

**The Potential of Turning Community-
Oriented Policing into a Force
of Civility and Democracy**

Sam S. Souryal, PhD.

Professor

**College of Criminal Justice
Sam Houston State University**

Tel: 963-294-1643

Fax: 936-294-1653

Email: icc_sss@shsu.edu

Author's Biography (Sam S. Souryal)

Sam S. Souryal is professor of Criminal Justice and Ethics at the College of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas. He received a BA degree in Education from the American University in Cairo, a Masters Degree in Public Administration from the State University of New York at Albany, and a Doctorate of Philosophy in Political Science from the University of Utah, Salt Lake City. A former police officer and a representative of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in Indonesia, Dr. Souryal also taught public administration, organization theory, and police management at the University of Wisconsin and Sam Houston State University. He later turned to teaching moral philosophy, justice, ethics, and civility. He has published *Police Administration and Management* (West Publishers, 1977), *Police Management and Organization* (Andersons, 1992), *Ethics in Criminal Justice: In Search of the Truth* (Anderson, 2003, 2007, 2011), and in 2004, he wrote *Islam, Islamic Law, and the Turn to Violence*(OJC)

Abstract

This article presents strategies that can potentially revitalize Community-Oriented Policing, raise the officers morale, upgrade their capacity to serve the community—all while lowering crime rates significantly. These strategies first require upgrading COP's education by teaching them the fundamentals of liberal arts including those of communication, mentoring, and problem solving. Inherent in this education is introducing the fundamental concept of promoting civility, the vital foundation for strengthening democracy, all while progressively reducing crime rates.

The article suggests that CPOs be "educated" in the arts of civic engagement encompassing serving the people's welfare, keeping streets open and clean, removing graffiti, organizing the use of cabs (taxies), observe the rules of first come-first serve, solve small and mundane disputes, and more significantly, treating community members with dignity and act as role models for citizens. It is proposed that such activities can abundantly enhance the growth of true democracies while lowering crime rates.

COPs should be trained as group organizers, role models, and peace makers. They should be trained to practice true democratic values by acting with justice, honesty, equality, fairness, and compassion, all without bias associated with race, national origin, color, or ethnicity. By serving as such, the officers can earn the people's genuine trust especially among the young.

As a group, the officers can then focus on establishing on enhancing a culture of true democracy, one no different from that in developed nations (i.e., Scandinavian countries, England, Switzerland, New Zealand, and, among Asian countries, Singapore and Hong Kong). By practicing this novel role, COPs can upgrade the level of civility; the foundation of genuine democracy. Most likely, the outcome would be treating their constitutions with dignity, and mutual respect. One should perhaps note that the recent Middle East uprisings in February 2011 were almost totally repudiating the ugly and corrupt grip of their local police. By transforming Community-Oriented Police forces to agents of Civility and Democracy citizens' satisfaction will increase, the officers' morale energized, stability strengthened, and public dignity achieved--all while reducing crime rates.

Key Words

Community-Oriented Policing

Hard Policing

Soft Policing

PCSO

Polis

Civility

Democracy

The Potential of Turning Community-Oriented Policing into A Force of Civility and Democracy

*We want to revive the idea of community policing
but for a modern world.*

Tony Blair, Former Prime Minister, UK.

Overview

Much has been written about the role of Community-Oriented policing and its impact on the development of communities, cities, nations, and the police departments themselves (Kelling, 1987, Klinger, 1997, Innes, 2005a, Moore & Trojanowicz, 1988, Weitzer, 2000). No wonder the 1980s and 1990s were labeled the age of Community-Oriented Policing. The original philosophy of Community-Oriented Policing was considered by foreign countries as the latest in American police thinking. As such, many developing countries have copied this novel model and used it under different titles including Neighborhood-Oriented Policing, Intelligent-led Policing, Reassurance Policing (Fielding & Innes, 2006) as well as “Third Party Policing” (Mazerolle & Ransley, 2005), “Fixing Broken Widows,” and “Zero Tolerance theory.” (Fielding & Innes, 2006). Yet, we disagree with Fielding & Innes’s view that “there is not an agreed upon definition of Community-Oriented Policing” (Fielding & Innes, p:1). Their commentary seemed incoherent in light of the doctrine “if you cannot define it, you cannot understand it” (Souryal, 2007), let alone teach it. It should be easy, I presume, that grouping the words “community” and “oriented,” when added to the word “Policing” can be sensible enough to craft a fairly coherent definition of the term.

Moreover, attempts to mask the mission of Community-Oriented Policing under labels as those mentioned earlier may not be helpful to understanding the intended mission of community policing in addition to being redundant or divergent. Take for instance the title “Zero Tolerance.” Despite its journalistic use, it is almost impossible to implement because it denies the capacity of discretion which is arguably the core characteristic of Community-Oriented Policing theory. In a sense, if discretion were to be debunked, Community-Oriented Policing would have insignificant distinctions from the duties of regular patrol officers. Also, “Zero Based” policing is a hyperbole term since, in the human course of events, giving a traffic ticket for a minor violation to one’s own colleague, let alone one’s boss. On the other hand, Fielding and Innes (2006) should be applauded for identifying Community-Oriented Policing as a “surrogate trust mechanism in an era when trust in police institutions is declining.” Having said that, the proposed “Scene of Thought” should be carefully examined from two aspects: the strategic and the practical. The confluence of these two variables can naturally cause a shift in the practice of Community-Oriented Policing. As to the skeptics who fear such a shift, they may better served if they observed O’Toole’s statement (1995) “overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom.”

This “Scene of Thought” suggests that establishing or promoting civility in the neighborhood can better serve such neighborhood; better enlightened populace and a more attractive environment, all while crime rates would progressively drop noticeably. In this context, Community-Oriented Police Officers should, *in addition to accomplishing their statutory functions*, be tasked with promoting civility and enhancing democracy. Kelling (1987) states “it is always necessary to nudge the evolutionary process of any system as long as there are higher peaks to be reached.” As such, we further predict that Community-Oriented Policing, in the near future, can peak to the level of acting as an “environmental police force;” a non-coercive assignment that can further monitor climate control and global warming, thus protect their communities from a possibly dooming hazard. The approach here proposed may well be fairly affordable since all that it really needs is cross-training current COPs in the new tasks they may be called upon.

To put it succinctly, Community-Oriented Policing is far too valuable to be left so negligently and aimlessly when the nation is buzzing with calls for civility without which

true democracies can neither survive or prosper. It is also imperative that this proposition is not an agenda to put people to work or take them from work. It is a progressive means to couple human and national interests with human and national abilities. On the other hand, the only danger inherent in this proposition is making it a political matter, treating it indifferently, or denigrating it before it is carefully examined. If such a case were to occur, the only alternative should be reassigning Community-Oriented police officers to their old Peelian beat model with all its bureaucratic missteps.

From Aristotle's *Polis* to Goldstein's Policing

Goldstein's breakthrough (1979, 1990) introducing Community-Oriented policing was not new in the history of the human kind. Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E) had previously advocated the concept of *polis* (the ideal district) 2500 years before and urged Athenians to *sustain the integrity of their polis*. In Aristotle's *Politics*, the *polis* (the ideal community) was far from being territorial; it was also cultural, cooperative, ascetical and politically pure (Jowett & Butcher, 1979, 255). Indeed, if Aristotle was in charge of a Community-Oriented policing unit today, he, most likely would have *required* officers to live in their districts, supervise municipal elections every year, ensure that the roads are open, clean and unobstructed as well as training young boys in daily gymnastics, among other rituals. In this context, it might be interesting to mention that Singaporean Community-Oriented Police officers today prohibit anyone from chewing gum on the streets or in public places for fear of soiling the image of their sparkling city with wrappers and human spits (personal observations, June, 199). What is even more intriguing is that Singaporean residents got used to warning their visitors before they would embarrass themselves by committing such transgressions.

Goldstein in 1979 published his vision of preserving the modern *polis* by redesigning the traditional Peelian role along functional lines; territorial, cooperative, and enlightened. Soon after, many police authors were enthralled by the Goldstein's concept of "Problem-Oriented Policing"(1979) and its humanitarian advantages. The high crime rates in the 1980's might have driven the young academics (Cordner,1995; Laycock, 2002; Taylor et al., 1998; Wilson, 1983) to interpret Goldstein's vision in their own images. While the Goldsteinian model was Aristotelian in origin, it could not free the

officers from the grip of the *structural trap*. Police officers found themselves still required to fill out time sheets, prepare flow charts, and write lengthy incident reports, and attend court rather than treating the roots of criminal behavior. Community-Oriented Police officers used education, role modeling, and mentoring to—including the would-be criminals—to avoid crime and act civilly. Nevertheless, the bureaucratic tradition continued untouched. The organizational culture of patrol officers may have dimmed the luster of Community-Oriented Policing by distorting the lines of communication between patrol officers and Community-Oriented Police forces, thus, perhaps, diminishing the value of both.

It might also be necessary to point out that Community-Oriented Police forces in the United States normally receive no more training than that required for regular police officers receive; a situation that, in a sense, tarnished the original philosophy of Community-Oriented Policing as more humanitarian and trained as problem solvers. Yet, critics among Community-Oriented Police Officers resented playing second fiddles to “beat officers” whom they thought are traditionalists who misunderstood the new role of “soft policing.” Community-Orient Police officers, nevertheless, continued to use reasoning, justice, problem solving, and compassion as new means *to sustain the integrity of their Polis*.

The Civility of Nations

Aristotle defined civility as “a partnership for a better living.” (Souryal 2007). He, advocated that “if citizens are to survive, they must live in close cooperative association with each other, and toward this end, the *polis* (ideal city) should be actively involved in promoting civility” (Souryal, 2011, p.455). Shils, (1997: 4) defined civility as “a virtue expressed in action on behalf of the good of all society.” Rouner defined civility as “sacrificing to help others to achieve the common good; to be seriously concerned for order, beauty, and good housekeeping.” In a different context, Rouner (2000:25) defined civility as “sacrificing to help others to achieve the common good; to be seriously concerned for order, beauty, and good housekeeping”(2000:25). McClellan (2000,78) defined civility as “a recognition of the full humanness of both oneself and the others; an awareness of one’s interdependence with others; and a desire to make common

cause with one another.” In a more practical sense, Souryal defined civility as “a stage in human development which is characterized by reasoning, justice, equality, and compassion” (Souryal, 2011).

Civility is a virtuous human condition that can exist even in some of the most cruel conditions (i.e. the Holocaust was no exception). For instance, in the highly civilized Monarchy of Bhutan in the Himalaya, acts of incivility are extremely rare (as witnessed by the author during visit by the author in 1994). Also consider the Islamic North African oasis of Siwa (a community of 17,000), where acts of incivility (let alone criminal acts) were almost non existent (Souryal,2001). Siwans who lived in the oasis since 2500 B.C., had no police, no courts, no judges, no jails and no prisons; yet no acts of incivility were ever apparent (Souryal, 2001). The long habit of civility in Siwa was begun due to the role of tribal elders who maintained justice, harmony, pride, and mutual respect. For example, residents pleasantly sweep the portion of the road in front of their dwellings, irrigate their land acreage on time, keep the markets quiet, respect the elderly (especially the women), and raise their children as well-deserving Siwans (Souryal, 2001).

On the other hand, any act that violates the principles of civility can constitute an act of *incivility*. While such acts may be more common, Rouner (2000) defined them "as acting dishonorably, using unnecessary force, abusing authority and, not infrequently shipping off democracy." Therefore, for those who want see a pictorial image of uncivil acts, it would be wise for them to compare the daily course of events in Norway, Sweden, or Austria with those in Nigeria, Zambia or Rwanda.

The Natural Connection between Police, Civility, and Democracy

Political scientists argue that true democracy cannot emerge or survive without political systems and parliamentary rules. (Carter, 1998; Moyer, 2004). Criminologists argue that the same *cannot* emerge and survive without national stability and collective responsibility. Yet, measuring the level of civility among nations can be exhaustingly

hard, it is not impossible because such a quantitative process inevitably encompasses numerous variables that can change in response to ever changing conditions, such as crime, accidents, diseases, education, national crises, financial recourses, among others variables (*Nationmaster.com*, 2005:1 & *Transparency International*, 1993-2005). Therefore, to ascertain the civility of a nation or community, one may do so intuitively by comparing the civility of one set of countries to another. Such a comparison can be based on a series of variables including national stability, standards of living, and the quality of life in such countries. (e.g. *nationmaster*, *COM*, *Countries by crime*, 2005).

Yet, one factor may be the most detrimental to promoting civility is the behavior of police, especially at the municipal level. Their level of professionalism, integrity, education, organizational culture, self-discipline, as well as their compliance with Human Rights prescriptions. While incivility, as a practice, is naturally disturbing, nowhere can it be more abusive than when innocent citizens are mishandled by police. In a recent U.S. study by the Department of Justice (1996), findings showed that trust in police recorded the largest drop between the years 1980 to 1995 and that the rank order of policing in the United States of America has dropped from the 5th place to the 10th place on a scale of twelve occupations (Department of Justice, *Police Integrity*, 1996). Equally disturbing, it appears, is the fact that although there are no significant differences between men and women respondents, a significant difference existed between African-American and White respondents. It should be safe then to assume that the operational model of policing in any country or district can over time inferiorate enough citizens causing them to give up hope on promoting civility and strengthening democracy are goals worth pursuing. No wonder, then, that Souryal proposes that "the civility of nations is measured by the civility of their police" (Souryal, 2007). Hence, it also seems logical, especially in the United States of America, to consider recasting Community-Oriented Police officers in the role of promoters of civility and defenders of democracy (USA TODAY, September 15, 2009, 1).

A critical question may yet be "why, despite the latest improvements in police recruitment, training, technology, and deployment, does American policing continue to receive low civility ratings?" In response, there can three reasons: *First*, in a free society, the public is assumed to be free to behave as they wish as long as they do not harm others

or violate any rules. This puts the onus on the police to act professionally and with intended restraint. The rationale for this is that, unlike the rest of public servants, police officers are supposed to be well selected, well trained, well supervised, well led, and possibly well paid. Subsequently, in a civil society, the police must be more restrained and demonstrate to the public that they (the police) are fully committed to acting democratically. *Second*, the public may rightfully be fed up with police promises that have not been met. By so doing, the public might rightfully conclude that the police is really disinterested in “respecting the Constitutional rights of *all* men to liberty, equality, and justice,” or seriously acting as “exemplary in obeying the laws of the land and the regulations of their department” (*The Police Code of Ethics, 2009*). While it may be erroneous to suggest that all police fall in this category, a minority may act with disrespect, and/ or indifference. That is the more reason, perhaps, to reeducate COPs in topics of liberal arts and simple logic. *Third*, expecting Community-Oriented Policing to fight crime *as well as* promote civility is a win-win proposition. The veracity of this assertion is clear: civil policing provide citizens with more satisfaction, which, in turn, dissuades the public from acting illegitimately as long as access to legal means is available, open, and unobstructed. The considerably lower crime rates in Scandinavian countries may be a clear case in point (see, Kleinig, 1996, and *nationmaster.com*, 2005, Perception of Safety) as well as Article 2 of *The United Nations Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, 1971*.

Why Community-Oriented Policing?

Ideally, all police officers should be trained as Community-Oriented agents since their designation is serving the community. Furthermore, the concept of community – oriented policing is a philosophy rather than a procedure (Moore & Trojanowicz, 1988). However, to escape the tall and complex bureaucratic structure, and to ensure that all aspects of government are adequately secure, police agencies opted to devote special squads to focus directly on the needs and aspirations of identified communities. That was basically the reason why Community-Oriented Policing was created. Nevertheless, two overriding stipulations in the process were the agency’s suitability to produce measurable

results as well as its freedom to innovate new methods to achieve the "common good" even if such methods were not consistent with the agency's statutory missions.

As to the reasons why Police-Community Policing is deemed the most suitable group to meet the new challenges, there are seven arguments: (1) COPs are already ubiquitous and cover the entire community without the need for any additional human or financial resources; (2) by virtue of their humanistic mission, COPs provide the best fit to undertake the new tasks. They would be more susceptible to accommodate the needs and aspirations of community members' and, at the same time, most protective of the community interests against any attempts to exploit the community by unscrupulous elements (i.e., law breakers); (3) by virtue of the relative youth of COP officers, they may be more capable of cross-training which can help them by learn new techniques that prepare them to handle more complex situations, more humanly; (4) by virtue of CPOs' closeness to the community, they can be better able to mentor the citizens in innovative techniques to solve their problems (i.e., no other institution can be so effective: no home, no family, no church, no army, no school, and obviously no laws); (5) because CPOs are generally better educated, they might be more motivated to use modern technologies such as communication systems, computer systems, GPS systems, among other new techniques; (6) because PCOs' disassociation with their former departments, they may be better insulated from old police cultures and beliefs. (7) because PCOs will be assigned to more patriotic and honorable missions, their motivation would, most likely, be considerably higher than regular street COPs; and (7) the cost of cross-training new COPs is much more affordable than most other police training programs.

Having stated that, the potential success of COPs in completing their new tasks may be one of the most rewarding police projects. If Kelling and Coles (1996) are correct, the expected dividends these COPs can receive may have already happened. The two authors state that "many cities across America are now adopting the Broken Windows Prescription subsequently, as a result, the number of murders, robberies, and other felonies has plummeted" (Kelling & Coles, 1996, p.1). Also, *Nationmaster* in Map & Graph published as *Countries by Crime: Total Crimes* (posted 9/14/2005) seemed to hugely reinforce Kelling and Coles' findings.

The rationale behind these potential successes are fairly clear, if not self-evident: *First*, when civility becomes a culture, the would-be law breakers will have little incentive (if any) to act illegitimately and, therefore, may change their criminal plans (Souryal 2011). *Second*, forming partnerships between citizens and CPO officers allows the latter to claim real ownership of their districts while, at the same time, embolden CPOs to intervene in broader and more complex communal projects (i.e., natural crises, patriotic celebrations, athletic events, caring for the aged, teaching in schools, and role-modeling to community citizens. For instance, if a COP officer showed friendliness during a scheduled visit to a household, the entire community would more likely know and applaud their civil engagement. *Third*, as CPO Officers socialize more and more with citizens, they would open more channels of communications with all concerned. be better able to advise them to keep up their homes, instill security alarms, and turn the lights on at night. In time, citizens in the district may be motivated to do the same. *Fourth*, due to partnerships with community elders, the officers' morale would be enhanced as they find themselves leading tourist groups, accompanying dignitaries, and influential politicians. *Fifth*, as Community-Oriented Police Officers cement their partnerships with citizens, they can be embolden to negotiate with City Hall, school districts, religious centers, and large enterprises (e.g., Walmart, Home Depot, Target, etc.). In summary, COP officers well be experts in two specific areas: *Procedural Justice* and *esthetic justice*. The former, can reduce crime rates; minimize acts of racial profiling, end gang activities, and settle differences between schools and parents of school children. The latter, underscores community esthetic activities including keeping the streets clean, removing debris and abandoned vehicles, as well as organizing cabs in neat columns for patrons call upon them, as well as reducing loud noises around hospitals, schools, and churches and assisting elderly individuals in procuring their medical or basic needs.

An Illustration from the UK

The author of this article recently visited the UK and had several interviews with members of the British Police-Community Support Officers (PCSO). They are police officers and have the authority to make an arrest (as a matter of last resort). From a structural perspective, they closely resemble Community-Oriented Policing in the United

States except for being unarmed, always on foot, dressed in light blue uniforms, wearing blue soft hats, and hooked to their dispatchers through a small microphone fastened to their shirts' epaulets. Members of PCSO's institution do *not* replace the Bobbies. They only enforce the law in two basic ways: *First*, by handling "minor" law violations such as J walking, turning car horns high, running a red light, thus affording the Bobbies more opportunity to handle more serious cases; and (2) by providing the Bobbies with in-real-time suspected behaviors before any such behavior become rough enough requiring intervention by the Bobbies. PCSO officers modestly walk the old neighborhoods and blighted areas, display their presence in narrow lanes, conduct house-to-house enquiries, issue fixed fines to disorderly citizens, and assist the public in whatever they might legitimately need (The Home Office Circular, 2007).

There are two main differences between the British PCSO's and the American COPs: *specific training* and *a mild and comforting demeanor*. On the first issue, PCSOs receive a short, yet intensive, training period for about three months depending on the financial resources of their own departments. The *essence* of this training is a culmination of what this article is about although they do not exactly use the word civility; they use other similar words such as public order, discipline, or propriety. On the second issue, PCSOs fight crime displaying a more comforting and unthreatening demeanor which, in fact, ascertain *democratic values*, and in the absence of a British written constitution, it is not too different from it is not too different from democratic values as known in any true democracy. In talking with PCSOs, they stressed that the more civil the police treats the citizens, the more the citizens obey their local police and get accustomed to living in a free, peaceful, and responsible culture. Because the PCSO's display laxity, yet confidence, the public normally responds with respect and gratitude. This, in turn, motivates the PCSOs to practice civic engagement and great sense of responsibility.

In the United States, Community-Oriented Police officers normally do not receive any more training than regular patrol officers. Thus, while they may receive a longer term of training, their training is far from being consistent with their mission as COPs. From a behavioral perspective, while COPs in the United States are trained as police generalists, PCSOs are, perhaps, more trained as "modest gentle persons." Another

symbolic, yet significant, difference between the behavior of these two groups of professionals is that while the COPs would rather be left alone, unless called upon to act, PCSOs seem as if they are actively awaiting to be talked to. They (PCSOs) also seem more familiar with understanding human behavior, social communication, as well as an academic knowledge of moral philosophy. Also, by showing off their level of gregariousness, they seem as if they are more willing to serve. To quote a female PCSO, she stated “our unspoken weapon is treating the public with dignity, patience, and a sense of humor” (a personal conversation with a female PCSO’s on March 9, 2010 at about 11:00 AM). In sum, the PCSO’s role seem as if their goal is not necessarily fighting crime (this is left to the Bobbies to do), but convincing the public to portray themselves as fine “ladies and gentlemen” which is consistent with acting civilly (Wilson, 1993). This type of behavior, PCSCOs argued, can accomplish *four* specific goals: *normalcy*, without which abnormalities could be more easily spotted and addressed; *justification*, without which police decisions would be either random or arbitrary; *discretion*, without which innocent citizens would be protected; and *logic*, without which none of the before mentioned goals would make any sense. One lesson to be gleaned from this discussion, perhaps, is that it might be necessary for COPs to consider adopting a similar approach (*not* by copying the British model), but by adapting their own attitude while, perhaps, displaying a more comforting and truthful willingness to serve and protect.

Hard and Soft Policing

Innes of Britain (2005b) marks a significant division between the Bobbies whom he calls “hard policing;” a force that is founded on “direct implementation of coercive power, hierarchal forms of organizations and subscribing closely to crime control theory” and PCOSs whom he calls “soft policing” (Hobkins-Burke, 2004). These two groups of police officers have been so characterized because their Original Condition (Hume’s term) is basically different. The former group acts formally and authoritatively, while the second, sociologically human. In the United States, however, there seems to be no radical difference between “hard or soft” policing since both corps are enacted concurrently—a condition that suggests that law and order can not be wholly based upon

hard policing, nor is it wholly based on soft policing. Innes (2005a), nevertheless, regrets the curvilinear distance between “street cops,” (namely the Bobbies) and PCSOs who are the counterparts of American COPs. Subsequently, Innes observed that Bobbies tend to treat PCSOs with disdain (Reiner, 2000), a behavior which is not too different from the case in the United States whereas COPs are often perceived as a reserve police force (Fielding & Innes:2006).

Innes adds rather regretfully that “Street Cops,” almost all over the world, seem unable or unwilling to change their old Peelian (after Sir Robert Peel) mode of policing since it has been the only model they grew up with and totally relied upon (O’Toole, 1995). This state of dissonance might have caused consternation among American Community-Oriented Police officers who subtly resent playing “second fiddle” to the “real cops.” Critics among them may also believe that they (COPs) have been so organized for no other reason than appeasing the politicians who wanted to boast increasing the number of police officers on the street, or making their administrators look good (Souryal, 2007). Nevertheless, with the advent of new technologies (e.g., street cameras, fast computers, electronic communication, GPS technology, among other tools), the practical value of COPs seemed to rapidly slipping away.

Having said all that, it may be intriguing to note that numerous foreign countries (both developed and developing) continue to copy the American model unbeknownst to them that their native (village style) methods of crime control might be more effective in maintaining law and order and keeping crime rates low (e.g., Botswana, Kuwait, Bahrain, New Zealand, Baton, and to some extent, Israel). Moreover, in some developing countries, the American model of Community-Oriented Policing may have been adopted basic as a matter of propaganda, simply to demonstrate modernity and equivalence with more advanced countries. For instance, in a recent visit to two African countries, both of their police Commissioners proudly stated “as in your country, we also use Community-Oriented Policing.” After some friendly discussions, they mildly admitted that they really believed that their “village type” of policing is indeed more effective, as well as much more affordable (Quinn, 1999). It may also be surprising to know that after 9/11 events, no American police theorists or practitioners recommended that Community-Oriented Police Officers be assigned to guard and assist in the huge disaster that ensued,

in a manner akin to the “Special Police Force” activated during the London Blitz in 1941-42. However, it should be noted that few COPs do participate in mentoring Muslim citizens to avoid extremism and help victims of violence to relocate after those disastrous events. (Houston Post, December 11, 2010).

Cultivating True Democracies

The basic assumptions in this article are clear, if not self-evident. They are: (1) with the exception of Cuba, North Korea, and China, the vast majority of countries claim to be democratic while, in reality, they *are not*. Defective democracies, if left unaddressed, can be dangerous to societies because they can be misleading or self-deceptive. Skeptics should only remember that Hitler’s regime (not unlike many other dictators) named his regime a “social democracy” and Qaddhafi of Libya called his regime *Ghamaheria* which literally meant a super democracy. (2) while *true* democracies are fairly rare, they basically survive on the backs of enlightened institutions and individuals are devoted to keeping them alive and prospering. It may also be worth remembering that after adjourning the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, when Benjamin Franklin was asked by citizens which type of government should expect, he replied “a Democracy, if you can keep it”; (3) for *true* democracies to survive, nations might have to fight wars in order to achieve peace (e.g. Iraq and Afghanistan) Skeptics who may doubt this comment consider travelling in central Africa, central America, or Arab countries to see the disastrous consequences of incivility and phony democracies; (4) it would be contradictory (and rather deceptive) if a country were to claim its government as democratic, yet it’s police *is not*. Any such claim can demolish the integrity of the country in question; (5) no where is the sentiment of civility ever so necessary as in the procedures of the criminal justice system whereas a small forgery or a even a lie can condemn innocent person to death. Sadly, it might be true that “the civility of nations is measured by the civility of their police” (Souryal, 2007).

To underscore these assumptions, it might be more assuring to learn what Ian Johnston, President of the Police Superintendents’ Association in England (2005) stated when he described the hidden side of the British police system:

[We] must learn to provide better service...over half of the complaints against the police were about rudeness and incivility... [a] problem that has been exacerbated by officers having to spend all their time pursuing people for trivial offences in order to meet Home Office targets” (*Telegraph.Co.UK. posted at 6:28, 11 September 2008*).

Johnston further added:

“We [the police] cannot get away from the fact that national poll after national poll says that despite our record on crime levels, confidence is decreasing. So somewhere we are going wrong” (*Telegraph. Co.UK. posted at 6:28, 11 September 2002*).

Ten Words of Caution

One more time, this article examines how communities can smartly reduce crime rates while, at the same time, maximize civility and reinforce democracy. These are two overriding goals threatened developed and developing societies our society for generations. One may envision four expectations that can make this goal a reality: *First*, in light of the huge financial investment in Community-Oriented Policing in the United States (and other countries) it seems imperative that governments take the first step trying to change the way police theorists and practitioners think. *Second*, to achieve the reality, COPs should become masters of “reasoning” so they can capture the “truth of the matter” before taking any action based on opinion, beliefs, sentiments, or hearsay. *Third*, to help develop *true* democracies as those in Scandinavian countries (or even Hong Kong or Singapore), countries should revisit the role of their Community-Oriented Police and establish a small number of identifiable honorable and worthy missions. For such missions to truly succeed, they must pass the test of legal and moral legitimacy and seriously taught to the officers in charge. If the missions are truly legitimate and necessary, COP’s leadership should consider innovative methods (i.e., perhaps never thought before) for accomplishing these few missions. Everyone at this planning stage should acknowledge and remember that “while all nations have crime, only civil nations can offer justice” (Souryal, 2011, p. 443). *Fourth*, COPs leaders should take the issue of justice seriously, since it is a key factor in the sociological equation. At this point, it

should be acknowledged that “a crime is an act of injustice,” therefore “the more justice offered and preserved, the less crimes are contemplated or committed.” *Fifth*, for *true* democracies to prosper and endure, there must already be a *robust foundation of civility* otherwise democracies be stillborn. The reader should also realize that a bad democracy may be a worst option than no democracy at all. *Sixth*, civil police can create civil societies, which in turn, enhance the emergence of civil democracies. *Seventh*, highlighting justice reinforces the chances for developing civil cultures, while, at the same time, lower crime rates accordingly. *Eighth*, if Community-Oriented Policing is to be so re-casted, it would likely be one of the smartest plans to effectively utilize the police since Robert Peel passed “A Bill for Improving the Police In and Near the Metropolis” in 1829 (Souryal, 1977). *Ninth*, nothing other than that has worked in the past, or is likely to work in the future.

Structural-Functional Concerns

The structure and mission of Community-Oriented Policing in the United States have for long been treated rather randomly, if not haphazardly. By way of analogy, officers were made to believe that if they accomplished three specific functions, a *miracle prophecy* will automatically follow. These three functions have been: *First*, exercising formal or informal (depending on the situation) control measures without inciting riots or stirring up violence; *Second*, ensuring people’s safety in their homes and effects without invading anyone's privacy; and *Thirdly*, creating a “civic trust” relationship between the police and the public whereas each side can count on the other. As for the *miracle prophecy*, it seemed to have been lost.

Yet while the structure of Community-Oriented Policing the United States is theoretically laudatory, its application seemed hypothetical.” To paraphrase a famous quote from an old movie, “*if* these objectives are attained, the miracle will occur.” Yet, as in most social transformations (e.g., democracy in Iraq, peace with Israel, non-nuclear Iran), there is no assurance that any miracles (in our case) will follow, let alone automatically. For one reason or another, the structural-functional aspects of Community-Oriented Policing seemed hindered by complacency and lack of imagination (Taylor et al., 1998). It should be added that since its inception, Community-Oriented Policing

came under scrutiny not from police chiefs or city administrators (who stood to gain both professionally and personally), but from seasoned patrol officers and supervisors, those who walk the beat, so to speak. While, on the one hand, officers and supervisors kept awaiting the *miracle prophecy to materialize*, the prophecy seemed blunted because of the absence of clarity in their mission.

In Innes' (2005b) article "Why Soft Policing is Hard?" he called attention to the inexplicable oscillating between "hard policing" by patrol officers and "soft policing" by Community-Oriented Police officers. While Innes argues that while Community-Oriented Policing may under some circumstances succeed, in reality that would be the exception rather than the rule (Oliver, 2008). Foremost among those who shared Innes' doubt are not the high ranking officers but the lower level "seasoned supervisors" (Oliver, 2008). Disappointed, yet not wanting to risk their careers, these officers have little hope the Community-Oriented Policing can ever be productive. *Second*, due to their long experiences in policing, seasoned Community-Oriented officers accuse their departments of being hypocritical: while their department claim to encourage discretion and transparency, they, on the other hand, become alarmed when the officers make a bold discretionary choice. Such a contradictory state seems more consistent with Goldstein's (1979) comment, "purely structural arrangements for achieving accountability do not, on their own, reach the problems citizens most want to reach." And, if this is accurate, it would be necessary to change the entire structural-functional body of Community-Oriented Policing. And, if this is plausible, it would be necessary to reform the structural-functional combination of Community-Oriented Policing both conceptually and practically, if the entire system is to survive. The most adequate solution to this quadron might perhaps be learning from the PCSOs. Only when Community-Oriented Police Officers are sufficiently re-educated both conceptually and temperamentally, will there be enough hope that they can succeed, and only then can Aristotle's four attributes of the *polis* be met (Jowett & Butcher, 1909, Preface). In sum, Community-Oriented Policing should consider moving from the traditional prescriptive model to the logical model.

The Traditional Perspective: Police is Primary

Writers on Community-Oriented Policing have been partially oblivious to the need for an ethical dimension to support a humanity-based style of policing. Although many seasoned officers continue to argue that “policing is policing is policing,” Yet, in light of what has been said, there are *four* arguments against that view: *First*, this view portrays Community-Oriented Police Officers as mere messengers rather than role models, mediators, and protectors of the peace. Continuing this trend can further embolden would-be criminals to commit more criminal acts without risking being caught. *Second*, requiring more education for Community-Oriented Police officers can suggest they are a preferred group of officers, who once educated will deserve and demand higher pay. *Third*, some regular police departments may harbor the wrong assumption that once they declare themselves members of Community-Oriented Policing Club and perhaps accredited, they deserve a *prima facie* higher status than officers in non-certified police agencies. in non-certified departments. This belief—despite the best intentions of its supporters—can create a serious illusion not much different from that when the FBI claimed it had totally “prevented all” terroristic attacks in the United States, which was untrue. *Fourth*, police departments that practice Community-Oriented Policing are understaffed to such a point that it makes little impact in the broader equation. This can make the more efficient CPO officers “lose heart” abstain from making partnership with citizens in their districts, or doubt the ability of their supervisors, and, as a result, take their jobs less seriously than is required, and that occurs, If this occurs, Community-Oriented Policing may be ineffectual and lose its claim to legitimacy and give credence to the bureaucracy they were accustomed to for years.

The Logical Perspective: Community is the Original

Since the times of Thomas Jefferson, the United States followed Aristotle's views on the supremacy of the idea of the independent *Polis* (i.e., community) which, in Aristotle's view, was far supreme to any other institution at his time. Yet, In previous policing experiments (i.e., team policing, problem-oriented policing, Zero Tolerance policing, Fixing Windows Policing, among other theories), the significance of the

independent "Community" was the central figure in designing local administration. Indeed, the original design of police had little to do with crime and more to do with promoting civil and harmonious communities (Jowett & Butcher, 1979). Moreover,, the *Polis* idea was more about *the state's ability to promote an independent civil Community that can resolve its own conflicts, pass its own constitutions, and try its own law violators*. That, in a sense minimized the impact of crime, prevented violence, and promoted civility. Although harmonious Communities could function under a repressive police style (i.e., Jewish ghettos in Poland and the Inquisition System), no amount of advanced policing could function independently from the sovereignty of community interests and community welfare. As suggested before, , when civility rises there would be a far better chance for democracy to emerge, at least in the image of Human Rights.

Without civility, and regardless of the best intentions of Community-Oriented Police agencies, true democracy will have no chance to "hatch" (Taylor et al. 1998). Hegel called this phenomenon of hatching "organicism" (Lavine, 1984:264). He considered it essential to the *gradual evolution* of the civil state since it allows a natural interdependence among all the parts essential to sustaining the whole (Lavine, 1984). On the other hand, implementing Community-Oriented Policing in third-world countries where civility is law will, under no circumstances, be capable to foster a *true* democracy (Arab countries have been trying that for a long time but failed). Indeed, we reason that without treating the community with justice, dignity, honesty, the interconnectedness between professional policing, civil communities, and constitutional restraints, *true* democracy would have no chance to emerge anywhere. (Taylor et al., 1998).

Toward Recasting Community-Oriented Policing

Transparency International Records (1993-2003) show that the more civil the community, the more democratic it is. The same source also shows that the ten most democratic countries in the world (N= 192), have considerably lower crime rates than any rich--but less civil-- countries . The more likely conclusion then, is that unless the public is community-schooled in the arts of civility and complies with such arts principles countries can hardly achieve democracy.

The logistics of recasting community-Oriented Policing requires *internal* and *external* intervention combined with a standard knowledge in human sanctions. External intervention is initially learned under the tutelage of parents, teachers, preachers and role models. Examples include principles such as: "first come, first serve," "no littering on the streets," "accepting and respecting justice," "treating all people equally," and "expressing compassion to the poor and the needy. These sanctions are usually learned at home then reinforced in lower schools, high schools, as well as colleges. In time, they such principles become more as one's "second skin," and are internalized in the deepest cells of one's brain. Consider, for instance, the cultural habit of Muslim households to slaughter a sheep inside the house or on the street to celebrate a religious event. In most cases, patrol officers ignore such practices as a weird cultural habit endorsed by many clerics. This is certainly a morbid example, yet the practice would not be aborted without the intervention of a brave police-community officer who could convince family members of the incivility involved in this practice. In time, the entire neighborhood would hear about the incident and abstain from practicing the old way and accept the contribution of the concerned Community-Oriented Police officer. Yet for this to work, Community-Oriented Police officers should be humble enough and eloquent enough to analytically convince community members instead of offering personal opinions, bias, or whims. Furthermore, *four* subsequent ideas could presented here to articulate what a reformed Community-Oriented Policing agency can do to cement the relationship between the police and the community, and, in turn, democracy. These are:

(1) *Community-Oriented police is a culturally-based philosophy.* Regardless of how it operates, its main advantage is being flexible by making the community civil enough and ready to appreciate democracy . Obviously, the factors behind this equation include the community's level of literacy, sophistication, available funds, and docility. In other way, while Community-Oriented Policing programs should be guided by certain rules and regulations, such rules and regulations should be allowed to vary from one community to another, and one situation to another. As mentioned earlier, it is hoped that, in the future, community members would swayed to get involved in attractive projects such as "respecting the trees, lowering global warning, encouraging musical festivals, or displaying murals in central locations." As an example of flexibility, the

reader may be reminded that during the First World War, the French soldiers and the German soldiers fought a trench war against each other (1914-1918). Yet both armies decided to stop fighting on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day because they considered fighting during Christmas a seriously uncivil act in practicing Christianity.

(2) *Community-Oriented policing should not pander for the purpose of looking good.* For example, many public agencies are used to pander to endear the police to the Community. Examples include standing almost still at athletics stadiums or in front of synagogues and churches on Saturday or Sunday, basically to impress the community members. Alternatively, humble acts of civility can more effectively capture the “hearts and minds” of communities, by motivating their constituents to honor nobility including police nobility as well (Wilson, 1983: 241).

(3) *Police Chiefs Should Make House Calls.* This idea might reflect one of the most civil practices in community affairs. If police chiefs and community-oriented supervisors adopting a habit of making random house calls (obviously at the invitation by the household). This idea, if adopted, can certainly have a great impact on the community when neighbors next day realize how far the police is personally reaching out to their community.

(4) *For Community-Oriented Policing to succeed they should be serious.* Community-Oriented police agencies should be keen to select intelligent officers (preferably with 30 hours of college education) who are personally and intelligently dedicated to serving the “public good.” Such qualifications are essential. Yet, while such candidates may be rare, there are likely a number of individuals who are willing to volunteer and, at the same time fit the profile. What makes recruitment of such officers rather difficult might be the native old skepticism of police officers regarding their leaders’ desire whom they want rather than who would best for the common good (Denhardt, 1987; Herzberg, 1976; Hummel, 1994; Kleinig, 1996; Souryal, 2007). Whatever the case might be, it seems safe to suggest that many police departments can find “good individuals” to hire.

Can It Work ?

Cordner (1995) discusses four dimensions of Community-Oriented policing: philosophical, strategic, tactical, and organizational dimensions. While his discussion is informative, it stops short of answering a number of important questions. For instance, what evidence supports the view that these four dimensions are the *only* qualifying dimensions applicable to Community-Oriented Police agencies? Might there not be smaller departments, rural departments, more or less affluent departments where Cordner's views may not fit? Also, what good are these four dimensions if the officers (the agents themselves) are misinformed or mistreated, therefore, unwilling to comply? Also, how much cooperation should exist between Community-Oriented Policing and the mother police department as well as the regional institution? Summarily, the question to Cordner should be "Is that all we can offer."

By contrast, Morris (1997), who addressing business and bureaucratic institutions presents another set of *four* dimensions that naturally encompass the soul of Community-Oriented Policing: these are the *intellectual* dimension that seeks the truth, the *moral* dimension that seeks goodness, the *spiritual* dimension that seeks unity, and the *aesthetic* dimension that seeks *temperance*. While a comparison between Cordner's work and Morris's may be irrelevant in this article, the integration of both works can be empirically useful to both models. Furthermore, Community-Oriented officers should naturally be interested in serving individuals as well as communities. Such officers should be more than willing to act as partners in the social connection between the governors and the governed. Furthermore, in a democracy, sovereignty should unquestionably be in the people's domain, and not in the hands of the police. Moreover, officers must be of the opinion that if communities are worth serving, they should be served well. Finally, communities would more sincerely appreciate it if the police succeeded in seriously resolving their problems, rather than being ignored, forgotten, and the problems are for them to resolve.

Most importantly, community police officers should be analytically alert and not accept cheap managerial slogans such as "ends justify the means," which is only true if the means are legitimate. Any other interpretation would be foolish. Finally, for Community-Oriented policing to be honorable and noble, the officers themselves must

act as democratic role models who are duty bound to serve the "common good" and only in "good faith." This might give credence to the statement, "*good faith is the only virtue that can make all other virtues possible*" (Souryal, 2007: 274).

The Enlightenment Challenge

Consistent with the previous reservations and the imperative to instill a moral dimension in Community-Oriented Policing, the following are global propositions that can be grouped under the rubric of *Instilling civility*. They constitute a single body of virtue for all concerned. The following *four* concepts should be applied together; if one is missing, then the whole template is flawed. These are: *reasoning, justice, good faith, and discretion*.

Reasoning

Reasoning is a fundamental human capacity that separates human beings from all other creatures. Other creatures may instinctively think in short flashes, but they are unable to reason. Reasoning can be defined as a *pure method of thinking by which proper conclusions are reached through abstract thought processes* (Souryal, 2007: 12). Among Plato's famous four levels of knowledge (i.e., opinion, belief, science, and reasoning), reasoning is the paramount talent. It basically commands one's brain to dialectically debate (within itself) all aspects of the subject being questioned, examining all points of view, and selecting the best option without bias, favoritism or personal gain. By the same token, the out-product of reasoning is *logic*, the art of proof by confronting one's agonist with self-evident facts that cannot be denied.

In Community-Oriented policing, it is essential that officers understand how to reason and how to use logic rather than acting upon opinion or belief. Without the reasoning process, officers will be compelled to make decisions based on their personal opinions, experiences, religious faiths, family traditions, or fable stereotypes. On the other hand, the absence of reasoning can ruin the integrity of an arrest, lead to contrived evidence, or make a mockery of the virtue of justice.

Justice Above All

Community-Oriented police officers should understand that, consistent with the rule of antonyms, crime is an act of injustice. Hence, the logical lesson is training community officers is to think, first and foremost, of the primacy of justice. Stated differently, if there is no standard of justice, there cannot be a standard of crime. As such, Community-Oriented Police officers should more actively function as agents of justice, if they wanted to effectively reduce crime. St. Augustine's stated "when there is no justice, then what is the role of the state but a band of robbers expanded?" (Souryal, 2007: 151).

While justice has been defined differently by many philosophers (see Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Kant, Locke, Rawls, and Nozick), they all, in essence, identify the practice of *giving each what he or she deserves* (Solomon & Murphy, 2000). Hence, the critical task of Community-oriented policing is to honestly and accurately determine "who deserves what and why." Responding to this question can be critical to Community-Oriented Police officers as long as the question remained unexplained. According to Aristotle, justice is the middle ground between two extremes, one of "excessiveness" and the other is "insufficiency." The ideal practice of justice therefore—short of scientific standards—is selecting the middle ground between the two extremes, provided the officer is acting in good faith, without bias or malice.

Injustice, on the other hand, is not necessarily the opposite of justice, since according to the rule of contrarians, the opposite of justice is *not* injustice, but the *absence of justice*, and the opposite of injustice is not justice but the *absence of injustice*. This distinction is critical to Community-Oriented Police officers since (unless there are other incriminating factors) the officers must treat citizens with equal standards.

Good Faith

Acting in good faith is another condition required of all police especially Community-Oriented Police officers. Accordingly--unless justified (as in keeping classified information)--officers should not voluntarily lie, cheat, or steal. Acting in good faith literally means acting justly to all, telling the truth, or making decisions based only on the merits of the situation while upholding the moral standards of honesty,

fidelity, and obligation. Given the different culture in Britain, the PCSOs like to advocate that if they treated the public in good faith, the public would almost certainly, reciprocate; a belief which obviously cannot be interpreted universally. Regardless of differences in culture, however, the British belief maybe, more likely, thought of as a natural law. Even if the constituents do not reciprocate, PCSOs argue, it would be more likely that Community members would look up to the officers and appreciate their role as "ladies and gentlemen."

Justified Discretion

Discretion is the practice of focusing one's attention on the most sensible option available at the time, among a variety of other options. It can be defined as the *officers' ability to use their independent judgement in blurred situations when there is no readily available advice from a supervisor or a partner at the time*. Discretion is necessary for all public or private servants, yet it may be most essential to police officers, and even more so to Community officers since they normally work alone without close supervision. As such, making accurate discretionary decisions by Community-Oriented police officers requires much more profound reasoning, higher moral justification, and responsible judgment. It requires the application of new professional skills to particular problems or incidents. A guiding formula for police discretion is presented in Souryal's work (2011). The formula is $E=PJ^2$ in which E (the Ethical decision) equals P (the ethical principle involved) times J (the degree of justification observed), and the square power of 2 refers to possible exegesis for the officer to determine how justifiable is the discretion selected earlier. For instance, violating the speed limit to take a dying child to the hospital is by far more important than speeding to catch a plane, or to attend a class, or to eat lunch. Ethical discretion represents the epitome of the justification process since the power of P is consonant while the power of J can be a changing variable. An application of this formula has been recently adopted by New Haven Police Department (Order Maintenance Training Bulletin 96-1). The policy explains police discretion in a more mathematical approach.

Summarily, the global lessons to be learned from the concept of justified discretion is preventing crime, reducing citizen fear, facilitating public discourse, creating

an atmosphere of civility, and improving the quality of life in the neighborhood. As such, Community-Oriented police officers should be most keen to intervene at the following three levels: educating the offenders by teaching them the rules of civility and the consequences of incivility; informing the offenders of the consequences of incivility; and if the reply is negative, then arresting the offender without an apology. The New Haven policy also presented six possible levels of justification: the gravity of the crime, the time of the crime, the location of the crime, the condition of the offender(s), the condition of the victim(s), and the number of suspects involved. According to this policy, officers can more accurately evaluate the justification of their discretion in specific situation and calculate whether it warrants either accentuating or mitigating factors that can modify the charges to be pressed.

Summary and Recommendations

Since 1990's and the early 2000s, the effectiveness of Community-Oriented Policing in the United States of America seemed progressively weak and its reputation (as well as its performance) was diminished. Especially after the 9/11 events, it became almost obsolete. It seemed to suffer from the absence of a sound set of missions or a clear declaration of what the officers' assignments were. In essence there seemed to be a structure unable to support what the required functions needed.

This article is not designed to criticize Community-Oriented Policing, but to applaud what they have been doing as well as what they can do in the future. The discussions in this article examined the ways and means available to revitalize the system in the United States as well as countries that use different models of community policing. The purpose of this article is to help transform the institution of Community-Oriented Policing into a robust, yet humanistic and a modern model; one that is supported by new organizational missions, a better educated line of officers, and a more diversified leadership style. The purpose of this transformation is to turn the institution into a modern factory designed for promoting civility as the foundation for reinforcing democracy. The model appears like a win-win scheme since any increase in civility would translate to a drop in crime rates. The proposed transformation should be based on humanity, justice, and dignity for the community residents. This, in itself, can raise the

morale of community officers coupled with a far more effective propositions to upgrade the welfare of the communities involved and maximizing the officers' motivation to create a new and improved structural-functional relationship—all while at the same time lowering the motivation of would-be criminals to commit crime since the paths of justice and dignity would be available, open, and unthreatening.

This article recommends redesigning Community-Oriented policing nation-wide by forging a scientific balance between police demands for law and order and the Human Rights' demands for an honest and open system of government. For this reforms to occur, however, officers should be re-educated, missions to be redesigned, and communities to be partners in close relationships that can share decision making, management techniques, and a united motivation to establish a worthy, yet effectual, system of higher levels of civility and organizations with highly advanced technologies that can serve national and state needs. Subsequently, a new democratic system will likely emerge; one that can exercise social control both formally as well as informally without inciting violence; ensure people's safety without violating their privacy; and enhance the civic trust between the police and the Community to the extent that each side would be eagerly willing to aid the other; developments that will emerge and survive at a most affordable cost. As it is the case in the UK and other advanced countries, the new Community-Oriented Police system will require an intensive educational program in soft philosophy, elementary justice, ethics and decency, dignity and etiquette—all mixed with a display of pleasantness, compassion, and humility. Furthermore, like members of the Peace Corps, Community-Oriented Police Officers should be selected wisely on the basis of merit, education, and a lot of passion to serve their communities faithfully yet efficiently.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. (1979). *Politics and poetics*. (B. Jowett and S. H. Butcher, Trans.). (Original work published 350B.C). Norwalk, CT: The Easton Press.
- Carter. S. (1998) Civility, Morals, and Etiquette of Democracy. New York Times Book Review.

- Cordner, G. (1995). Community Policing: Elements and Effects. *Police Forum* 5(3), 1–7.
- Denhardt, R.B. (1987). Images of death and slavery in organizational life. *Journal of Management* 13, 529–541.
- Fielding, N. & Innes, M. (2006). Reassurance policing, community policing and measuring police performance. *Policing and Society*, 16, 127-145.
- Goldstein, H. (1979). Improving policing: A problem-oriented approach. *Crime and Delinquency*, 25, 235-258.
- Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Herzberg, F. (1976). *The managerial choice: to be efficient and to be human*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Houston Post. <http://houston-post.com/>
- Hopkins-Burke, R. (2004). Introduction: Policing contemporary society. In R. Hopkins-Burke (Ed.), *Hard cop, soft cop: Dilemmas and debates in contemporary policing*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Hummel, R. P. (1994). *The bureaucratic experience*. New York, NY: St. Martin's press.
- Innes, M. (2005a). Why 'soft' policing is hard: On the curious development of reassurance policing, how it became neighborhood policing and what this signifies about the politics of police reform. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 156-169.
- Innes, M. (2005b). What's your problem? Signal crimes and citizen-focused problem solving. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 4, 187-200.
- Kelling, G. (1987). Acquiring a taste for order: The community and police. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, 90-102.
- Kelling, G. & Coles, C. M. (1996). *Fixing broken windows: Restoring order and reducing crime in our communities*, New York: Martin Kessler Books.
- Kleinig, J. (1996). *The ethics of policing*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Klinger, D. A. (1997). Negotiating order in patrol work: An ecological theory of police response to deviance. *Criminology*, 35, 277-306.
- Lavine, T. Z. (1984). *From Socrates to Sartre: The philosophic quest*. Toronto: Bantam books.

- Laycock G. (2002). Realistic expectations. *The Scottish Journal of Criminal Justice Studies*, 8, 26-44.
- Mansfield, B., Gardner, E., & Kiely, Kathy. (2009, September 15). *What happened to civility? USA Today*, pp. A1-2.
- Mazerolle, L. & Ransley, J. (2005). *Third party policing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McClellan A. (2000). Beyond courtesy. In L. S. Rouner (Ed.), *Civility*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Moore, M.H., & Trojanowicz, R.C. (1988). *Policing and the fear of crime. Perspectives on Policing*, 3. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Morris, T. (1997). *If Aristotle ran General Motors*. New York, NY: First Owl Books.
- Moyer, B. (2004). *Mover in America*, New York, Norton & Company.
- Nationmaster. <http://www.nationmaster.com/index.php>
- New Haven Police (1996). *Order maintenance training bulletin 96-1*. New Haven Police Division of Training and Education.
- Nick, A. (2008) Telegraph. CO.UK. "Police Officers Disappointing the Public" posted September 11.
- Oliver, W.M. (2008) *Community –Oriented Policing: A Systemic Approach to Policing*. New Jersey, Pearson.
- O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading change: Overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Police Integrity (1996). Retrieved October 6, 2009, <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov>.
- Quinn, D. (1999). *Beyond civilization: Humanity's next great adventure*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Reiner, R. (2000). *The politics of the police* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rouner, L. S. (2000). *Civility*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Shils, E. (1997). *The Virtue of Civility*. Indian Polis: Liberty Fund.
- Solomon, R. C., & Murphy, M. C. (2000). *What is justice: Classic and contemporary readings* (2th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Souryal, S. S. (2011). *Ethics in Criminal Justice: In search of the truth* (5th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishers.

- Souryal, S. S. (2007). *Ethics in criminal justice: In search of the truth* (4th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishers.
- Souryal, S. S. (1977). *Police administration and management*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- Taylor, R.W., Fritsch, E.J., Caeti, T.J. (1998), "Core challenges facing Community policing: the emperor still has no clothes", *ACJS Today*, 17,1,3-5.
- The Home Officer Circular. <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/about-us/home-office-circulars/>
- The police Code of ethics (2009). Retrieved October 6, 2009, from <http://main.uab.edu/police>.
- The Telegraph. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/>
- The United Nations Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials (2009). Retrieved October 6, 2009, from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/codeofconduct.htm>.
- Transparency International (2003). Retrieved October 6, 2009, from <http://www.transparency.org>.
- USA Today. <http://www.usatoday.com/>
- Weitzer, R. (2000). Radicalized policing: Residents' perceptions in three neighborhoods. *Law and Society Review*, 34, 129-155.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1983). Crime and American culture. *The Public Interest*, 70, 22-48.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1993). The Moral Sense, *Free Press*, p.241.