
No wonder they call us plods

Posted by dws - 2008/09/13 13:09

When I read this article it rang so true to me that I decided to share it here. In my opinion it gives an insight into what the lads and lasses on the ground have to cope with from those who are meant to be behind them.

Two years ago, a serving police constable calling himself PC David Copperfield wrote a groundbreaking book, serialised by the Mail, describing how ordinary bobbies are frustrated at every turn by bureaucracy. The Government then promised widespread reforms.

But now a senior officer in a regional force - using the pseudonym Inspector Gadget - reveals that the situation has actually worsened. Here, he reveals how elf'n'safety laws, political correctness and barmy target-setting are preventing the police from catching criminals.

Have a read, folks. I believe it to be worth your time.

=====

Re:No wonder they call us plods

Posted by DoricMan - 2008/09/13 17:20

dws wrote:

When I read this article it rang so true to me that I decided to share it here. In my opinion it gives an insight into what the lads and lasses on the ground have to cope with from those who are meant to be behind them.

Two years ago, a serving police constable calling himself PC David Copperfield wrote a groundbreaking book, serialised by the Mail, describing how ordinary bobbies are frustrated at every turn by bureaucracy. The Government then promised widespread reforms.

But now a senior officer in a regional force - using the pseudonym Inspector Gadget - reveals that the situation has actually worsened. Here, he reveals how elf'n'safety laws, political correctness and barmy target-setting are preventing the police from catching criminals.

Have a read, folks. I believe it to be worth your time. One of my son's athletic club pal's is a police sergeant, and he is under the same burdens your link described dws. How on earth have we destroyed the abilities of our police to do the job we in the community require?

I believe we have to uncover who and what is responsible for the many hurdles this profession is dealing with daily, and get them to explain to us, the public, and justify why these are necessary in their current form/s. Smoking out who is behind, and who justifies these issues, should be a first priority.

=====

Re:No wonder they call us plods

Posted by dws - 2008/09/13 19:00

DoricMan wrote:

One of my son's athletic club pal's is a police sergeant, and he is under the same burdens your link described dws. How on earth have we destroyed the abilities of our police to do the job we in the community require?

I doubt if you'll find many under the rank of Superintendent who'll think otherwise, but it's a case of the emperor's new clothes, Doricman. This "policy" floats down from on high, and we must all abide by it, ignoring the elephant in the room.

The result is lip-service to a mantra that no-one really trusts or believes in, but must pretend they do or be spotlighted as not being receptive to change, and that would never do.

=====

Re:No wonder they call us plods

Posted by Robin T Cox - 2008/09/14 09:46

This kind of bureaucracy is not restricted to the police.

We live in a litigious age, and whilst the police need to be prepared to justify their actions to the IPCC, most other organisations also have to face regulatory bodies, and health and safety standards, as well as environmental standards of all kinds. All of which are backed up by legislation, much of which seeks to hold senior people in those organisations responsible. So it's hardly surprising that they put in place processes to protect themselves and their organisations in the event of the inevitable mistakes.

Whilst it's relevant to lament the extra work this makes for everyone, let's also face it: the abolition of modern safeguards always seems to lead, sooner or later, to problems. As we saw in the case where deregulation allowed a major outbreak of foot and mouth, which did tremendous harm. In the worst event, bad policing can be lethal, as we saw in the Menendes case.

A policeman's lot has never been a happy one, but I for one support our police precisely because they do have to show that they are beyond reproach. And I do not favour the kind of sloppy policing that we see in countries whose police are, shall we say, less scrupulous about taking short cuts or administering their own rough justice. Effective policing in a democracy depends on public consent, and the public in this country demand the highest standards, as do the police themselves.

Having said that, it is also relevant to point out that recent legislation, such as the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA), and the widespread use of electronic surveillance and CCTV originally designed to counter terrorism, are now also being extensively used to pursue other enquiries which previously would not have been sanctioned quite so easily. So to that extent, the extra burden of police work is surely not only because of bureaucracy but also of legislation and technology that has made the task of the police easier.

Finally, it's relevant to point out that we cannot have good policing on the cheap. A political party that promises you tax cuts and extra police resources is telling you porkies: and yet successive elections have been won by means of such deception. Every single one of the complaints made in the Mail article could be addressed with a proper policy of police resourcing: but then, that might not be so popular with those who favour tough controls on public sector expenditure.

=====

Re:No wonder they call us plods

Posted by DoricMan - 2008/09/14 10:56

Robin T Cox wrote:

This kind of bureaucracy is not restricted to the police.

We live in a litigious age, and whilst the police need to be prepared to justify their actions to the IPCC, most other organisations also have to face regulatory bodies, and health and safety standards, as well as environmental standards of all kinds. All of which are backed up by legislation, much of which seeks to hold senior people in those organisations responsible. So it's hardly surprising that they put in place processes to protect themselves and their organisations in the event of the inevitable mistakes.

Whilst it's relevant to lament the extra work this makes for everyone, let's also face it: the abolition of modern safeguards always seems to lead, sooner or later, to problems. As we saw in the case where deregulation allowed a major outbreak of foot and mouth, which did tremendous harm. In the worst event, bad policing can be lethal, as we saw in the Menendes case.

A policeman's lot has never been a happy one, but I for one support our police precisely because they do have to show that they are beyond reproach. And I do not favour the kind of sloppy policing that we see in countries whose police are, shall we say, less scrupulous about taking short cuts or administering their own rough justice. Effective policing in a democracy depends on public consent, and the public in this country demand the highest standards, as do the police themselves.

Having said that, it is also relevant to point out that recent legislation, such as the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA), and the widespread use of electronic surveillance and CCTV originally designed to counter terrorism, are now also being extensively used to pursue other enquiries which previously would not have been sanctioned quite so easily. So to that extent, the extra burden of police work is surely not only because of bureaucracy but also of legislation and technology that has made the task of the police easier.

Finally, it's relevant to point out that we cannot have good policing on the cheap. A political party that promises you tax cuts and extra police resources is telling you porkies: and yet successive elections have been won by means of such

deception. Every single one of the complaints made in the Mail article could be addressed with a proper policy of police resourcing: but then, that might not be so popular with those who favour tough controls on public sector expenditure. The points you make Robin are sadly the "situation" our police are faced with. However, my view is that when systems are burdensome, manifestly corrosive or preventing proper return on the investments being delivered, then these must be investigated and put right.

I do not have solutions Robin only sympathy with the frustrations our police endure.

=====

Re:No wonder they call us plods

Posted by dws - 2008/09/14 18:29

Robin T Cox wrote:

...the extra burden of police work is surely not only because of bureaucracy but also of legislation and technology that has made the task of the police easier.

Really? I hadn't noticed. To access that sort of material demands endless requests and audit trails. I find though, that when I could be out on the streets, I'm answering crappy surveys from above as to "how we can provide the optimum service to the customer" or "What we can do to improve our public image"

Errmm...leave us alone to do our bloody job!!

Thank you.~)

=====