

The Demise of Community Policing; *law enforcement's failure to engage the community as co-equal partners*

Richard L. Corriea
California P.O.S.T. Command College
Oxnard, California

Copyright © 2006 by Richard L. Corriea
All rights reserved

INTRODUCTION

Reports of the end of *Community Policing* as a paradigm may be premature, but there are indeed signs of trouble and cause for serious concern. How serious is the concern for the future of *Community Policing*? In fact, as a nationwide model, its very survival is uncertain, and it may meet a silent end for want of complete implementation.¹ Full implementation has not occurred, in large part, because law enforcement has failed to engage the community as co-equal partners in relationships characterized by mutual cooperation and shared responsibility. Moreover, research suggests that it is only through the building co-equal partnerships between the police and the community that the full power of *Community Policing* can be released.²

Some might ask, “So what? Why is *Community Policing* that important? Shouldn’t we just let the cops do their jobs?” Others stand firm in their belief that policing can only achieve its potential if performed in a manner seen as responsive by those they serve. To address these differing perspectives, we will look at why the *Community Policing Model* emerged, where we are now, and how we might take appropriate “next steps” to truly

¹ Mary Ann Wycoff, *Making Sure Community Policing is Here to Stay* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p. 209.

² Bonnie Bucqueroux, *Community Policing in the Years Ahead; And Now the Really Hard Part* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p. 74.

forge the bonds of the co-equal relationships necessary for the police to achieve their mission of public safety.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON COMMUNITY POLICING

The *Professional Policing Model* immediately preceded law enforcement's relatively recent adoption of *Community Policing*. Developed in response to police corruption scandals in the 1930's, the *Professional Model* relied on college education for officers, proper training, oversight and strong enforcement of the law as its cornerstones. Characterized by its focus on internal management of police departments and performance measures related to effectiveness at bringing criminal law to bear on offenders,³ the *Professional Model* was widely accepted in law enforcement circles because it narrowed the police mission to serious crime and dangerous offenders.⁴ It gained popularity (and holds it to an extent to this day) out of the public's interest to hold police managers accountable, measure police performance and closely follow how hard earned tax dollars were being spent.

Performance measures created in this model (e.g. crime rates, arrests, response times and clearance rates) were appealing because they were

³ Geoffrey P. Alpert and Mark H. Moore, *Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing* (Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc, 2001) p.239.

⁴ *Ibid.*,240.

objective, ascertainable and amenable to computerized tracking.⁵

Unfortunately, no matter how *professional* a department may have been, the model did not address root causes of crime, and was dependent on the rest of government and the criminal justice system to resolve the issues.

Civil unrest in the United States in the 1960's, though, was often illustrated by the response of the police, commonly portraying them as unprofessional, inflexible and brutal. Crises in confidence in the nation's police led to congressional investigations, the formation of the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) and a myriad of efforts intended to ensure the police represented the interests of those they served, and that their work both professional and responsive to the problems they were intended to solve. In fact, this effort brought perspectives regarding the police "full circle" back to its foundations more than a century earlier.

The Roots of Modern Policing

The roots of policing in the United States are traced in significant part to the work of Sir Robert Peel, who established the Metropolitan Police in the United Kingdom in 1835. Peel outlined his philosophy about policing in

⁵ Ibid.

his now famous Peelian Principles.⁶ These principles provide the theoretical basis for modern *Community Policing*, especially principle Seven, which states:

“Police, at all times, should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent upon every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence.”

Some scholars suggest that American law enforcement never fully adopted Peel’s philosophy and commenced a slow departure from the Peel’s Principals as long ago as 1865.⁷ What does appear obvious is that the Professional Policing Model solidified and codified the complete departure from Peel’s principles through its focus on efficiency, statistics and enforcement.

In fact, the *Professional Model*, with its emphasis on internal management and arrest powers, is in direct conflict with Peel’s belief that the test of police effectiveness is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it. In contrast to the Professional Model, the *Community Policing Model* has adopted Peel’s

⁶, Robert Peel [Encyclopedia on-line] (Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, 2005, Accessed 23 October 2005) Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peelian_Principles

⁷ Gene Stephens, “Policing in the Future, Law Enforcements New Challenges”, *The Futurist*, 1 March 2005, p.51.

notion that responsibility for public safety rests with the entire community. In this connection, Peel was exact in his description of the role that the police and community play in the maintenance of public safety; each has the same duty relative to the community welfare and existence.⁸ The major reason for moving away from the Professional Model of policing was the recognition the police alone couldn't control crime and disorder. Ultimately, the *Professional Model* has proven ineffective in reducing crime, reducing citizen's fears, and satisfying victims that justice would be done.⁹

Sir Robert Peel said, "...the police are the public and the public are the police".¹⁰ This philosophy captures the basis of *Community Policing*; the police should not be separate from the community, but should instead join in partnership with them.¹¹ In the turbulence following the strife of the 1960's, many sought to move back to Peel's outlook on the police. Thus was born the *Community Policing* movement in this country.

⁸ Robert Peel [Encyclopedia on-line] (Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, 2005, Accessed 23 October 2005) Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peelian_Principles

⁹ Geoffrey P. Alpert and Mark H. Moore, *Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing* (Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc, 2001) p.240.

¹⁰ Lorie Fridell, *The Defining Characteristics of Community Policing* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p.3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*,4.

Community Policing Defined

The United States Department of Justice defines *Community Policing* as follows:

Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police services that includes aspects of traditional law enforcement, as well as prevention, problem-solving, community engagement, and partnerships. The community policing model balances reactive responses to calls for service with proactive problem-solving centered on the causes of crime and disorder. Community policing requires police and citizens to join together as partners in the course of both identifying and effectively addressing these issues.¹²

With regard to community engagement and partnership, the definition of *Community Policing* implicitly recognizes the community and the police share the same duty relative to public safety and each has the ability to impact problems. In a modern *Community Policing* sense, the community's duty and the parameters of public involvement are both explicit and incredibly broad, as the following language from the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Oriented Policing Office suggests: "...citizens are

¹² *What is Community Policing?* [Government information on-line] (United States Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2005, Accessed 16 November 2005); Available from <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=36>,

viewed by the police as partners who share responsibility for identifying priorities, and developing and implementing responses.¹³

Thus, the community's role in policing is clear. *Community Policing* requires police and citizens to join together as partners in the course of both identifying and effectively addressing issues of crime and disorder. Moreover, the task of fostering this joint effort falls to the police, whose community policing duties require community engagement.

Given the clarity of the description and the historical theoretical underpinnings, one would expect that the need for partnerships would be embraced and implementation would follow unimpeded. A review of the relevant data suggests otherwise.

THE CURRENT STATE OF COMMUNITY POLICING; PARTIAL IMPLEMENTATION

Clearly, one desired end state in the implementation of *Community Policing* is the community will be engaged as equal partners in relationships characterized by mutual cooperation and shared responsibility. With the community's participation as a significant component of Community

¹³ *What is Community Policing? External Elements* [Government information on-line] (United States Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2005, Accessed 11 July 2006); Available from <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=478>

policing, one would think that adoption of the paradigm would include law Enforcement embracing the community as prescribed. As you will see, the data shows this isn't the case. An important question begs to be answered, then; to what extent has *Community Policing* been implemented?

National Surveys, 1992-2002

Many Police Departments in this country identify themselves as community oriented and engage in some form of *Community Policing*. A 1992 survey by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) of 2,300 law enforcement agencies indicated that 20 percent of the respondents had implemented *Community Policing*, while 28 percent had not considered implementing such a program.¹⁴ In a similar survey five years later (which included many of the agencies responding to the earlier survey), those who had implemented *Community Policing* had leapt to 58 percent; 27 percent more were in the process of implementing a *Community Policing* program. Only five percent were not considering such a program.¹⁵ Clearly the *Community Policing* trend in the United States was growing at a significant pace.

In 2002, PERF conducted a survey aimed at the 282 law enforcement agencies who indicated they had adopted some form of *Community*

¹⁴ Lorie Fridell, *The Results of Three National Surveys on Community Policing* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p. 41.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 41-42.

Policing.¹⁶ It is clear from the 2002 survey that many agencies only adopted modest forms of *Community Policing*. For instance, agencies are likely to engage citizens in problem solving and citizens patrols. The survey showed that nearly every one of the 282 agencies responding had embraced the following *Community Policing* problem solving policies and procedures: citizens helping police identify problems, use regulatory codes in problem solving efforts, building code enforcement and regularly scheduled community group meetings.¹⁷

Conversely, the survey indicated that less than three in ten agencies included the community in preparing work agreements commonly used in *Problem Oriented Policing* for problem solving. Police have similarly been less than willing to include the community in police performance evaluations, complaint review, personnel decisions and development of policy.¹⁸ In sum, while agencies were getting quite good reaching out to the community for help, they tended to confine community participation to limited aspects of the police mission. Departments clearly seemed to find it

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁸ Gary Cordner, *The Survey Data: What they Say and Don't say about Community Policing* (Washington, DC: Police Executive research Forum, 2004), p.65.

easier to engage the community as volunteers who assist, rather than as partners who have significant power and authority.¹⁹

Focus Group Conclusions

While conducting research related to this article, a focus group was employed to identify trends and events relating to the full implementation of *Community Policing*. The group included an elected official, two police executives, two students, local residents, a sworn community policing official and community activists.

In defining partnerships in the *Community Policing* context during the group session, both police executives defined them as simply meeting with the community and hearing their concerns. Implicit in this view was that the community was advisory, and the work of public safety was retained by the police. The concept they identified as a partnership seemed to the casual observer to describe more of a paternalistic relationship, lacking the hallmarks of co-equal partnership, such as sharing power and responsibility. After explaining the notion of partnerships envisioned for *Community Policing*, there was marked resistance to the concept by those in policing.

Interestingly, this palpable resistance was followed by a lengthy commentary asserting that *Community Policing* ultimately would be

¹⁹ Bonnie Bucqueroux, *Community Policing in the Years Ahead: And now for the Really Hard Part* (Washington, DC: Policing, Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p. 74.

subordinated to more pressing police matters, including disaster response and terrorism. Conversely, one community member of the group suggested that partnerships could be force multipliers, and thus useful when staff is diverted to attend to security concerns. There is no doubt that homeland security matters will alter some aspects of the police mission; however, to suggest the change portends a choice between *Community Policing* and homeland security creates a false dilemma. For instance, the civilian member of the group accurately pointed out one way that *Community Policing* might support security efforts. And while *Community Policing* and the homeland security mission may indeed clash, law enforcement will most assuredly have the opportunity to blend the two philosophies.²⁰

IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING, THE NEXT STEP.

On what might be the next level in *Community Policing*, Gary Cordner, Dean of the College of Justice and Safety at Eastern Kentucky University, offered the following comment: “The next level could entail efforts to promote adoption of those aspects of Community Policing that the 2002 survey showed were least common. In particular, few police agencies seem to have been willing to engage in real power sharing with the community, such as by inviting the community help select, promote, and

²⁰ Richard Meyers, *What Future(s) Do You Want for Community Policing?* (Washington, DC: Police Executive research Forum, 2004), p.174.

evaluate officers...The next frontier of community policing might be characterized by greater input and participation by citizens in police department policy making and decision making.”²¹ Metaphorically speaking, full implementation of *Community Policing* will require the public’s transition from the police station community room to the police briefing room. That will mean a move from part-time volunteer to full-time co-equal partner.

The impetus for co-equal partnerships arises from the notion that it is the public that has ability to create safe communities. In a co-equal partnership, the role of the police should be a supportive one, engaging and helping the community with actions aimed at promoting public safety. The partnership would add new or enhanced strategies to police work, including, community based problem solving (i.e., the SARA Model of collaborative problem solving) and community building.²² Where communities lack structure and formal leadership, the police would help them build from within so that they can function as true partners. For instance, the police could identify communities and educate leaders about how the police and the community might partner.

²¹ Gary Cordner, *The Survey Data: What they Say and Don’t say about Community Policing* (Washington, DC: Police Executive research Forum, 2004), p.66.

²² Bonnie Bucqueroux, *Community Policing in the Years Ahead; And Now the Really Hard Part* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p.79.

The *San Francisco Chronicle* reported recently on comments made by a Deputy Chief of Police concerning responsibility for crime.²³ The official felt the police were often unfairly blamed for crime; asserting crime was result of societal issues and an uncooperative public. While blaming the police for crime may be unfair, the assertion that crime is the fault of an uncooperative public is incorrect. Interestingly, the official's department is a self-defined "Community Policing" agency. In the *Community Policing* context, it is an unengaged public that prevents implementation of successful crime interdiction strategies. Since *Community Policing* requires the police to engage and partner with the community, one cause for crime may be the Department hasn't fully engaged the community in a spirit of partnership and implemented *Community Policing*.

The role set out for community members with regard to policing is clear, and has been so since 1835. It is equally clear that law enforcement has failed to fully adopt policies that make the *Community Policing* notion of partnership a reality. These well-supported assertions beg one question: Why is community participation so necessary for *Community Policing* to be successful?

²³ Rachael Gordon, "Deputy Chief Rejects Blame Heaped on Police-Homicide rate is a Societal Issue," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 1 January 2006, Bay Area Section, p. 1.

IMPLEMENTING CO-EQUAL PARTNERSHIPS

When author Bonnie Bucqueroux wrote the most significant challenge of successful *Community Policing*, she meant simply this: there is still an obvious reluctance on the part of the police to share power and decision making with members of the community.²⁴ She points out sharing power and decision making is ultimately necessary if community residents are to shoulder their fair share of the work and responsibility for making their communities safer.²⁵

Full implementation of *Community Policing* depends on the active involvement of a sufficient base of citizens. Most communities have only a small number of people who are interested in community activities related to public safety and while it is true that most neighborhoods will respond in a crisis or participate in activity related to specific problem for a short time, the challenge for *Community Policing* is sustaining a level of community engagement when there is no crisis.²⁶ To achieve such engagement our community building efforts need to first focus on the learning about the needs, interests and expectations of the community.

²⁴ Bonnie Bucqueroux, *Community Policing in the Years Ahead; And Now the Really Hard Part* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p. 74.

²⁵ Ibid. 73.

²⁶ Darrel Stephens, *The Challenges to the future of Community Policing* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p.201.

It is important to learn the broader community's sentiments, not just those of the individuals we usually encounter or those who are naturally inclined to participate in safety focused community projects. Such information is collected at community meetings, citizen advisory panels, focus groups, and through surveys. Police leaders can use this information to reduce the gap between the community and the police and to identify issues for the police and community to coalesce around. The issues define what needs to be done; it is the partnership's work to determine how to do the work.

The notion of co-equality in community/police partnerships provides a rational framework in which all problem-solving action is based on consensus, or full agreement. Thus, there is little risk of abuse of authority or a partnership sanctioning of untoward activities. Moreover, problem solving efforts must be scrutinized and the relationship between the particular methods employed and the results accurately measured, as successful endeavors will encourage more community building and further implementation of *Community Policing*.

Why must the community participate? Because the tools needed to provide for public safety are overwhelmingly in their hands. In the pursuit of safe neighborhoods, the power the community holds is far more

comprehensive than any power vested in the police. A community enjoys the leadership, structure and resources necessary to deal with most of its problems; occasionally, the community's efforts to resolve its problems will be supplemented as needed by the police, whose unique authority spans the broadest range of options, including arrest and deadly force.²⁷ The more limited criminal justice system has traditionally only relied on law, dominance and deterrence to promote public safety. Community residents, however, retain the lion's share of the power derived from informal social controls necessary to create safe communities. Their social control mechanisms²⁸ include: laws, dominance, deterrence, membership, internalization, reputation, metanorms and social proof. These mechanisms are tools that can be used to promote positive social norms.

Consider, for instance, a community that places a high value on education and explicitly links commitment to education with good reputation. How the police might support such a system would be determined in a consensus-based partnership with the community. The police might buttress the community's efforts by bringing instances of truancy to the attention of family and the community in a consistent and

²⁷ Bonnie Bucqueroux, *Community Policing in the Years Ahead; And Now the Really Hard Part* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p.76.

²⁸ Robert Axelrod, *The Complexity of Cooperation; Agent based models of Competition and Collaboration*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1997) .

formal manner. In turn, the community could employ any number of informal interventions to support parents and children in attaining the good reputation that comes of commitment to education. Thus, in this example, the community established a norm, has responsibility for enforcement and is assisted in their endeavors by the police. In contrast to the “revolving door” approach many police agencies use to deal with truancy, this moves it from being a “school district” problem to a solution with a vested interest in the community’s future.

Power and Control

The ultimate goal of Community Policing is to strengthen communities so they have the power to police themselves through their informal social control mechanisms.²⁹ Initially, the community may have a fight on its hands as it retakes its streets. Consider that as early as 1981, during the Newark Foot Patrol Experiment³⁰, researchers observed that one successful strategy included a component wherein, “...through collaboration with and on behalf of citizens, officers established “rules of the

²⁹ Bonnie Bucqueroux, *Community Policing in the Years Ahead: And now for the Really Hard Part* (Washington, DC: Policing, Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p. 74.

³⁰ The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment [Research brief on-line] (1981, Accessed 8 August 2006); Available from <http://www.policefoundation.org/docs/newark.html>

street” that were commonly known and widely accepted by *respectable people* as well as *street people*”.³¹

This supportive role requires that the police share power and control with the community. In turn, the public has the responsibility to establish and reaffirm norms, and thus police themselves. Sharing power means that the community and the police engage in a dialogue, with each party having some real control over the ultimate conclusion. More, specifically, each partner has some control over how the police operate to support community action.

The focus group’s commentary points up that there will be some internal police resistance to real power sharing partnerships, especially where fiscal constraints, new missions and limited staffing are involved. Research indicates that, “...many police officers resist changing their behavior out of opposition to the philosophical underpinnings of community policing, doubts that community policing works, or just plain habit”³²

Overcoming resistance is critical to the full implementation of *Community Policing*. The industry would be astute to reinforce internally the notion of the intrinsic goodness found in the police/community relationship and that officers enter a vocation of service, which is indeed an

³¹ George L. Kelling and Catherine M. Coles, *Fixing Broken Windows* (New York: Martin Kessler Books, 1996), p. 17.

³² Gary W. Cordner, *Community Policing-Element and Effects* (Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.,2001),p.509.

honorable endeavor. Moreover, an engaged community is a supportive community, especially on budgetary matters and where political will is sought out. The relationship to the community is a natural one since “nearly all citizens want to be safe from violence, what their property protected, and want some level of orderliness in their neighborhoods.”³³ Lastly, where policing is ineffective or the police have not engaged the community, there is a risk that dis-intermediation will in itself change the nature of the police mission. In this regard, business, vertical communities and middle class neighborhoods are turning to private police for services traditionally provided by the police. The number of private police or security officers already exceeds the number of public police officers.³⁴ In sum, embracing the community as partners is a necessary evolutionary adaptation for law enforcement, which will both enhance the efficacy of police work and preserve the fundamentals of a vocation in public service.

While power sharing and partnership aren’t complex concepts nor difficult to define, they do, however, represent significant change to current police practices. The 1992-2002 PERF national surveys identified particular *Community Policing* activities that were least common among the respondents, and illustrative of the limited role that the community has taken

³³ Ibid.,502.

³⁴ Richard Meyers, *What Future(s) Do You Want for Community Policing?* (Washington, DC: Police Executive research Forum, 2004), p.179.

thus far in police administration and policy making.³⁵ The six least likely

Community Policing activities identified were:

- community participation in problem solving work agreements
- community participation in the police promotional process
- court watch programs
- community review of complaints against the police
- participation in the selections of new officers, and
- Community participation in performance evaluations

These activities, which have been included in *Community Policing's set of tools* for many years, necessarily involves power and authority sharing between the community and the police.

It is especially disquieting that problem solving work agreements, which memorialize community based problem solving efforts (i.e., the SARA Model of collaborative problem solving) are not being utilized. Such agreements are intended to be the result of partnership and collaboration, and to clearly allocate in writing the related notions of responsibility and authority to the appropriate party. It may be a subtle point, but we should recognize that the nature of a partnership relationship is less a matter of

³⁵ Gary Cordner, *The Survey Data: What they Say and Don't say about Community Policing* (Washington, DC: Police Executive research Forum, 2004), p.62.

definition and more related to what the partnership does. Thus, if an agency wants to implement the sort of community partnerships contemplated by the *Community Policing Model*, an appropriate start would be to seek the community's participation in one of the six activities noted above.

As a general rule, police should avoid claiming that they alone can handle crime, drugs or disorder. Instead, without casting blame, we should encourage individual citizens and community groups to shoulder some responsibility to deal with such problems.³⁶ Using anti-drug tactics as an example, consider for a moment the current way we do business. Based on information from the community, the police can have some impact on drug problems with sweeps, buy-bust operations and code enforcement to close drug houses. However, successes that survive the test of time involve community efforts to change the prevailing norms.³⁷ Community tactics can range from developing citizen patrols to having former addicts talk to kids, but the important issues is the community's commitment to doing whatever it takes to make a positive difference.³⁸

In terms of what challenges lay ahead for law enforcement, the futurist community has weighed in on the topic of partnership with the

³⁶ Gary W. Cordner, *Community Policing-Element and Effects* (Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.,2001),p.507.

³⁷ Bonnie Bucqueroux, *Community Policing in the Years Ahead: And now for the Really Hard Part* (Washington, DC: Policing, Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p.78.

³⁸ Ibid.

following commentary: “In democratic countries...a consensus model based at the community level will slowly replace...“fighting”crime, and this is the model that will prevail in policing within the next few years. Combat will still be necessary occasionally to root out terrorists and violent gang activity, but even here, police–community partnerships to proactively prevent such activity have begun to replace military tactics...”³⁹ In this connection one need only consider how *street sweeps* for gang and drug activity have been replaced in part by partnerships pursuing civil lawsuits against gang members, asserting that their activities amount to a public nuisance.⁴⁰ Consider further how code enforcement at drug houses serves to abate a problem long before the need to make a high-risk tactical entry. All of these issues, and more, beg for a solution from the community, not just those paid to protect and serve.

Conclusion

To fully implement *Community Policing*, the industry must redesign its internal polices to support the *Community Policing* philosophy and create internal performance measures consistent with its full implementation.⁴¹ In

³⁹ Gene Stephens, “Policing in the Future, Law Enforcements New Challenges”, *The Futurist*, 1 March 2005, p.51.

⁴⁰ *Gang Injunctions* [Encyclopedia on-line] (Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia, 2006, Accessed 24 August 2006) Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gang_injunction

⁴¹ Mary Ann Wycoff, *Making Sure Community Policing is Here to Stay* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004), p. 216.

the external environment, the literature suggests that full support for *Community Policing* by local political authorities, integration of *Community Policing* into community-oriented government and citizens' involvement in the design and delivery of police services are all necessary.⁴²

There is little doubt the current form of *Community Policing* can limp along for some time; however, unless the future has police engaging the community as co-equal partners, then *Community Policing* has reached its apogee. Responsibility and authority are related notions; where the community has no power to exercise authority, they bear no responsibility for the outcome. Moreover, if it is only the community that can rid itself of crime and other blights, then without the community taking responsibility exercising its power, unsafe communities will endure. It makes little for the police, who have neither the power nor the resources to maintain public safety, to continue to treat the community as less than co- equal partners.

The police need a new structure that fosters teamwork and cooperation with other agencies and community groups—where police in some cases must give up some of their power and become subsidiaries in a larger operation.⁴³

⁴² Ibid., p.218.

⁴³ Gene Stephens, "Policing in the Future, Law Enforcements New Challenges", *The Futurist*, 1 March 2005, p.53.

The impact of law enforcement's resistance to power sharing has significantly stalled the implementation of Community Policing. Without a serious recommitment to the sort of community partnerships prescribed by the *Community Policing Model*, there seems little chance of a future that includes police sharing responsibility for public safety with the community. Consequently, *Community Policing* will fail as for want of implementation and a corresponding lack of efficacy. One day in the not so distant future an author may, in fact, have to report on the demise of *Community Policing*.