil rights movement pitted police against African-Americans and other civil rights demonstrators. "...(Police) were used to enforce existing laws, which in many cases meant arresting and inhibiting the freedom of those marching for freedom" (Dempsey, 1994: 16). Incidents like Birmingham's (Alabama) Sheriff Bull Conner "unleashing dogs and hoses at a black "freedom march," and the police continued to play a large role in the movement and disturbances.

Second, anti-American involvement in the Vietnam War and the subsequent anti-war demonstrations that followed, including the Dealey Plaza incident, wounded by police in南京, and the University in Ohio and the wounded by police in Washington, D.C.

Third, while city police lieutenants were in镊子 of incident was followed by a new order during these years, the police-community relationship was strained.

FEDERAL STEPS

The transition from the reform era to the community era was shaped by the social unrest and conflict that characterized policing. A variety of factors were at play:

The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (OLEA) was created with the purpose of supporting the community relations movement. OLEA's money was given to universities and local police departments for law enforcement research.

In 1965, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Urban Violence was established to study the problem. Its report concluded that "...had too little to do with the police and too much to do with community issues..." (1994: 28).

In 1968, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Urban Violence was established to study the problem. Its report concluded that "...had too little to do with the police and too much to do with community issues..." (1994: 28).

The implications of these events on the community, urban violence, and the police (community era) police organization are significant.
ced opposition to policing. Telephones and provided the corruption of law 950s is considered power across the encouragement pressure from Iice authorization Further, neighborhoods they. As Kelling and remove political most autonomous It provided a favorable ran into difficulty Conner “unleashing hoses and police dogs against demonstrators” added fuel to the movement and did nothing for police except garner much negative press (1994).

Second, anti-Vietnam War demonstrations pitted police against those opposing American involvement. Many of these protestors were college students and campus disorders erupted across the United States. The police embodied everything that was wrong with government during the 1960s, and violence exploded at several venues including the Democratic presidential convention in Chicago in 1968 and Kent State University in Ohio. When it was over, the tally was taken in dead bodies and those wounded by police and national guard gunfire (1994).

Third, while students were protesting, major riots occurred in ghetto areas across the United States. The shooting of an African-American youth by an off-duty New York City police lieutenant “precipitated the 1964 riot in Harlem.” In subsequent months, this incident was followed by riots across the country. “The efforts of the police to maintain order during these massive shows of civil disobedience and violence caused wounds in police-community relations that have yet to heal” (1994:20).

FEDERAL STEPS TO IMPROVE LAW ENFORCEMENT

The transition era was also a time when the federal government, in response to social unrest and new waves of police corruption, took steps to improve American policing. A variety of federal measures were implemented.

The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (OLEA) was created in 1965 for the purpose of supporting training and new programs in criminal justice. While much of OLEA’s money was directed to law enforcement agencies, some funds were channeled to universities and colleges for the establishment of degree programs in criminal justice and law enforcement (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1993).

In 1965, the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice was created in response to public outcry. As Carter and Radelet note, “The public wanted to know if the police were accomplishing their goals. Corruption scandals, accusations of political impropriety, excessive use of force, and clashes with Vietnam War protestors and civil rights demonstrators prompted closer scrutiny of police practices” (1994: 61).

In 1968, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence were charged with examining the urban riots of the decade. Among the findings of these Commissions was that police “...had paid too little attention to effective organization, had given inadequate attention to community issues and concerns, had not explored their internal biases, and had not seriously considered preventive strategies to deal with civil disorder and violence” (61). The implications were clear: “...law enforcement must establish an open dialogue with the community, deliver comprehensive services, and reexamine the traditional (reform era) police organizational structure and processes” (61).
CRIME PREVENTION-COMMUNITY RELATIONS MOVEMENT

The crime prevention movement “became important during the late 1960s” and was often “used by police as a public relations tactic to improve their image” in the community, suggesting superficial motives (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1993: 74). During this time crime prevention became closely associated, and sometimes synonymous, with police-community relations efforts. Gaines summarizes the crime prevention-community relations movement: “Unfortunately many of the police community relations programs rapidly evolved into public relations programs, which police could use to manipulate their image and build public support...genuine concern for the community and its problems were lost or became secondary to managing appearances” (1994:20).

RESEARCH REGARDING POLICE REFORM STRATEGIES

Federal efforts during the transition era allowed for academic and government research into police practices. Research results challenged the strongly held notions about prevailing police practices that emanated from the reform era. Among the policy myths shot down were preventive patrol and rapid response.

In 1972, findings from the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Study indicated that the reform strategy of random patrol was “not only uncommitted time but it was also non-productive time. Results suggested that police should explore how resources could be better used and that police should examine processes that might be more effective in dealing with crime problems and citizen concerns” (Carter & Radelet, 1994: 64).

Rapid response to citizens’ 911 calls was another police strategy based on the traditional (reform) approach. However, beliefs about the effects of rapid response on crime reduction and citizen satisfaction were based on unexamined assumptions about police patrol. Overall, findings suggested that rapid response had little effect on producing positive crime outcomes and that citizen satisfaction was associated with “whether the response time met the citizen’s expectation for response,” not with the rapidness of the response, per se (1994).

Summarizing, the transition era “brought a new set of critics who recommended reforms” that were intended to overcome the problems of police isolation from the community and to “create a police-public partnership” in responding to crime and order maintenance problems (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1993: 73). Nearing the end of the transition era, departments began to focus their resources and efforts on new organizational strategies and policies aimed at quelling the new wave of critics. Ushering in the community era were early reform attempts at team policing, problem-oriented policing and foot patrol.

The Community Era

The reform efforts of the transition era span into the community era and a variety of strategies were being tested to engender increased police accountability to the American public. These forerunners of the modern community era were team policing, problem-oriented policing, and foot patrol.
The "buzzwords" of patrol management in the 1970s and early 1980s were team policing. "Basically, team policing incorporated many of the accepted management theories of participative management, job expansion, and closer interaction between police and community" (Gaines, 1994: 21). Rosenbaum and Lurigio call team policing "one of the earliest efforts to redefine police practices in terms of a community orientation (1994: 301). However, its rise and fall was quick. The reason for team policing's short life span is attributed to the omission or de-emphasizing of mid-level managers within the police organization. Angry at having been left out of the loop, middle managers undermined its success (Gaines, 1994). Despite its quick demise, team policing led to the next stage of advancement in law enforcement and launched a second wave of police reform-- that of problem-solving (Walker, 1993).

Walker views problem-solving or problem-oriented policing as the result of "two pivotal events: Goldstein's 1979 Problem-Oriented Policing article and Wilson and Kelling's 1982, seminal, Broken Windows article" (1993:35). Wilson and Kelling's theory of broken windows backgrounds both community and problem-oriented policing. Problem-oriented policing, while narrower in scope than community policing, was accepted by many police agencies. Often confused with the broader philosophy of community policing, Eck and Spelman (1987) define problem solving the core of problem-oriented policing - as a tactic, "...a department-wide strategy aimed at solving persistent community problems. Police identify, analyze, and respond to the underlying circumstances that create incidents" (xv).

Woods and Ziembo-Vogl contrast the 1982 foot patrol experiment conducted by Trojanowicz in Flint, Michigan with the publication of the 1979 Goldstein article. Trojanowicz drew from his social work background formulating a model that empowers citizens to solve their own problems, while Goldstein advocated an organizationally directed approach (1995). As for the Broken Windows article, it links physical and social disorder to crime, while questioning the effectiveness of traditional police procedures. This saga of events, which combines the Flint Foot Patrol Program with the two pivotal articles cited by Walker, spurred increased scholarly interest in a philosophy that would become known as community policing.

There exists a long history of corruption and ensuing series of reform efforts that lead to the community era. Viewed historically, there are many parallels between the political and community eras of police evolution as envisioned by Kelling & Moore. First, the community era emphasizes a return to broad provision of services beyond simply crime control. Second, there is also a return to decentralization of organizational design. Officers are deployed back out into the community - perhaps on foot or as the research indicates, most often via a combination of patrol methods. This method of service delivery requires that police and citizens work in partnership with one another.

The tactic of problem solving is viewed as a key strategy of the community era and is central to the aspect of partnership. There is also a return to an intimate relationship with the environment. "During the reform era, police claimed a monopolistic responsibility for crime control. Now citizens share responsibility and police recognize community crime control efforts" (1988:12). It is this intimate relationship between police and citizens that has raised issues of community policing's potential for unethical police behavior.
CORRUPTION, ETHICS, AND COMMUNITY POLICING

Criticisms that community policing removes accountability and promotes corruption center upon situational aspects of this reform's service delivery style. Community policing requires decentralized and personalized service delivery (Trojanowicz, 1991, et al.) and "the most important thing about this situation is that many of the anti-corruption measures of the past decades have been based on the concept of impersonal administration of the law and on the practices that follow logically from that concept" (Bracey, 1992: 179).

Proponents of community policing's potential to breed unethical, officer behavior cite abuse of discretion as the key factor or culprit in the production of corruption via "sustained officer presence" within the community and the removal (in their estimation) of an accountability mechanism:

...Greater involvement with the community brings up problems of ethics, corruption, and stagnation. With increased interaction with the community, chances also expand for various discretionary acts for which officers will be accountable. Pressures from neighborhood or block committees or from various criminal as well as noncriminal figures can make officers look the other way. (Friedmann, 1990: 85)

Reduction of the political and social isolation of the police may increase the risk of corruption and favoritism and greater autonomy and discretion for police officers increases the risk of police officers being beyond the effective control of their departments. (Nelligan & Taylor, 1994: 59)

...Community policing opens possibilities for corruption consisting of inducements to use that discretion illegitimately. At least some (police/community) relationships will be intense and of long duration, leading to the very type of personal interaction that provided corruption opportunities in the past. At the very least, sustained participation in the community will lead to what professional police reformers considered minor forms of corruption. (Bracey, 1992: 180)

Like Bracey, Sykes, too, recalls one reason for prior attempts to reform policing by reminding us "...it was the fear of uncontrolled police discretion that fueled reform movements" (1986: 60).

The potential for corruption is not relegated solely to community policing philosophy, per se. In their discussion of the police strategy of problem solving, with its inherent broader approach, Eck and Spelman cite, "...police agencies that take on a broader, problem-solving role can be more effective than before. But they may also do more harm than before, either through inadvertent mistakes or through outright abuses of authority" (1987: 48).

The charge of community policing's potential for unbridled use (and abuse) of discretionary powers is countered by examining accountability. Opponents claim accountability is absent for community officers deployed within the flatter, decentralized organizational structure of community policing departments. Proponents claim that accountability is not absent, it just shifts from one entity to another entity - from the hierarchical police organization to the community. As Trojanowicz claims, "community police officers identify with, and are held accountable to, the community they serve" (1991:3). A community police officer is accountable to the community.

This new arena of police-community interaction is fraught with pressure from fellow officers. Bracey, in particular, notes in agreement, Sykes and define the extent to which rather the extent to which accountability is placed on the community.

Eck and Spelman note the combination of diverse pressures from neighborhood committees or from various criminal as well as noncriminal figures can make officers look the other way. (Friedmann, 1990: 85)
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A community officer agrees, "With CPOP, on a personal level, you feel accountable to the people" (Webber, 1991:126). This new accountability permeates (and some would say, ignores) the culture of the police organization. With traditional policing, the officer’s first loyalty is to his/her fellow officers. This type of accountability promotes corruption. Sykes goes one step further, stating that "the paramilitary police structure creates an image of police accountability, while leaving them free to use their discretion (1986: 61). With community policing, “a police officer’s first loyalty must be to the people in the community, not to fellow officers back at the stationhouse” (Trojanowicz, 1991:6). As if in agreement, Sykes notes that “the most significant factors, which ultimately influence and define the conduct of the police, may not be the formal institutional context, but rather the extent to which police officers reflect and mirror the values, expectations, and demands of their communities (1986: 61).

Eck and Spelman take a similar but broader view of this accountability shift. “Some combination of the same actors who already set and enforce police standards: informal pressure from private citizens in their contacts with individual offices, elected officials, the staff of other public and private agencies, and the police themselves” will set the limits of police authority (1987:49).

Bracey, in her concluding remarks goes furthest out on the limb by claiming that a community officer’s closer ties with the community “may well promote a lower incidence of corruption than was true” previously. Still further, Bracey states, “by creating a job that is professionally and personally satisfying, closer relationships with the community may actually prevent corruption” (1992:181).

Having addressed the general criticisms let us now consider some distinct ethical charges expressed in conjunction with community policing. In a Newsweek article, Bogart and Beals state that the “success of community policing depends on a fragile bond of trust between police and residents and a corruption case can surrender that quickly” (1994: 32). The journalists refer to five of the ‘Dirty 305 officers who were assigned to a community policing unit and profited from drug tips instead of making arrests.

With the bond of trust between a community officer and residents is not fragile. Perhaps at the very onset, but over time this bond becomes strong and survives misinformed assaults. One needs only to ask the community officer or residents in order to confirm. Second, in the Harlem situation, the officers were corrupt prior to being assigned to the community policing unit. Third, as Bogart and Beals state at the end of their article, “most Harlem residents are still ardent fans of community policing.” In other words, the “dirty” narcotics officers assigned to the community policing unit were community officers in name only, not in practice. Citizens knew the difference. Aside from being an invalid case of corruption affiliated with community policing philosophy, this incident dramatically exemplifies the grave danger for communicating misinformation when journalists report on topics about which they possess little subject knowledge.

Nelligan and Taylor who also look more specifically at the potential for corruption cite several concerns:
Police departments will hardly be able to avoid becoming partners in the political and social aspects of particular community factions, perhaps bringing the department into conflict with other community segments...influence with or control of the police department may increasingly become the big prize in segmented communities. (1994: 62)

What Nelligan and Taylor propose was evidenced in Houston, Texas where Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP) and Innovative Neighborhood Oriented Policing (INOP) were poorly implemented. Bureau of Justice Administration and Police Foundation evaluations of Houston's programs found that "impact was predominantly confined to non-minority, home-owning residents — those whose need for community policing was marginal, at best. Residents at the bottom of the social economic ladder — those without political importance — were severely underrepresented in terms of awareness and contact with community policing programs and were clearly unaffected by them. In short, the better off became increasingly better off, and the disparity between area residents grew deeper."

To date, the tolerant and established community lifestyles of the Reform Era have been replaced by more hyperactive and confrontational politics. To examine this critical shift, we must look at how the law enforcement role of the police has changed in the Amerindian and African American communities of the South. What we have here, however, is not fault in the community policing philosophy, per se, but rather fault and failure of its implementation.

The potential for ethical misconduct has also been raised at a more micro level, this time framed within the construct of individual police/citizen relationships. Per Nelligan and Taylor: "As relationships develop, the community police officer will experience increased pressure to accept gratuities and gifts" (1994: 63). Although this ethical conundrum is also referred to by Bracey (1992) and Kania (1988) who cite the importance of reciprocity in building relationships, there is no extant evidence of this type of ethical problem in the community policing evaluation literature — a body of literature that has become quite extensive over time.

Offering another ethical twist, Nelligan and Taylor comment that "Community policing officers run the risk of information overload... (leading to officers who will have to) face the questions of what incidents to process in the criminal justice system, what to handle informally, and what to ignore" (1994: 63). There is some truth to this twist.

Case studies indicate that after a community policing officer builds up a relationship of trust within the community, that officer does become the recipient of a high quantity of information, often-higher quality information, as well. This is true. It is also true that all officers, traditional or community-oriented, face questions of what incidents to process through the criminal justice system, what to handle informally, and what to ignore. However, an officer's discretionary powers and abilities do not degenerate simply due to the amount of incoming information. There is no evidence to support this criticism. Further, this charge suggests officers (in general) are not above he generalized levels of corruption experienced back in the Political Era of policing and totally negates any advances in police professionalism and integrity that were evidenced as resulting from the Reform Era or transitional years between the Reform and Community Eras.

A final ethical issue raised relates to politics and the community officer's alleged ability to garner votes via close ties with citizens:

Questions emerge about the political role of the individual community police officer. If the community policing model works as intended, community police officers should become a significant force within communities... Can community policing provide a political force? Would the police force swell by community officers? To date, the tolerant and established community lifestyles of the Reform Era have been replaced by more hyperactive and confrontational politics. We must ask if the law enforcement role of the police has changed in the Amerindian and African American communities of the South. What we have here, however, is not fault in the community policing philosophy, per se, but rather fault and failure of its implementation.

In sum, what we have here is not fault or failure of community policing philosophy, per se, but rather fault and failure of its implementation.

CONCLUSION

Finally, we must acknowledge that the host country as well as the developing partner countries ("new norms") is a primary cause of the reform attempts in both countries. We must also consider that the Slovene police are as professional as their American counterparts. We must also consider that the Slovene police have to work within the American police cauldron of the Reform Era. The police force evolved out of the Reform Era, which was rampant, the American police depended on crime fighting, and the police worked within the unrest during the 1960s. We must also reestablish police departments...
should become the most knowledgeable, trusted, and popular individuals in their communities... Can it be long before he community police officer becomes a significant political force? Will it be long before the ranks of those seeking local political office are swelled by community police officers? (1994: 63)

To date, there is no evidence of community policing officers leaving their chosen, established careers (replete with inherent seniority, rank, and retirement benefits) for political lifestyles. The “swelling” feared has quite simply not materialized. Let us examine this criticism a step beyond the conjuring of a community police officer leaving law enforcement for political aspirations. More problematic, ethically, would be a community policing officer who attempted to run for political office while still employed as an officer. However, this potential ethical issue is not a problem akin specifically to community policing officers. Law enforcement agencies have dealt with this ethical issue historically and many departments (if not the majority of departments) have set regulations and implemented policies concerning policing and political campaigning. All officers, traditional and community oriented must follow the same regulations. All officers, therefore, are citizens and free to run for political office (within the confines of department regulations).

In sum, what we see as a result of examining the variety of ethical concerns broached is that if community policing is implemented properly	extsuperscript{9}, every ethical and corruption issue raised is without substantiation. However, if previously corrupt officers are assigned to community policing positions, corruption will infiltrate the community era. We must also remember that community policing is still evolving. While most corruption-related concerns have failed to materialize and community policing has evolved beyond Klockar’s (1991) view that “…the required innovations of police-community reciprocity, decentralization of command, reorientation of patrol, and civilianization, are unworkable” this is not to say that new concerns will fail to emerge in the future. We must remain vigilant and cautious in determining whether community policing, per se, exhibits potential for corrupt practices or whether corruption and ethical misconduct resulted as an artifact of other individual or organizational factors.

CONCLUSION

Finally, we ask how all this is relevant to newly democratic states? Consider our host country as example. Given that “Bringing the police closer to the public and developing partner relations with citizens” ("...with the observation of legal and ethical norms") is a primary goal of Slovenian law enforcement (Ministry of the Interior, 1999) and also a fundamental principle of the Trojanowicz Paradigm	extsuperscript{10}, it is valuable for Slovene practitioners and academics to examine the transitional state of Slovenian law enforcement and its practice of community policing in light of past patterns evidenced within the American model. There is much to be learned from the outcomes of various reform attempts in the United States. For instance, at a time when political corruption was rampant, the reform response was to professionalize, narrow the police function to crime fighting, and to distance officers from citizens. This distance, in turn, fueled social unrest during the transition era and resulted (ultimately) in a renewed reform effort to reestablish police-citizen relationships. It is also known that recreating close...
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relationships with the community does not automatically equate to recreating corruption. Newly democratic countries will find it beneficial to examine the social issues and police practices inherent within their countries and compare their own patterns with those evidenced in America. The mistakes made in reforming American police need not be repeated in other locales. And, we remind others that, implemented properly, community policing philosophy does not equate to enhanced opportunities for corruption.

NOTES

1. This is of particular importance considering the influx of immigrants during this time period.
2. Kelling and Moore include the 60s and 70s in the reform era. We view these decades as distinct and transitional to the community era.
5. The ‘Dirty 30’ was a group of allegedly corrupt officers from the 30th Precinct (Harlem) of New York Police Department. Twenty-nine of the Dirty 30 were arrested for allegedly stealing drugs and cash from local drug dealers.
6. Case studies indicate that the time required for a community police officer to build a relationship of trust with the community varies depending on the characteristics of the officer and the neighborhood. On average, building trust may take six to twelve months.
8. Citing but one of many evaluations, thus was the situation in Lansing, Michigan, USA.
9. Refer to above commentary regarding Houston Police Department.
10. As defined by Ziembo-Vogl and Woods, 1996.
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