In “Homeland Security and Community Policing: Competing or Complementing Public Safety Policies”, Robert Friedmann and William Cannon (2007) analyze the role played by Americas Department of Homeland Security in influencing criminal justice policy issues. They also compare this role to that played by community policing. They feel that the two public safety strategies can actually benefit from working together.

The article begins by identifying the fact that recent years, we have witnessed a change in the role of law enforcement from just locally protecting life and property to dealing with both local and international threats.  Terrorism is mentioned as being one of the major threats.  A few policy issues such as coordination between state and federal agencies are mentioned as being able to help prevent potential terrorist attacks.  It is mentioned that while some of these steps are considered independently a DHS idea, they are in fact quite similar to community policing (Friedmann & Cannon, 2007).

The article goes on to analyze the nature of terrorism.  It highlights their five elements that are criminality, aggressive and violent actions, the purpose of communication as well as political goals and symbolic targets.  To better understand the different ways in which terrorists act, it goes on to discuss their management and leadership structures.  First there is the hierarchical unit where the chain of command is very tight, then the decentralized cell structure that has minimal supervision.  They conclude this section by saying that terrorism should not be limited to just the criminal justice system and that the community, business and government entities all need to be involved.

Within the framework of the Homeland Security Department, law enforcement should be able to fit within the goals of DHS. This includes distributing useful information to both state and local organizations (Sozer, 2009). It is noted that local government has a role to play in this by, among other things, expanding community-police relationships.  Implementation and design failures are noted as some of the limitations preventing DHS from working effectively with the community.

There are certain general principles in which community policing applies.  These include joint efforts and partnerships with independent bodies among others.  Commonalities and differences between DHS and community policing are compared.  It is noted that both use information gathering, emphasize on cooperation, partnerships and aim at enhancing public safety. In spite of a few differences, Friedmann & Cannon (2007) both feel that it would do great good for community policing not to be sidelined by Homeland Security, as had been done since 2003, when Homeland Security was formed to address future threats.
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The department of homeland security has a clear goal. It aims at creating a safer, more secure America that is very much resilient against the major threat of terrorism and other potential threats. This goal was highlighted in my summarized article. Based on the summary, this department has particular roles in influencing criminal justice policy. These systems of practices are aimed at upholding social control, preventing crime and sanctioning law violators with criminal penalties. They include, as mentioned in the summary, gathering and distributing information, creating partnerships with the state and local governments and cooperation with the community. All these are in line with DHS aim to end terrorism and enhancing security as well as strengthening the security enterprise that includes transparency among other important targets.

The authors feel there is a need for DHS to work alongside community policing. They compare the roles played by the two security systems and come up with some similarities as well as differences. Based on these similarities, they conclude that DHS cannot effectively work independently. Based on the current policies as discussed in the article, the recommendations are relevantly appropriate. Gathering information, for instance, would not be efficient without involving the community (Friedmann & Cannon, 2007).

Furthermore, community policing systems have a long established criterion to approach this scenario. If this is to be applied, effectiveness would be inevitably realized. Currently, DHS is enhancing performance by focusing on accountability, efficiency, transparency and leadership development (The Department of Homeland Security, 2015). By noting that this is done to enhance performance, community policing, which goes hand in hand with the mentioned areas of focus, is seen as an essential component.

I feel the journal article effectively captures the role of the Department of Homeland Security. By comparing it to community policing, it further strengthens the understanding of this role while ensuring participation of the local people. Since all players including government and business all have a role to play in ensuring security, I also feel the authors’ arguments are appropriate. Furthermore, consideration is given to the fact that without community policing, some roles of DHS would not be possible. Also, there are some lessons that DHS can pick from community policing. Conclusively. Therefore, none of them can be entirely independent.
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