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Foreword

John Grieve

It is over 25 years since Robert Adlam first talked to me about police leadership. It was at his then puzzling instigation that I read the psychology part of my joint honours degree in philosophy and psychology; a choice greeted with howls of derision by my immediate police supervisors at the time: 'As much good as flower arranging to the police service'. To contribute to this important volume and to be invited to write the foreword is both an honour and the payment of a debt.

Peter Velliers contributed to my thinking over the last dozen years, a period of both personal and organizational challenge. He and I, inspired by Neil Richards, another influence and contributor, developed some strategic workshops on ethics and latterly human rights and miscarriages of justice. In addition to my thinking derived from philosophy and psychology, I was able to revisit my father's library of military leadership and draw forth new links.

Those philosophical flowers, now tied into different bundles in this collection, are as old as Plato—Socrates' mother was a midwife, hence 'miscarriage'—and are at the forefront of the increasing challenges to senior police leaders as we enter the twenty-first century.

This is an important and timely book, not only because of the depth and breadth of the coverage of the issues but because it addresses the practical challenges of leadership at all levels. Full police leadership is complex, and combines formal and informal elements—whether the leader in question be the highly experienced and respected late turn van driver as she races from call to call dragging her probationer constables in her slipstream, or the Chief Officer arguing with the Attorney General, Solicitor General and Director of Public Prosecutions about the merits of a prosecution. I have been involved in both situations and their outcomes, and earlier access to the ideas in this book would have been helpful to me then.

Police leadership is no longer a mechanical task, if it ever were. It is not enough, in order to be able to carry out a coextensive operation with official approval, for the senior detective simply to complete the latest proforma and hope for the best. When the challenges come, as come they will with increasing speed and subtle trajectory, an understanding of the underpinning principles and conflicting values of policing is vital for organizational survival. The need for a philosophy and doctrine of leadership and its application to everyday policing was never more important, both to the police and to society. For the challenges we face, both from the thoughtful and those of ill will, were never stronger, never more politically inspired nor more legally informed.

Many of those people who have contributed to this analysis of policing have played a role in the series of meetings and working relationships, operational and theoretical, that have characterized my working life over the last 37 years.

John Alderson has long been a hero and role model of mine. He has, like Roger Scruton, Terry Mitchell and Seumas Miller, delved into the philosophical basis for policing. Philosophy, like psychology, was not held in high regard by my peers when I chose to study the subject at Newcastle University on a Bramshill scholarship. Yet the need for the thinking police leader, who is prepared to examine a problem from first principles and reach a solution which will stand up to moral scrutiny as well as satisfy the practical dictates of the situation, has never been greater.

Sir Robert Buxyard trained me as a sergeant and later as a chief officer. The relationship of training and education to operational policing has long been debated, and his contribution will add fuel to that debate. It is essential that senior officers drill down to find out what is happening, not only on the streets but also within the stations under
Introduction

For many years we have been responsible for the education and training of senior police officers. During those years we have been based at the Police Staff College, Bramshill, an institution constituted to support and develop effective police leadership within the context of a liberal democracy. Our own role has been particularly focused upon the design and delivery of training programmes that have taken as their overall goal 'the development of leaders with justice, integrity and humanity'. The current police leadership of the United Kingdom has experienced the ethos of these training programmes. We should add that this ethos has also pervaded the programmes of study offered to police officers from all four quarters of the globe. Most recently we have been engaged with the process of helping the police service in those countries wishing to join the European Community. The fundamentally important issues of police ethics and human rights have lain at the heart of those programmes.

This book has emerged as a result of our lengthy association with the past, present and future police leaders of the UK, the Continent and a very large number of police forces throughout the world. Through its pages we are primarily interested in making a contribution to the practice of morally principled and commendable policing, i.e. 'good' policing everywhere.

We should add that the book is also designed to further the effectiveness of police leaders and to 'strengthen leadership' in the public sector.

The reputation of the police

It is a necessary truism to begin by acknowledging that the British police service is the best known in the world, and still retains its reputation for innovation, experiment and excellence. Whatever Scotland Yard does is imitated elsewhere and its leaders—and those of other British police forces—are called in as experts, problem-solvers and reformers wherever there is a need.

At the same time, policing is a controversial subject, and the British police are in the somewhat paradoxical position of being widely admired abroad, whilst on occasion heavily criticised at home. For example, the Metropolitan Police have been hauled over the coals on the matter of institutional racism in the aftermath of the inquiry into the death of Stephen Lawrence in 1993—an issue we explore in depth in this volume.

The attack goes wider, and is part of a structural criticism of public service leadership and management which is not confined to Great Britain, but which finds an acuteness of expression there. British police chiefs, it is believed in the higher echelons of Whitehall and its advisory discussion groups, are poor managers. They do not know what anything costs, and have no real idea of how to achieve efficiency. Their stock answer to any external scrutiny is that policing is unquantifiable and does not lend itself to measurement—which is very irritating in a performance management culture.

Police leaders, moreover, fail to think strategically and act positively. Whereas the Government is looking for inspirational or even 'transformational' leadership, the police service fails to rise to the challenge, but remains bland in its statements and fundamentally averse to achieving radical change in its actions—even though it may have mastered the jargon of reform. The leadership of the
modern police service, by and large, continues to practice 'transactional' leadership—in other words, the leadership by bargaining that comes naturally to the nomenklatura, or indeed to any member of a pensionable bureaucratic class. A reasonable and relatively undemanding style of command, transactional leadership has served police leaders well in their careers, and indeed has much to be said for it in the uncertain and rocky terrain in which police operatives usually operate, whether within or outside the station. Moreover, it is at least arguable that transactional leadership is the norm for leadership within the public service as a whole; certainly bargaining, as well as idealism, is an indispensable part of political life.

The paradox of leadership

Police chiefs are expected to show exceptional levels of skill and commitment in both leadership and management, but without acknowledgement—or possibly, without even recognition—that these two requirements may clash with each other. The cautious, artful, consensus-seeking manager—knows the cost of everything, who is determined to please everyone and upset no-one, and whose quota is always fulfilled—may be quite incapable of swift and dynamic leadership when the situation requires it. Indeed, the qualities of independent-mindedness and self-reliance that 'transformational' leadership requires may impel the leader in question to challenge either the objectives of the government, or the methods by which it chooses to address them—or both at the same time.

None of these courses of action is likely to prove very popular with the reforming administration, especially if it can claim a democratic mandate for its reforms: and the practice of 'transformational' leadership brings the addition of other qualities to back it up, as we shall later explore. (For an example of vigorous and independent-minded police leadership in practice, consider the current debate about the enforcement of the law concerning the use of illegal drugs, in which some police leaders have expressed views that dissent from governmental orthodoxy. However, police leadership as a body would appear to be disunited in its views on this issue—perhaps as a reflection of the lack of consensus within society as a whole.)

Police work can be a difficult and demanding occupation, and whilst it is not always a vocation it requires certain qualities of character in order for its practitioners to be successful. In one sense, every police officer is a leader; for all police officers exercise discretion, make decisions, and provide an element of leadership in the community. However, as Garry Elliott points out (Chapter 15), the police service itself requires organizational leadership. Its leaders must 'add value' to what goes on, not only in the narrow sense of contemporary reformist jargon, but in that they contribute something which the organization would not otherwise possess.

What is that something? Sir Robert Bunyard (Chapter 5) makes a historical analysis of the failure of the police service to eradicate institutional corruption, and points to the need for informed and effective supervision that is somehow able to reconcile trust and scrutiny. Seamus Miller (Chapter 7) quotes with approval David Bayley's notion of 'verifiable professionalism': in other words, professional judgement based upon demonstrable reasoning. John Alderson (Chapter 2) refers to principled policing and the need for the 'high police'—by which he means those with power to make and to implement policies affecting the police organization as a whole—to be able to strike the right balance between the maintenance of order and the protection of freedom, two principles which are in a permanent state of conflict.

Societies in which policing is principled are less likely to suffer from policing injustices than where policing is driven by political opportunism, professional caprice, or bad law. If policing is to avoid the worse misuses and abuses of power there has to be a robust moral objectivity in the way in which it operates.

Roger Scruton (Chapter 4) explores the philosophical foundations of the need for police leaders to acknowledge and apply the categorical imperative. Milan Pagon (Chapter 11) argues that the present generation of police leaders needs to prove its suitability for the task. Jennifer Brown (Chapter 13) points to the need for the feminine as well as the masculine qualities of command to be recognised. Both Robert Panzarella (Chapter 8) and William Hefferman (Chapter 9) argue, from the American context, that the military or paramilitary model of leadership as applied in the police context is fundamentally flawed—as Pagon shows it also to be in eastern and central Europe, amongst the aspirant or re-established democracies.

We believe that all our contributors add value to the debate as to the proper ends and means of policing—its philosophy, in other words—and the doctrine of leadership that it needs to espouse. We may synthesise our theme as follows. Good policing rests upon informed consent, as the result of an authentic dialogue that is truly inclusive. Good police leaders provide a service to the community they police, which that community would not otherwise achieve for itself. That role is not restricted to 'fighting crime', which in reality is a necessary but incomplete part of the duties of a public police service, and in which they may quite rightly be assisted by private policing (as our contributor Ian Blair (Chapter 15) has consistently argued elsewhere).

In a liberal democracy that is committed to the rule of law, the preservation of the peace, and the upholding of human rights, the police have a fundamental constitutional role and importance which cannot be reconciled with direct political control. Whilst it is important that the police exercise proper financial controls and are neither reckless nor profligate in their use of resources, efficiency is not the ultimate goal of policing, and cannot be the sole test of the success of any policing operation. (Indeed, when a police operation is successful, its cost is seldom queried.) Despite the current emphasis upon public sector reforms, at a deeper level the constitutional importance of the doctrine of the separation of powers is still recognised, since the alternative is despotism—whether or not it be based upon the will of the majority. Whilst the so-called tripartite arrangement, whereby control over the police is shared between central and local government and the police themselves, is under some pressure, it remains of fundamental constitutional importance. The police continue to need to be led by men and women of appropriate judgement and calibre, who are capable of exercising a degree of independent far-sightedness in their interpretation of their role as guardians of the public interest.

The current emphasis upon public sector reform represents only a part of the body of established doctrine on the needs of the public service, which stretches back to the Northcote-Trevellyan reforms of the civil service in the mid-nineteenth
century, and arguably before that. If we turn briefly to twentieth-century history we shall find that the British government itself laid down a very clear doctrine for the development of an independent-minded police leadership, based on the need to acquire and retain local respect. A national police college was set up in 1948, as a consequence of more than a century of conjecture and debate, in order that the police service should be able to foster and develop its leadership from within, rather than look elsewhere for its high command—such as to the military. (The contemporary example would be to look to business, or to those hybrid consultancies that specialise in public sector reform.)

It was intended that the officers who attended the Police College would be able to demonstrate: The growth of the broad outlook, the quality of leadership, and the independent habits of mind which are essential if a senior police officer is to command the respect of his men [sic] and the confidence of all classes of the community' (First Report of the Police Post War Committee, HMSO, 1946. Quoted in: The First Fifty Years: The History of the Police Staff College. Police Staff College, 1998). That doctrine is still valid, even if we would nowadays automatically extend the embrace of the leadership of the police service to those who have the appropriate ability, from any background.

This book serves to record the ideas on leadership developed at Bramshill and by police leaders, commentators and theorists who have been in some way connected with that police college in the years since 1948, and who continue to address its ideals. The resulting philosophy is incomplete and the doctrine of leadership is confined to broad principles. We have been able to record, however, that:

- leadership is less of a mystery than is often supposed, and there is a great deal of useful and applicable research on the principles of democratic leadership;
- much of mainstream leadership theory can be applied to police leadership; and
- although the 'natural' capacity to lead varies from individual to individual, the qualities required by police leaders can be developed by proper education and professional training.

Finally, we return to where we began. Police work can be a difficult and demanding occupation, and its leadership can make great demands upon the physical, mental and spiritual capacities of the person in charge. Police leadership requires more than a skill in performance management or an ability to read the political runes—useful, as these characteristics are to promotion within a self-serving bureaucracy. A healthy democracy depends upon an active and reflective police service, led by men and women with the capacity to serve the public good in a practical way. Those aspirant leaders who know or prove themselves to be unequal to that challenge had better look for work elsewhere.

Peter Villiers and Robert Adlam
September 2002

CHAPTER 1

Philosophy, Doctrine and Leadership: Some Core Beliefs

Peter Villiers

Many factors came together in influencing us to produce this book. They included:

- researching the origins and purpose of the Police Staff College for a fiftieth anniversary publication, and revisiting its key emphasis upon developing the present and future leadership of the police service;
- revising the Special Course and producing the Accelerated Promotion Scheme and Programme;
- rewriting the Overseas Command Course in order to produce a coherent and comprehensive body of thought on police leadership for international police commanders;
- scrutinising new developments in military thought and doctrine thorough liaison with the Colonel Defence Studies and Strategic Combat Studies Institute at Camberley and elsewhere;
- the creation of the National Police Leadership Faculty in 2001; and
- the influence of the Police Reform Agenda—a Whitehall initiative which began in the same year and led to the creation of the Police Leadership Development Board and a number of other ventures.

Whatever were the contributory factors that led us to wish to collate and edit this work, we expect to be judged, critically but not unfairly, by the outcome. Is it relevant? Is it valid? Is it useful? These are more interesting questions than what led to its creation. However, we cannot ignore the historical background to the project. For our starting point, like Descartes', was to assume a position of fundamental doubt. We asked ourselves three questions. Firstly, is there such a thing as police leadership? Secondly, if it exists, can it be formally articulated and shared? Thirdly, what is the relationship between police leadership and police philosophy? We believe that the answers to these questions will emerge as our text unfolds. However, we lay out our core beliefs now.

CORE BELIEFS

These are as follows:

- the police service needs to articulate an agreed philosophy of policing, and further agree an appropriate style of leadership, in order to achieve its full professional development;
CHAPTER 7

Authority, Leadership and Character in Policing

Thomas Miller and Michael Palmer

In this chapter the authors outline the proper goals of policing, consider the professional autonomy of all police officers, review the general virtues and vices of police leaders and managers in terms of both discretion and original authority, and offer an account of good management and leadership in the contemporary policing context. They reject the performance management culture that has now spread to Australia as shallow and unhelpful. They believe in appropriate virtue.

Policing ... inescapably deploys methods which are harmful [and] which are normally considered to be morally wrong ... To be effective a police leader must have, and clearly demonstrate, an understanding of the reality of this complex environment before exercising authority over it. This requires sensitivity as well as decisiveness, compassion as well as strength, and the courage to protect and share blame as well as the preparedness to punish. It also requires the enthusiasm to celebrate the success of others, as well as one's own.

INTRODUCTION

Good leadership and good management are relative to the nature and goals of an occupation or organization to be led or managed. Good managers facilitate the successful pursuit of the proper goals of the organizations they manage. By contrast, bad managers impede or undermine the successful pursuit of such organizational goals. But there are important differences between institutions and between occupations. Police services are not, and ought not to be assimilated to business corporations or educational institutions. It might be an important role of a business corporation to make a profit by providing whatever goods and services will best meet consumer demand, but this is not a fundamental goal of a school. Rather, schools ought to have as a fundamental goal the provision of education. So if a school simply provided a diet of light entertainment because it was cost effective and in keeping with what children desired, that school would fail in its fundamental institutional purpose. Again, police services to not exist for the purpose of making a profit, nor do they exist principally for the purpose of providing education.

Good managers not only facilitate the proper purposes of an occupation or organization, they also understand and respect the nature of the occupational organizational roles and tasks undertaken by those who comprise that organization or occupation. In particular, good managers understand and respect the degree of professional autonomy that ought to accord to those whom they manage. Clearly, the level of autonomy that the manager of a sandwich shop accord to a casual sandwich hand is different from that a headmaster...
needs to accord to a senior school teacher. And the degree of autonomy the individual police officers ought to have relative to their managers is going to be different to that of a sandwich hand relative to their supervisor, and perhaps different also to that of a teacher relative to a headmaster.

So goals and good management are relative to the proper goals of an occupation or an organization, and relative also to the degree of autonomy that the occupants of the occupational and organizational roles in question ought to have. But good leadership and good management are also relative to the specific features of the organizational and wider context. What might be good economic management practice in a time of abundance, might not be so in an economic depression. Similarly for police leadership. Management practice in the Royal Ulster Constabulary in the nineteenth century might have needed to be quite different from contemporary police management best practice. Accordingly, if we are to provide a coherent account of good leadership and good management in policing, we need to do four things. We should provide:

- an outline of the nature and proper goals of policing;
- a description of the professional autonomy of police officers;
- a description of the general virtues and vices of police leaders and police management;
- building on these first three points, an account of what might count as good management and good leadership in the contemporary policing context.

THE PROPER ENDS OF POLICING

The ultimate justification for the existence of fundamental human institutions, such as government, the education system and the criminal justice system is the provision of some moral or ethical goods or goods to the community. The existence of universities is justified by the fact that the academics that they employ discover, teach and disseminate the fundamental human good or goods. The existence of governments is justified by the fact that they provide the fundamental social goods—leadership of the community, and thereby contribute to prosperity, security, equitable distribution of economic goods, and so on. In short, the point of having any one of these institutions is an ethical or moral one; each provide some fundamental human or social goods.

In times of institutional crisis, or at least institutional difficulty, problemsolving strategies and policies for reform need to be framed in relation to the fundamental ends or goals of the institution. That is to say, they need to be contrived and implemented on the basis of whether or not they will contribute to transforming the institution in ways that will enable it to provide, or better provide, the moral good(s) which justify its existence. However, in relation to policing, as with other relatively modern institutions—the media is another example—there is a lack of clarity as to what precisely its fundamental ends or goals are. Indeed it is sometimes argued that there can be no overarching philosophical theory or explanatory framework that spells out the fundamental nature and point of policing, and that this is because the activities that police engage in are so diverse. Certainly the police are involved in a wide variety of activities, including control of politically motivated riots, traffic control, dealing with cases of assault, investigating murders, intervening in domestic and neighbourhood quarrels, apprehending thieves, saving people’s lives, making drug busts, shooting armed robbers, dealing with cases of fraud, and so on.

Moreover, police have a number of different roles. They have a deterrence role. They are highly visible authority figures with the right to deploy coercive force. They have a law enforcement role in relation to crimes already committed. This latter role involves not only the investigation of crimes in the service of justice, but also the duty to arrest offenders and bring them before the courts so that they can be tried and—if found guilty—punished. And police also have an important preventative role. How, it is asked, could we possibly identify any defining features, given this diverse array of activities and roles?

One way to respond to this challenge is first to distinguish between the activities or roles in themselves and the goal or end that they serve, and then try to identify the human or social good served by these activities. So riot control is different from traffic control, and both are different from drug busts, but all these activities have a common end or goal, or at least set of goals, which goal(s) is a moral good(s). The human or social goods to be aimed at by police, will include upholding the law, maintaining social order, and preserving human life.

Policing seems to involve an apparent multiplicity of ends or goals. However, some ends, such as the enforcement of law and the maintenance of order, might be regarded as more central to policing than others, such as financial or administrative goals realised by (say) collecting fees on behalf of government departments, issuing speeding tickets and serving summonses.

But even if we consider only so-called fundamental ends, there is still an apparent multiplicity. For example, there is the end of upholding the law, but there is also the end of bringing about order or conditions of social calm, and there is the end of saving lives. Indeed Lord Scarman relegated law enforcement to a secondary status by contrast with the peace-keeping role. Moreover, the end of enforcing the law can be inconsistent with bringing about order or conditions of social calm. As Skolnick says: ‘Law is not merely an instrument of order, but may frequently be its adversary.’

Can these diverse and possibly conflicting ends or goals be reconciled? Perhaps they can by recourse to the notion of moral rights. The first point here is that the criminal law is fundamentally about ensuring the protection of basic moral rights, including the right to life, to liberty, to physical security, to property and so on. The moral rights enshrined in the criminal law are those regarded as fundamental by the wider society; they constitute the basic moral norms of the society. Naturally, some of these are contentious, and as society undergoes change these moral norms change—for example, in relation to homosexuality—but there are a core which there is reason to believe will never change or ought not to change e.g. right to life, freedom of thought and speech and physical security.

The second point is that social order, conditions of social calm and so on, which are at times contrasted with law enforcement, are in fact, it might be suggested, nothing other than conditions in which basic moral rights are being respected. A riot or bar room brawl or violent domestic quarrel is a matter for police concern precisely because it involves, at least potentially, violation of moral rights, including the rights to protection of person and property.
So the general human and social good which justifies the institution of the police is arguably the protection of moral rights, and in particular those moral rights which are fundamental moral norms, and thus enshrined in the law, and especially—though not exclusively—the criminal law. But policing has further distinguishing features.

Bittner has propounded a very different theory of policing to the one suggested here. However his account is insightful. Bittner focusses attention on the means deployed by police to secure those ends. He has in effect defined policing in terms of the use or threat of coercive force. Bittner defines policing work as ‘a mechanism for the distribution of non-negotiable coercive force’ employed in accordance with the dictates of an intuitive grasp of situations exigencies.

Bittner’s account of policing is inadequate because it fails to say anything about the goals or ends of policing. Moreover, coercion is not the only means deployed by the police. Other typical means include negotiation, rational argument, and especially appeal to human and social values and sentiment. Nevertheless Bittner in drawing attention to coercion has certainly identified the distinctive feature of policing and one that separates police officers from, say, social workers or criminal lawyers.

Further, Bittner in stressing the importance of coercion draws our attention to a fundamental feature of policing, namely, its inescapable use of what normal circumstances would be regarded as morally unacceptable activity. The use of coercive force, including in the last analysis deadly force, is in itself harmful. Accordingly, in normal circumstances it is morally unacceptable. So would be morally wrong, for example, for me as a private citizen forcibly to take someone to my house for questioning or because I felt like some company. Use of coercive force, especially deadly force, requires special moral justification. Precisely because it is in itself harmful and therefore in itself morally wrong. Similarly, locking someone up deprives them of their liberty, and is therefore considered in itself morally wrong. It therefore requires special moral justification. Similarly with deception. Deception, including telling lies, is under normal circumstances morally wrong. Once again use of deception requires special moral justification because it is in itself morally wrong. Intrinsic surveillance is in itself morally wrong—it is an infringement of privacy. Therefore intrusive surveillance requires special moral justification. And the same can be said of various other methods used in policing.

The point here needs to be made very clear lest it be misunderstood. Coercion, depriving someone of their liberty, deception and so on, are harmful methods; they are activities which considered in themselves and under normal circumstances, are morally wrong. Therefore they stand in need of special moral justification. In relation to policing there is a special justification. These harsh and normally immoral methods are on occasion necessary in order to realise the fundamental end of policing, namely the protection of moral rights. An armed bank robber might have to be threatened with the use of force if he is to hand himself up, a drug dealer might have to be deceived if a drug ring is to be smashed, a blind eye might have to be turned to the minor illegal activity of an informant if the flow of important information he provides in relation to serious crimes is to continue, a paedophile might have to be surveilled if evidence for conviction is to be secured. Such harmful and normally immoral activities are thus morally justified in policing, and morally justified in terms of the ends they serve.

The upshot of our discussion thus far is that policing consists of a diverse range of activities and roles the fundamental aim or goal of which is the securing of those moral rights regarded as fundamental by society—and therefore for the most part enshrined in the criminal law—but it is nevertheless a profession which inescapably deploys methods which are harmful; methods which are normally considered to be morally wrong. Other occupations which serve moral ends, and necessarily involve harmful methods are the military—soldiers must kill in the cause of national self-defence—and politicians—political leaders may need to deceive, for example, the political leaders of hostile nations.

POLICE AUTONOMY

Thus far we have sketched an account of the proper ends of policing. We need now to turn to a consideration of the autonomy of individual police officers, and specifically to their individual power and authority.

On any account individual police officers have a significant measure of legal power. They are legally empowered to ‘intervene’—including stopping, searching, detaining and apprehending without a warrant any person whom the police officer, with reasonable cause suspects of having committed any such offence or crime—at all levels of society. Moreover in exercising this authority they interfere with the most fundamental of human rights. Arresting someone is necessarily depriving the person of his liberty. And should a suspect attempt to evade or resist arrest that person can under certain circumstances lawfully be deprived of his or her life by a police officer. For example, in many jurisdictions around the world police officers are legally entitled to shoot fleeing suspects.

These substantial legal powers are to a large extent discretionary, for at least four reasons. First, the law has to be interpreted and applied in concrete circumstances.

Second, the law does not, and cannot, exhaustively prescribe. Often it grants discretion or has recourse to open-ended notions such as that of the reasonable man or reasonable suspicion. Accordingly, a number of police responses might be possible in a given situation, and all of them might be consistent with the law. Police discretion is involved at most stages of their work. It may be involved in the decision to investigate a possible crime; to arrest or not to arrest; and whether or not to lay charges.

Third, upholding and enforcing the law is only one of the ends of policing. Others include maintaining of social calm and the preservation of life. When these various ends come into conflict, there is a need for the exercise of police discretion.

Fourth, policing involves unforeseen situations and problems requiring an immediate solution. It is therefore necessary to ensure that police have discretionary powers to enable them to provide such immediate solutions.
The original authority of the police and its relation to discretion

Regarding the concept of original authority, we first need to distinguish compliance with laws from obedience to the directives of men and women (including especially one’s superiors). Thus according to the law an investigating officer must not prosecute a fellow police officer if the latter is innocent. On the other hand he or she might be ordered to do so by their superior officer. Not individual police officers are held to be responsible to the law, as well as their superiors in the police service. However it is claimed that their first responsibility is to the law. So a police officer should disobey a directive from a superior officer, which is clearly unlawful.

However, the controversial doctrine of original authority evidently goes further than this. It implies that there are at least some situations in which police officers have a right to disobey a superior’s lawful command, if obeying it would prevent them from discharging their own obligations to the law.²

According to the doctrine of original authority, there are at least some actions, including the decision to arrest or not arrest (at least in some contexts), which are ultimately matters for the decision of the individual officer and in respect of which he or she is individually liable. Accordingly, a police officer may be entitled to disobey their commanding officer to the extent of refusing to arrest someone, although not to the extent of refusing to assist the superior officer in the officer’s attempt to arrest a suspected offender. Here the point is not that the superior officer has issued an obviously unlawful directive. Rather in some contexts the authority of the superior officer to direct is overridden by the authority of the individual police officer in respect of the police officer’s power to arrest.

The notion of individual police officers’ responsibility to the law, as opposed to their superior officers, and the concomitant legal liability of individual police officers, is known as ‘original authority’ in order to differentiate it from mere delegated authority. This notion of the original authority of individual police officers also needs to be distinguished from the notion of the quasi-judicial independence of police forces from other institutions, including especially government. Police forces have traditionally in liberal democracies jealously guarded their independence from government on the grounds that they exist to uphold the law and not to implement the political policies of the government of the day. This notion of the institutional independence of the police from political control has obvious resonances in places such as apartheid South Africa or the former communist regimes of Eastern Europe.

At any rate, the legal situation in relation to the doctrine of original authority in those countries in which it has been claimed to exist, namely the UK and Australia, seems unclear. While there is in law this notion of the individual police officer’s original authority, there is also some legal support for the opposite view. For example, there is some legal support for the right of police commissioners to order their subordinates to arrest or not arrest people, irrespective of whether it is desirable or otherwise problematic for the subordinates to make those arrests.³

As far as the factual situation of a police officer’s exercise of this original authority is concerned, it can be argued that there is a contradiction between this notion of the individual officer’s independence on the one hand, and the reality of the hierarchical and militaristic structure of actual police forces and the powerful structures of police culture, on the other. Notionally individual police officers might have original authority but in practice, it is sometimes suggested, they do what their superiors tell them, and they conform to conservative police cultural norms, including the norm of not reporting a fellow officer’s misdemeanour.

In addition to the legal and factual questions, there is a normative or value question concerning police original authority. Here the question is whether it is desirable for individual police officers to have and to exercise original authority. This question amounts to asking whether it is desirable:

- for individual officers to have the legal right to make decisions on the basis of their judgment of what the law requires—and to do so, at least in some circumstances, even in the face of the commands of superior officers;
- for individual officers to be legally liable for the untoward outcomes of these judgments, and;
- for the administrative structures and cultural norms within the police services to be such that individual police officers in fact act on that original authority in a significant number of situations.

This is a vexed and complex issue. On the one hand, if the police officers in the lower echelons are in fact the most competent to make decisions in a variety of circumstances—more competent than their superiors—then establishing original authority may be for the good. For when there is a clash between the judgements of such officers and their superiors or external authorities, it is likely that acting on the judgements of lower echelon police officers will lead to the best outcomes. On the other hand, since authority brings with it power, giving individuals authority enables the possibility of abuses of power. It also enables the possibility of bad consequences flowing from the poor judgements of inexperienced junior officers.

In conclusion, it is clear that where it applies the notion of original authority provides for a substantial degree of autonomy for individual police officers relative to their superiors, notably in relation to their powers to arrest, and to use coercive and deadly force.

VICES AND VIRTUES OF POLICE LEADERS

Let us now turn to the question of the matter of the specific character traits and qualities that police managers need to have if they are to facilitate the proper ends of police organizations, and suitably respect the autonomy of their subordinates.

We begin our moral analysis with police officers in general. Many of the moral principles which govern the actions of individual persons are universal; they apply to individuals at all times, both in their private life and in their public roles. For example, the moral principle prohibiting murder is universal.

The different purposes and activities of different professions and roles generate differences in required moral character. It is because the police officer
must track down and arrest criminals that he or she needs to have a disposition to be suspicious, a high degree of physical courage, and so on. Moreover, what may be virtuous in one occupation will not necessarily be so in another. For example, to deceive others is in general morally wrong; but it is necessary for some professionals, such as undercover police operatives, to engage in deception and do so as a matter of routine.

There is a further point in relation to moral character that might follow from the nature and purposes of the profession of policing. Perhaps the minimum standards of integrity, honesty, courage and so on, demanded of police officers ought to be higher than for many, even most, other professions and roles. After all, police have extraordinary powers not given to other groups, including rights to take away the liberty of their fellow citizens. Yet police are subject to moral temptations to an extent not typically found in other professions. Consider detectives working in drug law enforcement who are exposed to drug dealers who are prepared to offer large amounts of money to bribe police. This conjunction of extraordinary powers and moral vulnerability justifies higher minimum standards of moral character for police than for members of many other professions.

Thus far we have been speaking in general terms of the virtues and vices of police officers in general. We now need to focus on a particular species of police officer, namely, police managers. What are the appropriate virtues and unacceptable vices of police managers? As argued above, what counts as virtue or vice will in large part be determined by the ends and means of police organizations, and, more specifically, by the role of police managers in realising those organizational ends by recourse to those means. Presumably, a police manager who is unduly preoccupied with his own career and with self-promotion fails the first test for a virtuous police manager. When it comes right down to it, it is the collective and properly focused abilities of the men and women engaged in street-level policing that he ought to be centrally concerned to promote. The problem for officers in charge is to learn how to support that cohort’s endeavours, rather than pursuing his or her own professional self-interest.

This failure to understand and submit oneself to the proper ends of the profession and organization, and therefore to facilitate the activity of subordinate police officers in their pursuit of those ends, is one vice that has been prevalent within some police services.

Another vice of some police managers is negligence in respect of performing actions and framing policies that realise proper policing ends. For example, suppose a police manager who allows the manpower levels to run down to the degree that an area cannot be properly policed.

Another dimension of managerial or supervisory negligence concerns the tolerance of dysfunctional or corrupt behaviour among subordinate officers. Again, corrupt or incompetent police officers are problematic because they undermine the proper ends of policing, and accordingly it is the responsibility of police managers to ensure that the corrupt and incompetent are (at least) removed. A related vice to that of willful negligence is that of negligence by dint of psychological incapacity. Consider a senior police officer in the sphere of operations who is probably psychologically unable to take control of the situation he or she confronts; being too fearful to manage such stressful situations properly. Knowing this, the senior officer ought never to have accepted this kind of position of responsibility, or at the very least finding oneself incompetent in this position they ought to have resigned from it.

Another dimension of police management relates to the preparedness not only to take on the responsibility of managing others in the pursuit of the ends of policing, but also to accept blame for the failure to achieve those ends; or at least failure to discharge one’s management responsibilities in relation to the pursuit of those ends. As we have seen, Captain of the ship’ notions of responsibility are a common feature of police organizations everywhere. However, when things go wrong, police managers and senior law-enforcement bureaucrats may attempt to shift or spread responsibility through a range of devices. Amongst the rank and file of the service also, junior members may endeavour to evade responsibility by failing to volunteer information, exercise their autonomy or take initiatives unilaterally.

These two varieties of the evasive instinct can generate profound problems both upwards and downwards within a police bureaucracy.

Thus far we have spoken of police managers and police leaders as if there was no distinction to be made between these notions. However, this seems incorrect. A good manager is presumably someone who achieves the de facto and explicit aims of the organization efficiently and effectively by working within the framework of the rules and procedures, and by following instructions from above. The virtues of the good manager include:

- knowledge of the stated aims of the organization, and of its rules and procedures, as well as of the latest relevant technology;
- the ability to delegate in accordance with the job specifications of subordinates; and
- the capacity to communicate and to promote civility. Budgets are balanced, good relations prevail between the manager and his or her superiors, and the trains run on time (so to speak).

However, the virtues of leadership go beyond these qualities, and might on occasion come into conflict with them. A good leader generates, or stimulates other to generate, new ideas; he or she questions, and at times seeks to replace, given rules and procedures; a good leader supports subordinates when they are in the right, even at personal cost; a good leader interprets the rules and the explicitly stated aims of the organization not only in the light of political realities, but especially in the light of fundamental ethical values that ought to guide the organization and its constitutive activities; and a good leader energises and mobilises subordinates as members of a team in a collective enterprise to which all can contribute and from which all can derive kudos.

POLICE LEADERSHIP IN CONTEMPORARY SETTINGS

Thus far we have elaborated a highly general account of police leadership, and done so within a normative theoretical framework that emphasised, on the one
hand, the goal of policing to protect moral rights, and on the other, the importance of an appropriate degree of autonomy for individual practitioners. It is now time to look specifically at accountability in contemporary settings. What are the challenges for contemporary police leaders?

Or, at least, what are the challenges for contemporary police leaders who are seeking to fulfill, as they ought to be, the fundamental normative aims of policing and doing so in a manner that respects the legitimate autonomy of the individual police officers under their command?

Contemporary policing remains an intrusive and demanding profession. It places an unusually high burden and public responsibility upon its more inexperienced and junior members—both in terms of the discretion they are expected, even required, to exercise, and the nature and diversity of the work that they are tasked to perform.

As argued earlier, the reality of the operational policing environment is that, unpredictably and frequently with little or no warning, police practitioners may find themselves involved in any of a wide range of activities for which no amount of training can properly prepare them. Attending a violent domestic dispute involving people old enough to be their parents; dealing with a multiple road fatality in which the vehicle occupants have been horrifically injured; resolving a drunken fracas between people of their own age and with whom they may, not infrequently, associate in other circumstances; maintaining the peace at a demonstration in support of an issue to which they themselves are deeply committed; delivering a death message to a distraught mother; and determining the exercise of discretion in a drug overdose situation are just some examples. In today’s world in each of these situations the practitioner’s actions are likely to be subject to post-event analysis; in many they will be subject to contemporary public and media scrutiny.

Moreover, these activities occur against an organizational background in which high emphasis is placed upon quantitative results—such as clear up rates and response times—the financial cost of operations and investigations, and adherence to general orders and guidelines. They also occur in an environment of behavioural expectation in which there is little tolerance for error.

Added to this diversity of ends and functions is the stringency and ubiquity of internal and external, formal oversight and review, and the fundamental dichotomy between the independence and autonomy of the ‘office of constable’ on the one hand, and on the other, the restrictive, rules driven, authoritative structure of most police organizations.

To be effective a police leader must have, and clearly demonstrate, an understanding of the reality of this complex environment before exercising his or her authority over it. This requires sensitivity as well as decisiveness, compassion as well as strength, and the courage to protect and share blame as well as the preparedness to punish. It also requires the enthusiasm to celebrate the success of others, as well as one’s own.

This challenge is accentuated, some may say aggravated, by the continuously increasing levels of accountability which apply to policing and its performance. This is not to deny that similar expectations are held of many other organizations, but rather to emphasize that within policing the journey has been more recent, yet faster and longer for most organizations. Police leaders and governments must share the blame for the delay in departure. Moreover, the increasing demands of accountability have become such that there is a real danger that police performance will be measured only in narrow and superficial ways.

On the other hand, many of the changes in policing, including the recognition of the need for accountability, are to be welcomed. As David Bayley said, A new form of professionalism is emerging. This is professionalism that accepts accountability, that accepts the desirability of performance publicly evaluated. Whether the objective is enhanced effectiveness, efficiency or rectitude, police are beginning to collect the information that will show whether they are entitled to the expertise they claim. This might be called ‘verifiable professionalism’. 12

Although Bayley’s comments were made some seven or eight years ago they hold true today.

Policing, particularly over the past decade, has taken on a new dimension. Senior police managers are no longer simply field commanders, but people who are responsible for large and complex organizations and substantial public money; people who are expected to anticipate emerging trends and needs, to reshape their organizations and to upskill their people to meet new goals and objectives.

But, as Bayley said (see above), ‘unless the public plays very close attention to what often seems like a technical discussion, the promise of “verifiable professionalism” may be still-born’. 13

The Australian experience
Accountability for performance depends on the selection of measurement criteria. It seems highly probable that: ‘Unless the public insists on the right criteria, the police might become more accountable but for matters that do not make an important difference’. 14 In the Australian experience of the past decade there are arguably two areas to which this concern most importantly applies: funding and behaviour.

The adoption by most Australian governments of accrual accounting principles, and the consequent emphasis on achievement over activity; on output and outcomes, rather than input and on the “cost of doing business”, has markedly changed the equation for policing and police leadership. Historically, policing in the western world has been carried—probably driven—by the commitment of its members. Even members with little respect for police management or their organization have almost invariably applied themselves with dedication and sacrifice—particularly in emergency—to “the job”. That is their individual job rather than the organizational job to which they belong. Even at the height of industrial unrest police services are rarely significantly disrupted; and in the investigation of serious and violent crime—the protection of the most central of human moral rights—it has been common for police to work without any expectation of payment. The focus on cost-efficiency and outcomes rather than on activity and effort, whilst overdue, fully understandable and largely appropriate, has the potential to undermine morale overall operational effectiveness, unless properly led and managed.
Policing is a 'people business'. As a profession or occupation it sinks or swims on the back of the quality and endeavour of its people, regardless of legislation, rules and regulations, technical support or government imperatives. Never has policing been in better shape to allow its practitioners to exercise the individual discretion and original authority vested in the 'office of constable' but arguably, never has it been under so much pressure to retreat to an environment of autocracy and prescription.

Over the past 15 years or so, as Australian police services, both individually and collectively, have aggressively moved to improve the professionalism of policing in all its dimensions. A number of features have emerged. Recruitment and in-service education and academic qualification levels have increased markedly; the quality and wider relevance and sensitivity of training and development programs has improved (inter alia through greater emphasis on skills and qualities such as conflict resolution, cultural awareness and negotiation skills), internal audit and professional standards and review processes have been dramatically advanced, and levels of accountability extended both vertically and laterally to an extent unlikely to have been seen a few years previously.

Whilst the models have varied, in keeping with these developments, Australian police organizations have modified structures and autonomy levels to better reflect modern work practices and the quality and potential of contemporary police practitioners.

In many jurisdictions the scope of uniform patrol work has been significantly widened as more strategic, intelligence driven patrol and problem solving initiatives are introduced. Budgetary accountability has been devolved, in many cases to the district, even local station level, with district and station officers accountable for the results achieved with the money allocated to them. In the case of the Australian Federal Police, budgets are frequently allocated to individual investigations with the team leader of the investigation, regardless of 'rank', responsible for its expenditure and the results achieved.

As an example of structural and cultural change, the Australian Federal Police abolished its traditional rank structure for all national operations personnel, replacing them with a generic rank of 'Federal Agent', and virtually abolished all divisions and branches and implemented a flexible teams approach to all operational and operations support work. The team model is based on the ingredients of work, people and money. Basically, the competing importance of work is assessed and people and money applied to the work according to this assessment. While obviously initial decisions are frequently reviewed as an operation progresses, the approach allows the best mix of available skills—from the general workplace—to be applied, with the size and composition of the team varied according to competing demands and operational developments. As the team leader has responsibility for the operational budget the team has real ownership of its own work, decisions made and the results achieved.

A range of not dissimilar structural and cultural reforms are occurring in police organizations worldwide. The challenge of leadership in this environment is to achieve an appropriate balance between organizational flexibility, preparedness and capacity and organizational accountability and cohesion which will ensure the trust of the community, properly develop, skill and use police practitioners, and improve operational effectiveness.

This challenge requires, among other things, a commitment to, and proper understanding of, risk management by police leaders. It also requires an understanding of risk management on the part of governments and other critical stakeholders. A narrow fixation with accountability, driven simply by cost efficiency and a commitment to risk minimisation (e.g. through maintenance of corporate autocracy as a safeguard against autonomy and the resultant risk of corruption) has the genuine potential, we suggest, to render policing in the current century impotent. Accountability without context, it is suggested, is a recipe for failure.

The twenty-first century always promised to offer an environment of unpredictability, global interactivity, dynamism and diversity. The terrorist events of 11 September 2001 in the USA have simply—but dramatically—added to this already dangerous cocktail. In law enforcement terms, issues of security, social disorder and heightened ethnic tensions will take precedence over the challenges posed by organized criminal groups and electronic crime. This is occurring at a time when, it seems, criminal groups are operating increasingly in loose coalitions and partnerships, which are both mobile and international, in an environment of unprecedented opportunity, variety, profitability and potential for power.

If law enforcement is to remain credible and relevant it must direct every effort to improving individual and collective effectiveness in relation to the fundamental goals of policing. Police leaders and their organizations must become more flexible, imaginative, clever, patient, resourceful, co-ordinated and influential. Teamwork has always been important to police work. Now it is essential; and the size and structure of the necessary teams has changed. While local knowledge of the patch remains important, law enforcement practitioners now must recognize that their patch is part of a global patchwork quilt—a quilt of many cultures and languages, of many governments and systems. Whilst it is probably true to say that most police administrators are cognizant of these needs, it will take courage in the current environment to implement and maintain the strategies necessary to effect real change.

For despite the reforms occurring in most police services around Australia, we suggest more needs to be done. Certainly, in the terms of David Bayley's description of 'verifiable professionalism,' policing in most parts of the western world would struggle to identify a positive connector between accountability and results. Police leaders need to set minimum standards and ensure compliance and accountability.

However, police leaders must also continue to strive, we suggest, to create organizational arrangements which properly empower and personally enrich their people, and which facilitate and enable good performance and good results. For one thing, ethics in policing is not simply about compliance with minimum legal and moral standards, it is also about enhancing individual and collective virtues, and striving to improve one's professional performance.

For another thing, it is only by the good performance of individual police officers, and the good results of teams of police officers, that the fundamental moral purposes of police organizations will be realised in contemporary policing.
contexts. If these goals or purposes, notably the protection of the moral rights of citizens, are not realised, then the existence of police institutions ceases to have any point. The virtues of a good leader are inextricably linked to these purposes. One such virtue is trust. With devolution and autonomy goes trust in others, as well as accountability. Another virtue is the ability to communicate. For example, the effectiveness of the communication of the organizational directions and strategies is an important determinant of the level of ownership of those directions and strategies by those under their command.

The quality of the policies and decisions of police leaders is a fundamentally important contributing factor to the success of police organizations in achieving the moral purposes that ultimately justify their existence.
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CHAPTER 8

Leadership Myths and Realities

Robert Panzarella

Robert Panzarella lays bare the myths and realities of police leadership with surgical precision. Although police forces promote from within, many police leaders have climbed the bureaucratic ladder and have little operational experience. But lack of reality-based knowledge does not align itself with humility. Police leaders, politicians and the public are unforgiving in their expectations of those who do the actual work of policing. The quasi-military model of police command is outmoded even as a military model. The contemporary military may provide a more apt model for the necessary task of reinventing police leadership.

THE ORIGINS OF MODERN POLICING

Modern policing was created in London by Home Secretary Sir Robert Peel, who set up the Metropolitan Police in 1829 as a response to the urban disorder that accompanied industrialisation (Hobsbawm, 1968). Across the Atlantic, mob disorders gave rise to police departments based on the London model (Johnson, 1981). A delegation of New York City politicians went to London and brought back the plan for a new police organization, strongly influenced by military experience of organizing men to achieve a common task. Uniforms and ranks were introduced to facilitate large-scale deployments. Military-style roll calls were used as indicators of sobriety and fitness for duty. Like an army of occupation, the police sent out regular patrols to keep an eye on things and handle minor incidents. Back-up forces were maintained in fortress-like stations for deployment in larger incidents, and the entire force could be mobilized when necessary to put down major disorders.

Most importantly, a military ideology was imposed, more or less successfully, on the police. The essence of it was the understanding that superiors would make decisions and give orders, and that subordinates would obey orders without question.

That ideology is still alive today, and can be seen in the most professional of police-type organizations, such as the FBI. FBI agents do not wear a uniform or salute each other. But the FBI may be even more military in essence than other police organizations: by demanding greater faith in the organization’s mission, greater loyalty, and more readiness to do whatever may be ordered by superiors.

Although police forces today are often referred to as ‘paramilitary’ or ‘quasi-military’ organizations, the military and the police have evolved along separate paths and as time goes by they resemble one another less and less. Both, however, have had to cope with changing notions of leadership. It will be the essence of this article to argue that the police service has yet to find an