Western Oregon University

Digital Commons@WOU

Honors Senior Theses/Projects   Student Scholarship

6-2022

Necessary or Outdated: Are Post-9/11 Changes to U.S. Police Forces Still Justifiable?

Alex Stemm

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/honors_theses

Necessary or Outdated: Are Post-9/11 Changes to U.S. Police Forces Still Justifiable?

By
Alex Stemm

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Mari Sakiyama, for her insight and guidance throughout the process of writing this document. Your feedback and advice during our many meetings have been so incredibly helpful to making this project what it is. More importantly, your understanding and support during the highs and lows of these last few months has been very appreciated. I truly could not have completed this project without you.

To Dr. Gavin Keulks, my Honors advisor, thank you for always holding me accountable and giving me the motivation to finish this project. Your experience and knowledge have been invaluable in not only my thesis development, but also my progression as an undergraduate student at Western Oregon University. I have genuinely enjoyed learning from you these past three years.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family and friends for always keeping in touch and checking in on me. It has been wonderful to have such a strong support system during my time in college. Jessica, Chris, Donna, Chloe, and Leo deserve the dedication of this project. Without this special group in my life I would not be in the position I am in now. I hope I can make all of you proud with my next steps in life.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, many changes have been made to the U.S. police forces. These modifications have stirred a lot of controversies among the general public, especially because some groups argue that individual freedoms have been overlooked to give U.S. police more power to prevent crime. Previous research has studied the effect of militarization on the police-community relationship and has determined that the militaristic appearance and tactics of police has, in some studies, resulted in unfavorable public perceptions. The goal of the present thesis project is to evaluate how the police have altered their approach to law enforcement after 9/11 and if those changes are still necessary based on the effectiveness of militarized policing. In doing so, I will have compiled thoughtful analysis on the topic and contribute several recommendations that I believe will aid further research in this area of study.

Background

Discourse regarding the militarization of police forces in the U.S. has become more frequent in recent years. There are many misconceptions about the true meaning of militarization, many of which understand it as the simple acquisition and use of military-grade equipment. Kraska (2007) describes militarization as the application of militarism, which emphasizes using force, threatening violence, and employing military equipment and ideologies to solve problems. In the context of policing, this means arming officers with militaristic weaponry, training, and beliefs or values (Kraska, 2007; Delehanty, Mewhirter, Welch, & Wilks, 2017). In addition, militarized local police forces may don SWAT-like uniforms while utilizing military-grade weapons and armored vehicles, such as helicopters, tanks, or Humvees (Balko, 2013). An increase in police paramilitary units (PPUs) and SWAT teams, which derive much of their characteristics from the military, has also contributed to militarization of U.S. policing (Kraska, 2007). Hall and Coyne (2013) also support the idea that increases in the deployment of PPUs and SWAT contribute to the similarities between operations of the police and military.

There is much debate surrounding the definitions and implications of the term militarized. For example, Lieblich and Shinar (2018) note that although the term "militarized" does not inherently showcase an aggressive attitude from the

police, it simply suggests that the force is operating more like a military organization. Broadly, while the military handles external security threats to the U.S. and the police handle internal security threats, the line between the two objectives is blurring into one very similar line (Kraska, 2007). This occurs when law enforcement agencies begin to undergo military-style training and utilize military weapons (Hall & Coyne, 2013). Combined with federal grants, access to excess military gear meant that even the smallest law enforcement agencies in the U.S. could reasonably afford a SWAT team (Balko, 2013). Other factors that promote militarization in law enforcement include wiretapping and the use of personal records, like finances, without legal authorization (Hall & Coyne, 2013).

The rise of new technology also enabled the militarization of law enforcement due to the advances in surveillance and information gathering. Technologies that were once solely used by the military, such as facial-recognition, retinal scanners, and satellite monitoring, have become much more accessible to the police in recent years (Hall & Coyne, 2013). Law enforcement agencies access to this technology is attributed to the increase in perceived threats of crime, typically involving drugs or terrorism (Bloss, 2007). Several scholars suggest that the use of surveillance technologies in police agencies broadened specifically due to the terrorist attacks on 9/11, particularly because

there was a significant increase in the use of preemptive law enforcement (Bloss, 2007; Dubal, 2012).

Scholars primarily attribute militarization to the 1033 Program set by the Department of Defense and the Defense Logistics Agency in 1990, which allows surplus military technology and weaponry to be sent to local police forces at no cost (Delehanty, Mewhirter, Welch, & Wilks, 2017). Three years after the enactment of the 1033 Program in 1990, Balko (2013) states that 3.4 million orders for Pentagon gear were requested by various police agencies in all fifty states. In addition, Balko (2013) emphasizes that, in just three years, $727 million worth of military equipment had been issued to police agencies between 1997 and 1999. Fifteen years after the programs creation, over 17,000 law enforcement agencies nationwide had received service (Balko, 2013). Delehanty, Mewhirter, Welch, and Wilks (2017) state that, with an increase in access to military equipment – particularly assault rifles, armored vehicles, grenade launchers, helicopters, and camouflage – there is a natural increase in military-style training in order to safely utilize this equipment. The referred to equipment, when accounting for the quantity of each tool or vehicle, amounts to over $1.5 billion between 2006 and 2014 (Rezvani et al., 2014). Furthermore, an increase in new, militaristic equipment will often result in law enforcement agencies neglecting previously issued equipment that may, in certain circumstances, be

better suited to handle most conflicts (Delehanty, Mewhirter, Welch, & Wilks, 2017).

In the following sections, I will first provide a history of how 9/11 has influenced the militarization of the police in the U.S. by discussing several factors that accelerated the adoption of militaristic equipment and tactics. Next, arguments for an against militarization will be stated. Following the presentation of gaps in the current research, I will discuss the eras of policing to shape the discussion of the adaptation to militarism. Afterwards, I will compare the pre-9/11 and post-9/11 shifts to policing strategy and how those shifts have impacted U.S. policing on a variety of levels. Finally, a summary of the main points of my analysis and conclusions will be discussed.

Historical Background of 1033 Program and Policing

As previously mentioned, the 1033 program, as well as many other catalysts of militarization, became increasingly popular after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. The so-called "War on Terror" campaign was introduced by former President George W. Bush, after the foreign attacks on U.S soil. The attack prompted new arguments for increased militarization of U.S. policing in order to combat terrorism and promote homeland security, which caused a dramatic increase in new surveillance technologies, military equipment,

personnel, and funding (Katzenstein, 2017). Katzenstein (2017) further explains that the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq immediately following 9/11 prompted significant overhaul in security priorities, which led to billions of dollars in equipment to the police in the name of fighting domestic terrorism.

In response to the attacks, public perception grew heavily in favor of the police, especially in terms of approval ratings for policies surrounding surveillance software, such as facial recognition (Hall & Coyne, 2013). Although there are arguments that some methods of surveillance are an invasion of privacy, public opinions on the subject dramatically shifted in favor of surveillance after 9/11 due to the fear of further attacks by foreign groups. Specifically, 86 percent of people supported the police utilization of facial-recognition software at public events, 63 percent supported the use of cameras and other technologies in general, and 54 percent approved surveillance on private cell phones, emails, and internet usage (*Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics*, 2003). The favor of the public significantly aided the implementation of militarization in law enforcement agencies, as police forces were able to introduce a large number of new tactics and technology without much pushback.

While support for the police was rampant, the USA Patriot Act was enacted a month after the attacks, which eliminated many restrictions placed on law enforcement agencies' public surveillance efforts by allowing officers to

search private property without the rightful owner's consent or knowledge (Hall & Coyne, 2013). For example, Hall and Coyne (2013) explain that the domestic use of aerial spy drones was approved in the Federal Aviation Administration Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act after military personnel used it during surveillance on Afghanistan and Iraq. As technology improved, police departments were allowed complete access to these devices under the law. This, coupled with the facilitation of receiving military equipment because of the 1033 program, enabled the catapult of police militarization across the country. Furthermore, with the War on Terrorism in full effect, the War on Drugs provided even more incentive for police militarization. Balko (2013) stated that police were misusing their new, astronomical budget by arguing that their need for war gear was under the guise of school shootings or a terrorist attack by Al Qaeda, when in reality the gear was used for drug raids. By using these "wars" as justification for obtaining military equipment, law enforcement agencies militarized at a rapid pace.

Public Debates Surrounding Police Militarization

Arguments for Militarization

Although there is a lack of research in academia regarding the possible advantages of a militarized police force, many people in the U.S. propose several

arguments that promote police militarization. Safety of police officers and

citizens and crime prevention are among the many rationalizations for

militarization. Despite limited statistics to back these claims, along with a major

gap in the existing research, I will still evaluate these assertions in order to

provide a fair assessment and offer some recommendations for future research.

Some members of the general public that support the militarization of

police often cite reasons such as feeling safer as a citizen, while having more

confidence in police being able to handle violent crime safely and efficiently (Fox,

Moule, & Parry, 2018). Some people also suggest that, with civil unrest and the

increasing tension between communities and police forces, officers should be

more militarized to be prepared for backlash (Scott, 2020). Bieler (2016) also

suggests that militarizing law enforcement agencies will act to improve

professionalism and increase accountability for bad policing. In addition, Lieblich

and Shinar (2018) argue that the three main arguments in support of

militarization are better protected officers, deterring crime, and that normalizing

militarization "will eventually neutralize the exclusionary effect of militarization"

(p. 146).

Government agencies have promoted the concept that the militarization

of U.S. police forces is essential because criminals are becoming more advanced

and armed (Fortenbery, 2018). Because of this, Fortenbery (2018) states that

police officers will adopt a militaristic appearance due to improved training and

the implementation of modern equipment in daily police activity. Additionally,

the prominence of mass protests by the public has frequently overwhelmed local

police agencies, resulting in the reliance on military-style tactics and equipment

by police officers (Fortenbery, 2018; Gillham, 2011). It is also said that the events

of 9/11 have specifically broadened the police's ability to militarize because

support for more advanced law enforcement dramatically increased after the

terrorist attacks (Hall & Coyne, 2013; Fortenbery, 2018).

Groups that support the militarization of police acknowledge many of the

complaints of the public in their rationalizations. The idea that the public may

fear the military-like appearance of police officers who use militarized equipment

is well established, but supporters for militarization claim that this equipment is

necessary to combat criminals who have access to similar weapons and

technologies (Balko, 2013; Fortenbery, 2018). In addition, the concern that

militarization may result in a reduction of personal freedoms has been addressed

by these groups, who say that dangerous situations need to be handled with

more appropriately trained tactical units like the SWAT team (Balko, 2013;

Fortenbery, 2018). According to Fortenbery (2018), additional fears of the

general public can be addressed by increasing foot patrols and building

community relations by getting to know the people that police officers are

serving.

Arguments against Militarization

Despite the potential benefits of police militarization in the U.S., there are

many critics of the concept for a variety of reasons. The most prominent critique

of police militarization is the impact it has on police-community relations,

particularly concerning minority groups including the people of color. It is crucial

to understand the discrepancies between the effects of police militarization on

privileged groups and disadvantaged communities, as marginalized groups

disproportionately face militarized officers compared to their privileged

counterparts (Lieblich & Shinar, 2018). Nelson (2018) asserts that a 10 percent

increase in African American population resulted in a 10 percent increase in

SWAT mobilization per 100,000 people, which showcases the increased

utilization of military tactics on marginalized groups. These deployments are used

in lieu of normal police activity for non-emergency events, such as warrants and

drug raids (Mummolo, 2018). In these instances, Mummolo (2018) found that

there is "no firm evidence that SWAT teams lower an agency's violent crime rate

or the rates at which officers are killed are assaulted" (p. 9186) while also

suggesting there is either a small, or nonexistent benefit to SWAT deployment

compared to standard deployments.

Hall and Coyne (2013) describe that, while public perceptions of the police were favorable after 9/11, it quickly shifted once the wars on drugs and terror gained traction in the media, especially considering the dramatic rise in incarcerations for drug-related offenses. In 1980, slightly more than 41,000 people in the U.S. were incarcerated for drug-related offenses (Hall & Coyne, 2013). In just 33 years, that number grew to over 500 thousand people, which amounts to a 1,100 percent increase in drug-related incarcerations (Hall & Coyne, 2013). In addition to this increase, it is also notable that, as of 1992, Black populations account for 40% of drug-related arrests despite only making up 12 percent of the total population (Cooper, 2016). The disproportionate arrests of Black people for drug-related charges, on top of the fact that the War on Drugs campaign increases incidents of police brutality while making little to no impact on reducing drug activity, has resulted in a less favorable perception of police, especially from the Black population (Cooper, 2016).

With these statistics becoming more popular on social media, it is understandable that certain communities, specifically those that are more susceptible to raids, are beginning to fear the sight of law enforcement officers. The tension between historically marginalized groups and police departments may be attributed to the militarized appearance of officers because community members become frightened and anxious upon seeing the police (Mummolo,

2018). Mummolo's (2018) study prompted people to discuss their opinion when being shown a photograph of an officer in regular uniform or one that is donning riot gear with an armored vehicle nearby. The results of this study show a correlation between increased militarized-presenting officers' presence and decreased support for law enforcement, especially when asked about the officer's presence in their own neighborhood. The participants expressed concern, stating that it is scary seeing police officers in SWAT uniforms carrying large weapons (Mummolo, 2018).

This fear often can become community hostility toward the police, which encourages police to use violence or threats in order to maintain peace or problem solve (Bieler, 2016). To further this point, as there is a negative shift in public opinion toward law enforcement agencies or the government, the push for accelerated militarization becomes stronger to ensure homeland security is preserved. Interviewed police officers have also expressed concern on this subject, as some agreed that militarization itself is likely to "intimidate and alienate many community members," which ends up adding "more stress and tension between the public and the police" (Scott, 2020, p. 76). In contrast, a survey of Texas sheriffs had the opposite response to militarization: some officers support the accumulation of military equipment and techniques because they feel it better protects police officers (Meitl, Wellman, & Kinkade, 2020).

Gaps in the Existing Research

Research on the broad topic of police militarization has slowly developed

in recent years but has not fully covered the majority of considerations that

would provide serious insight on the debate of its necessity. In fact, not many

scholars even agree on what makes a law enforcement agency considered to be

militarized (Bieler, 2016). In terms of the general definition of militarization, most

aspects of the police in the U.S. can be considered militarized, so much of the

research is under the interpretation of authors. Bieler (2016) also states that

studies need to observe the impacts of militarization on officers, privileged

community members, and marginalized groups, especially people of color.

Furthermore, additional research must be conducted in order to understand the

outcomes of militarized policing, specifically considering police legitimacy, safety

of officers, and safety of community members.

Police legitimacy, which suggests that the police are a social authority, and

their command should be followed by the public voluntarily, may be questioned

by community members who see militarization in a negative light (Tyler, 2004;

2006). Fox, Moule, and Parry (2018) suggests that significant research needs to

dissect public perceptions of police, specifically concerning the similarities and

differences between privileged groups (e.g., wealthy white individuals) and

underprivileged groups (e.g., people in the LGBTQIA+ community, marginalized

racial groups, and people with certain religion). It may also be successful to study differing opinions between people who live in urban areas compared to those that reside in rural areas (Dezzani, McAden, & Radil, 2017; Meeks, 2006). Nonetheless, the existing studies that do examine these perceptions often have very small, non-diverse sample sizes. Future research should also target violent crime rates in areas with more militarization compared to areas with little militarization (Bove & Gavrilova, 2017). Because deterring crimes and providing officers with increased protection are the main arguments for police militarization, more research should be done to determine if these impacts are occurring as a specific result of militarized policing. Furthermore, surveys of the general population regarding the true definition of militarization, especially in the context of determining whether a law enforcement agency is militarized or not, may also be conducted in order to gain a better understanding on the public's idea of what a militarized police force is (Scott, 2020).

In an effort to address some of these gaps, I will compile information from a variety of sources in order to shed light on the topic of militarization and how it affects people in the U.S. By discussing the historical development of U.S. policing through the examination of the different eras and how each era contributed to militarization, I will be able to assess how, specifically, 9/11 has added to militarization of the U.S. police. An in-depth analysis on how 9/11 has changed

the way police officers are trained, how and when they use force in law

enforcement, as well as the impact these changes have had on the community

and police officers themselves will bring a new perspective to this topic.

The Eras of Policing

Because each state creates and enforces its own laws, police departments

across the country operate under different directives, making each one unique.

Despite this, it is clear that police departments nationwide follow certain trends

in policing, which allows the history of policing to be analyzed. Through much

observation, researchers have found that policing, like many other occupations,

has continuously changed throughout U.S. history. These changes occur when

police executives examine the impact of policing tactics and alter future strategy

to improve policing (Kelling & Moore, 1988). By investigating both past and

recent trends in policing, future decisions can be made to better understand how

to effectively utilize police forces to ensure the safety of the citizens. Based on

the history of policing since the profession was established, researchers were

able to identify three different eras of policing including the political, reform, and

community eras. These eras are differentiated by a variety of factors, but

essentially based upon the apparently widespread strategies used to police

communities (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

The Political Era (1840s – 1920s)

Early U.S. police operated in a manner that is almost entirely different from the current police. This can be attributed to the lack of power and authority that police had in the mid-1800s, particularly because the concept of police legitimacy had not yet been introduced during this time. Consequently, police in this period acted as political machines for local politicians by encouraging voting for certain candidates and, sometimes, rigging elections (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Working under political leadership allowed the police to establish some authority while gaining resources from the politicians they were assisting (Kelling & Moore, 1988). This era of policing is appropriately deemed the political era because of the roles that the police took under local politicians.

In the political era, police officers were trained differently and took on a variety of responsibilities that are uncommon in today's functioning. While police did do some work in crime prevention and maintenance, officers also provided a variety of social services, like running soup lines or providing immigrants with temporary housing and opportunities for work (Kelling & Moore, 1988). As police departments were decentralized and divided by precinct, it made difficult for officers to communicate with each other with the equipment available at the time (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Officers were hired and worked in precincts where they lived rather than commuting to neighboring cities for employment. This

gave communities and officers a sense of comfort, especially because officers

were typically hired by the same ethnic background as the political leaders in the

area (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Because communication and technology were less

developed in the political era, officers were trained in foot patrol, where they

would handle crime through interviews and other variations of investigative work

(Kelling & Moore, 1988). Using these methods, the police and communities had a

close working relationship with each other due to the political reliance on police.

The Reform Era (1920s – 1980s)

After local discussions concerning who has control over the police were

held, particularly between political leaders and citizens, the reform era began in

order to reduce the amount corruption police were inflicting on their

communities (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Through this conflict, the Federal Bureau

of Investigation (FBI), was formed by police officers who wanted the population

to be more controlled in terms of crime and immortality rather than who will win

elections (Kelling & Moore, 1988). With the intent to create a competent policing

organization, the FBI's reputation grew quickly because it only prioritized major

violent crimes like kidnapping or bank robbery (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

Eventually, after the development of the FBI and its status, supporters of police

reform identified involvement in politics as the primary matter of contention in

policing (Kelling & Moore, 1988). This resulted in the isolation of police from

political influence, causing police to become more independent and responsible for their duties by hiring leaders through the civil service and staggering new chiefs between the terms of a city's mayor (Kelling & Moore, 1988). These alterations to the community era, alongside the shift towards criminal law, began the legitimization and authorization of policing in its earlier stages.

The aforementioned adjustments to the structure of policing resulted in a variety of organizational changes that significantly impacted external relationships with local politicians, programs and tactics, and technologies of the police. In this era, Kelling and Moore (1988) state that police officers were trained in a manner that aimed to routinize and standardize police work by teaching the officers that they simply enforced the law and made arrests when able to. Special units were created in order to handle specific cases that became routine problems, such as juvenile or drug related crimes (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Additionally, police officers were taught to have an impartial approach to solving crimes instead of responding to a crime or its victim with emotions.

The approach to the police's relationship with the community significantly changed during this time because citizens were prohibited from vigilantism, making their sole purpose to report a crime and defer to the police unless called upon for information (Kelling & Moore, 1988). The reform era, which lasted between the 1930s and the 1970s, was only deemed a success for a relatively

short period. This is because the 1960's and 70's became difficult for the police to

manage, particularly because of social changes like the civil rights movement,

minority migration, increased fear among civilians, and significant increases in

crime (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Although the police faced significant challenges

during this time, the improvement of technology allowed the police to

communicate more effectively amongst each other and with the community

(Kelling & Moore, 1988).

The Community Era (1980s – Present)

The current era of policing is known as the community era, although there

is much debate concerning the timeline of this era and whether or not the U.S.

has surpassed it. In this era, foot patrol remained on an upward path as the

strategy became more prominent as cities expanded (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

Increased foot patrol helped decrease some of the fear that had grown in the

later stages of the reform era, which allowed for further development into

programs similar to foot patrol (Kelling & Moore, 1988). In addition, police

organizations realized that the public could be used to improve the quality of

crime solving by obtaining information from citizens about criminal activity and

their primary concerns within their respective community (Kelling & Moore,

1988). In doing so, the police's relationship with civilians increased dramatically

because citizens felt involved in crime solving and appreciated the concern

shown by officers (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

This era of reform resulted in a significant change in focus from the police.

Specifically, controlling crime was accomplished through preventative methods

and rapid response to reported crimes (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Additionally, a

major focus of the community era lied in decentralizing the police by creating

neighborhood police stations and allowing management to develop the various

policy-making strategies used by police organizations (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

These strategies focused on developing the relationship between the police and

civilians, as the name of the era suggests. Some important implementations of

community policing include assigning police officers to a certain beat, or patrol

area, for longer terms, emphasizing social relationships with citizens by

responding to their specific fears, and forming alliances with crime control groups

that are not under police control (Kelling & Moore, 1988). By allowing

communities to participate in crime control, police built a better relationship with

citizens and created a safer environment for citizens to report crimes. Increasing

the amount in which police officers interact with the community is of the utmost

importance in the community era (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

The Next Era?

Typically, eras of policing are established after they occur in order to ensure that the full historical context of the era is understood. Because historians prefer waiting until the end of an era to make classifications, there is no consensus on what the fourth era of policing truly is, particularly because scholars are conflicted on if the community era has ended or if it is ongoing. Therefore, it is difficult to predict eras before they conclude because speculations may or may not materialize in policing history. However, many researchers believe that the community era has run its course because the 9/11 terrorist attacks have transitioned policing into a new era. For instance, it has been suggested that 9/11 has pushed the U.S. into a new era that should be named the Homeland Security Era (Stewart & Morris, 2009). These researchers suggest that policing has shifted its primary focus back to crime control through a variety of new counterterrorism units and training (Stewart & Morris, 2009). Arguments against the idea of a new era have come from police chiefs, who acknowledge the dominance of homeland security as a police strategy but do not believe it has surpassed community-based strategies (Stewart & Morris, 2009). In upcoming years, it is expected that more research will be done to determine if the paradigm of policing was shifted after 9/11 and, if so, how specifically policing strategies have changed as a result of the shift.

Pre- and Post- 9/11 Shifts

September 11, 2001

It is no surprise that the trajectory of U.S. policing was significantly

impacted by the events that occurred on September 11th of 2001. With that said,

it is difficult to conceptualize why policing changed so drastically without fully

understanding what took place on that day and how it has impacted the future of

policing. The attacks, which began early in the morning, were conducted by a

total of 19 Islamist extremists from the al-Qaeda terrorist group (*Events of the*

Day, 2021). The terrorists divided into four groups and boarded flights in several

different U.S. airports. Although half of the terrorists were flagged by the

Transportation Security Administration (TSA), all were allowed to enter their

respective aircrafts (*9/11 FAQs*, 2021). Because guns and explosives were the

highest priority for TSA during this time period, several of the terrorists were

allowed to board aircrafts despite being equipped with knives or not having

proper forms of identification (*9/11 FAQs*, 2021).

A total of four planes were hijacked by the terrorists, who intended on

crashing the planes into well-known U.S. buildings (*Events of the Day*, 2021). The

hijackers were able to overcome the flight crews using the small knives that were

detected by airport security. The targets of each plane included the North and

South Towers of the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and either the White

House or U.S. Capitol building in Washington, D.C. (*9/11 FAQs*, 2021). Three of

the four planes succeeded in hitting major buildings. The North Tower of the

World Trade Center was struck at 8:46 a.m., the South Tower at 9:03 a.m., and

the Pentagon at 9:37 a.m. (*Events of the Day*, 2021). The flight on its way to

Washington D.C. failed to hit its target when passengers on board fought the

hijackers for control of the plane, which resulted in the plane crashing into an

empty field at 10:03 a.m. in Pennsylvania (*9/11 FAQs*, 2021). A total of 2,977

people died as a direct result of these attacks, making 9/11 the largest and most

lethal foreign attack in the U.S. (*Events of the Day*, 2021). Of the casualties, 23

were police officers at the New York Police Department and 37 were Port

Authority police officers.

Police Involvement in 9/11

Police agencies were quick to begin making institutional changes to police

work as the public's fear of new terrorist attacks grew rapidly after the events on

9/11 (Nacos, Bloch-Elkon, & Shapiro, 2007). Research showed that the media

coverage of terrorist threats after 9/11 increased drastically, which directly

resulted in increasing fear of terrorist threats by the public(Nacos, Bloch-Elkon, &

Shapiro, 2007). This dynamic of media attention and public reaction proved to be

something to consider for police as they began to implement counterterrorism

efforts (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). For this reason, maintaining a good

relationship between local police departments and their communities was emphasized significantly when applying counterterrorism efforts. Despite accounting for these considerations, there are still advantages and disadvantages in the involvement of police in counterterrorism efforts.

Police's Efforts and Involvement in Counterterrorism Practice

Although it is rare for local police departments to have specialized counterterrorism units, many made significant changes to their daily operations. This means that police officers from even the smallest police departments take measures against terrorism. Bayley and Weisburd (2007) found that local police agencies would typically get involved with counterterrorism efforts if any of the following conditions occurred:

1. The public demanded change from the local police department if terrorism has occurred locally.

2. The structure of the police organization allows counterterrorism practice to occur, which is more likely with state law enforcement agencies.

3. The size of the police unit is large enough to have the required personnel to participate.

4. The threat of terrorism has been present for some time.

5. The public has a high tolerance of "high policing" and the government agency's intolerance toward political dissent.

6. Resources are readily available, like equipment or funding, to allow a local agency to introduce counterterrorism efforts.

These conditions, which showcase how most police agencies are affected by threats of terrorism, clarify when a police department is likely to engage in counterterrorism efforts.

When police departments meet the aforementioned conditions, they are able to put measures of counterterrorism activity into practice. The main strategies and tactics that police departments implemented heavily focused on covert intelligence gathering, but also expanded to other means as well. Bayley and Weisburd (2007) compiled a comprehensive list of activities that police departments do to engage in counterterrorism. This list includes prevention of terrorist attacks by the disruption or dismantling of terrorist plots and target hardening potential sites of terrorism (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). Target hardening, which is essentially the improvement of security in a place to protect it from an attack, also helps protect the people and infrastructure of a potential target area. In the event that a terrorist attack happens, police departments that are involved in counterterrorism efforts will provide emergency care to affected people while moderating damage and attempting to maintain order during and after the event (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). Once an event concludes, the police

will then be able to launch a criminal investigation of the incident (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007).

Effects of General Duty Police Officer Involvement in Counterterrorism Practice

Police efforts against terrorism can also be implemented in general duty patrolling and law enforcement. A distinct advantage of using general duty police officers rather than specialists is that general duty officers are able to observe more of the local area and make better connections with activities associated with terrorism (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). Through patrolling and observations, police officers conducting general duty may be able to recognize patterns of crime that indicate the preparation of a terrorist plot (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). In addition, by building a good relationship with the local community and its businesses, police officers can develop trustworthy informers and may be able to rely on the public for knowledge about an attack or a potential attack (Weine, 2017; Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). These advantages clearly showcase the importance of general duty police officers when used in conjunction with specialized counterterrorism forces.

Although the advantages of using general duty police officers is apparent, there are several disadvantages that can be distinguished. The most notable disadvantage is that police departments have limited resources that may prevent the expansion of police officers duties (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). If police

departments reallocate the distribution of their current resources from services

that actively support their communities, public backlash may result in a decline in

police support (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). This is especially true if talented police

experts are diverted from their normal duties, which may result in the public

feeling like the protection of their community is not a priority (Bayley &

Weisburd, 2007). Additional problems may arise if police officers begin to see the

public as suspects rather than clients, especially if issues that alienate certain

communities, like minorities, occur (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). The role of

counterterrorism is one of great importance; if an act of overzealousness occurs

that breaks the trust of a large portion of a community then major tensions are

likely to come to fruition (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). These disadvantages may be

too great to overcome for many police departments, so expansion into

counterterrorism is certainly something to consider for police management.

Impacts of 9/11 on U.S. Policing

Given the significance of the events on 9/11 and the response from U.S.

police immediately after the attacks occurred, it is clear that the ramifications

have resulted in long-lasting impacts on U.S. policing. Because the number of

changes is so great, this paper will only discuss 9/11's impact on U.S. police

training and use of force, how 9/11 impacted police officers, and how the U.S.

police's relationship with the community has changed in recent years. The

following section will discuss the comparison of pre- and post- 9/11 changes in the context of training and use of force, as well as the impacts on police officers and their relationships with the members of their communities.

Training

Because there are no federal mandates on how long U.S. police officers must be trained, police departments' training varies across state by state and across each department. Typically, to enter a police academy in the U.S., candidates are interviewed and, if liked, are hired by the police agency. After this, there are a variety of paths for new hires to enter police academies, where students prepare for the job by learning the basics of being a police officer. What academy a new hire attends and how they are directed there often depends on the size of the municipal agency and the number of resources available, as Table 1 suggests. For example, a larger municipal agency (e.g., New York Police Department) typically has its own academy, whereas a smaller municipal agency may ask new hires to train with larger municipal academies. In addition, some academies require certain conditions that must be met by candidates, such as passing a written exam, physical test, background check, and drug test (Bykov, 2014).

Candidates are also asked to have a high school diploma or GED, but some academies have been prioritizing candidates who have higher education (Bykov,

2014). Once in this stage, police academies begin to vary in terms of what and

how they teach new officers, but typically the instructors are active or retired

police officers with lots of experience (Bykov, 2014). Bykov (2014) states that

there are debates on if this is the most effective method of choosing an

instructor, particularly because an active or retired police officer who instructs

cadets may have, and teach, personal biases that they have acquired during their

practice. The length of a cadets training and the topics they learn depend on the

instructor and the specific needs of the community they intend to serve (Bykov,

2014).

As previously mentioned, the terrorist attacks on 9/11 shifted the focus of

U.S. police to counterterrorism and homeland security in favor of civil and

constitutional rights (Bykov, 2014). Bykov (2014) states that this shift resulted in

academies focusing less on important issues such as ethics, discretion, and

tolerance of diversity, which results in officers feeling unprepared to handle

intense situations . Table 1 indicates that, prior to 9/11, police officers were

typically in training for over a month, but a new study conducted 12 years after

9/11 found that U.S. police officers, on average, receive less than six months of

basic training (Reaves, 2016). In fact, the average length of time spent for all

types of academy attendees was 843 hours, whereas the average length of time

spent participating in mandatory field training was only 521 hours (Reaves, 2016).

Additionally, the police academies from the same research required an average of 168 hours of training on weapons, defense tactics, and the use of force. Prioritizing training in these areas takes away from several crucial topics that can help build a better relationship with the communities these police departments are serving, as Table 1 suggests.

Use of Force

As discussed previously, law enforcement's primary focus was to neutralize any threat to the national security of the U.S. after the terrorist attacks on 9/11. The implementation of this strategy resulted in the shift away from negotiated management of a threat that may have been seen in the reform era (Gillham, 2011). This new tactic of policing was further expedited by the announcement of the Afghanistan War by then U.S. President George W. Bush, which came less than a month after the attacks (Kerton-Johnson, 2008). Table 1 summarizes that, to adopt the strategy called "strategic incapacitation," the police have made several changes to their operations, including: (1) surveillance and information distribution to monitor risks, (2) precautionary arrests and the use of less dangerous weapons to neutralize protesters that participate in disruption or those who will potentially disrupt during protests, and (3) large-scale control of space in order to isolate or impede potential or active disruptive protestors (Gillham, 2011).

Gillham (2011) clarifies that strategic incapacitation is often seen visually when police are monitoring large scale protests, or similar events, that have the potential to become disruptive to the community. In order for the police to employ this new strategy, demonstrators are categorized as contained or transgressive, which allows authorities to determine which protests may become disruptive (Gillham, 2011). This concept has some raised concerns, particularly because of the fear of infringement on the protesters' rights to free speech and peaceful assembly, which are granted by the First Amendment. To combat this fear, police and protesters now convene to establish a consensus that assures the willingness of demonstrators to cooperate with guidelines that are determined by the police agency involved (Gillham, 2011). Demonstrations that breach the set guidelines risk an order to disperse by the police. In terms of arrests, police attempt to neutralize protestors that are deemed transgressive when suspicion allows, sometimes before any crimes are even committed (Gillham, 2011). Gillham (2011) clarifies that these arrests are typically only made when the police intend to drop charges after the protesters are released from custody, meaning no evidence needs to be collected by officers. In cases where the police deem use of force necessary during an event, weapons considered less lethal, like tear gas, pepper spray, tasers, etc., are used to lessen the likelihood of serious injury or, in extreme cases, death (Gillham, 2011). The police resort to these methods to

deter protesters from prohibited areas or to neutralize transgressive protesters.

To control space, the police now use advanced fencing systems to defend an area

from protestors by securing perimeters using armed guards and real-time

surveillance footage (Gillham, 2011).

Previously, and particularly in the 1960s, police handled large

demonstrations much differently when compared to post 9/11 tactics. Gilham

(2011) describes the strategy at the time as "escalated force," which often

resulted in police overlooking protesters' First Amendment rights in order to

maintain law and order by arresting large groups of undisruptive demonstrators

and using overwhelming force. It was rare for police to allow demonstrations

and, when allowed, demonstration was only tolerated when protesters were

extremely careful in their behavior (Gillham, 2011). In addition, when

demonstrations were held, the police would not communicate with protest

leaders before or during the event, which led to many instances of

miscommunication that sometimes delved into extensive use of force (Gillham,

2011). When use of force was involved during the employment of the escalated

force strategy, police would resort to violent acts against protesters in lieu of

making arrests (Gillham, 2011). Gillham (2011) further states that controlling

space was extremely important for police during this time, particularly because it

facilitated arrests and use of force. For instance, large barricades and lengthy police lines were common when police engaged in the escalated force strategy.

Impact on Police Officers

While structural and organizational changes to policing agencies are the most well-known effects of 9/11, the perspective shift of police officers is an effect that is not frequently discussed. The root of the perspective shift in police officers lies in the potential swing away from community policing to homeland security policing. As stated previously, Bayley and Weisburd (2007) warn that moving away from community policing could result in police officers viewing members of the public as potential criminals rather than people to be served. Jiao and Rhea's (2007) survey that questioned police officers from various sized agencies revealed that the majority (81%) of police officers believed that 9/11 caused a culture change in their workplace. One interviewed officer in the same study stated that citizens and officers began suspecting people of everything, specifically when unknown items or packages were left unattended (Jiao & Rhea, 2007). Another statement from an officer revealed that, after the paranoia and fear instilled by 9/11, they "do not take any chances" when suspicious items are reported (Jiao & Rhea, 2007, p. 399). Table 1 indicates that these beliefs may damage the police's perception of the public, which would harm the overall relationship between the police and the community.

Despite the unrest caused by 9/11, the culture change does not necessarily mean that the culture shift has had a negative impact on police officers. In the survey of the 21 participants, 17 of the police officers reported a change in the mindset and culture of their police department (Jiao & Rhea, 2007). Officers attribute an increased consciousness of intelligence and information sharing to the mindset shift, which has resulted in officers being more open about working with other departments (Jiao & Rhea, 2007; Bloss, 2007). If homeland security is becoming more of an emphasis in policing, it is beneficial for police officers to value information sharing and cooperation with other police agencies. These partnerships can also extend beyond police departments, especially because the FBI realized after 9/11 that general duty police officers can be used as a tool to combat terrorist activity (Bloss, 2007; Jiao & Rhea, 2007). Not only does this companionship benefit the FBI, but it also can boost the confidence of police officers and the trust between agencies, as showcased in Table 1.

Relationship with the Community

Prior to 9/11, the police were able to build a strong relationship with their communities in the community era. As discussed previously, the police were able to do this by creating more foot patrol positions that ultimately resulted in the use of community information to investigate criminal activity in a community

(Kelling & Moore, 1988). As Table 1 shows, the involvement of community members in crime control reportedly made citizens feel more comfortable in their environment because it allowed members of the community to feel heard and be helpful to the police. The emphasis on serving the community is what allowed the police to create a strong relationship with citizens, so it was natural that the bond weakened once the police shifted away from community policing (Stewart & Morris, 2009). The community relationship in current times is significantly different compared to the period right after 9/11 when citizens were living at a heightened sense of fear and relied on the police to feel safer. Upon the adoption of antiterrorism and homeland security practices, the relationship between the police and the community became less of a prioritization for the police.

There are many factors that can determine which demographics show greater support for the police, such as age, gender, race, sexuality, socioeconomic status, and more. Several studies show that older people tend to favor law enforcement more than younger people, men more than women, white people more than people of color, heterosexual people more than LGBTQ+ people, higher socioeconomic status more than lower, and less education more than higher education (Fox, Moule, & Parry, 2018; Lockwood, Doyle, & Comiskey, 2018; Mummolo, 2018). While these factors are not necessarily related directly

to the terrorist attacks on 9/11, it is important to note these statistics in order to

fully conceptualize the support the government and police agencies received in

the brief period post-9/11. Hartig and Doherty (2021) explain that the attacks

resulted in a "rare spirit of public unity" that predominately supported the

federal government and law enforcement alike (p. 4). Table 1 summarizes that,

since this short-lived display of togetherness, support has drastically decreased

after social justice campaigns have questioned militarization and its impact on

the way police officers use force on the public.

Another factor that has contributed to the decline between the police and

community relationship is the Patriot Act, which is an expansion of the

government's surveillance power by allowing law enforcement to covertly search

citizens to obtain information about a crime without proving probable cause

(*Surveillance under the USA/Patriot Act*). As stated previously, the Patriot Act was

passed shortly after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which were used by the Bush

Administration to promote the need to alter surveillance laws under the guise

that newly proposed laws will prevent future events of terrorism (*Surveillance*

under the USA/Patriot Act). Since the Patriot Act was enacted, surveillance,

accompanied by the increased access to better technologies, has become

progressively more important to police work (Gillham, 2011). While this has been

beneficial to the police, especially because information can be shared much more

efficiently across federal, state, and local agencies, it has severely damaged the

trust between the public and the government, as Table 1 indicates.

Table 1: Summarized Impacts of 9/11 on Policing

Category	Pre-9/11	Post-9/11
Training	- No federal mandates on training - > 2 months training on average - Field training programs became more prominent, but smaller agencies may not participate	- No federal mandates on training - > 6 months training on average - Less focus on ethics, discretion, and tolerance of diversity - Major focus on field training and weapons, defense, and use of force
Use of Force	- Negotiated management tactics - Maintain law and order at all costs - Mass arrests and overwhelming force to disperse demonstrations - No meetings between police and demonstrators - Violent methods of force often used - Barricades and police lines to control space	- Strategic incapacitation tactics - Large emphasis on surveillance before and during events - Police preemptively monitor potential threats and categorize them based on threats - Police meet with demonstrators prior to event to discuss guidelines - Use less damaging methods of force, like tear gas or pepper spray - Fences, armed guards, and video surveillance to control space
Impact on Police Officers	- Community policing culture focused on building a relationship with the public	- Homeland security culture prioritizing risk-free policing

	- The public are people to be served	- Potential to see public as a threat compared to people to be served - Increased communication between police agencies - Increased confidence in gathering and sharing of intel
Relationship with the Community	- Community-centric policing - More foot patrols - Use of community to investigate criminal activity in a community - Emphasis on serving the community - Strict surveillance laws that cannot breach the Fourth Amendment	- Shift away from community policing - Weakened bond between police and community - Significant tension between police and minority groups - Passing of the Patriot Act, which some argue violates the Fourth Amendment

Discussion

To determine the necessity of post-9/11 militarization of U.S. police forces, it was crucial to understand the history of policing and how militarization occurred. By analyzing a variety of sources that provided insight on the historical background of policing, this paper assessed what changes occurred as a direct result of the terrorist attacks on 9/11. In doing so, an evaluation of these changes allowed for a discussion regarding the effectiveness of militarization on improving policing in the U.S., and if these changes are still necessary today.

With the 1033 program fully established years prior to 9/11, the passing of the Patriot Act solidified the U.S. police's transition towards militarization. With

the need to combat the growing threat of terrorism in the U.S., alongside the rise

of drug-related crime, the police have significantly expanded their arsenal of

weaponry by receiving extra military technology for no cost (Delehanty,

Mewhirter, Welch, & Wilks, 2017). Tear gas, pepper spray, tasers, rubber bullets,

and more have become commonplace in the police's strategy for several years

now (Gillham, 2011). Police in the U.S. also have access to armored vehicles, like

Humvees or tanks, and modern surveillance technology, like facial recognition or

satellite monitoring devices (Balko, 2013; Hall & Coyne, 2013). These

developments came alongside a shift in focus for the police when the concept of

community policing began to decrease in popularity in favor of homeland security

policing, which became particularly common after 9/11 (Stewart & Morris, 2009).

The transition from community policing to homeland security policing

brought forth several changes to the training of new police officers, particularly in

the subject of use of force. New training methods that take away from diversity

and ethics training, plus an overreliance on use of force, has been a major source

of controversy regarding the police in recent years. In addition, the more forceful

methods of policing have come under scrutiny by some police officers as well,

who understand the fear of the public when seeing more militarized and

dangerous police (Mummolo, 2018; Scott, 2020). The alienation of certain

communities in the public has also damaged police reputation, particularly

because it can lead to police preemptively seeing people as suspects rather than community members (Bayley & Weisburd, 2007). These shifts have severely harmed the relationship between the community and police, which has had negative effects overall on the current state of policing.

In order for a more comprehensive evaluation, more research needs to be completed to determine the effects of militarization on crime prevention and officer safety. Additionally, studies should continue to investigate how different demographics, particularly minority groups, respond to militarized policing. The compiled information, however, indicates that the post-9/11 changes to U.S. police forces have more established disadvantages than benefits, which may suggest that these alterations could be outdated in today's age. Additionally, given the current climate of the police-community relationship, militarization has only created more tension between the public and police officers. Recent movements, such as Black Lives Matter, suggest that diversity and inclusion training must be reestablished in police academy training. This policy, alone, would be a great help in easing the conflicts between the public and police. Additional recommendations also include a reduced and more strict use of militarized equipment when deemed unnecessary. If PPUs, SWAT teams, and less-lethal, but still harmful, equipment was used less often, public perception of the police may become more favorable. Overall, a shift away from community

policing after the -9/11 terrorist attacks has resulted in an overabundant use of

militarized tactics and equipment, which has resulted in a major blemish on

police legitimacy.

References

9/11 FAQs. 9/11 FAQs | National September 11 Memorial & Museum. (2021). Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://www.911memorial.org/911-faqs

Balko, R. (2013). *Rise of the warrior cop*. PublicAffairs.

Bieler, S. (2016). Police militarization in the USA: The state of the field. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *39*(4), 586–600. https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-03-2016-0042

Bloss, W. (2007). Escalating U.S. police surveillance after 9/11: An examination of causes and effects. *Surveillance & Society*, *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v4i3.3448

Bove, V., & Gavrilova, E. (2017). Police officer on the frontline or a soldier? the effect of police militarization on crime. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, *9*(3), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20150478

Bykov, O. (2014). Police Academy training: An evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of police academies. *Themis: Research Journal of Justice Studies and Forensic Science*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.31979/themis.2014.0209

Cooper, H. L. F. (2015). War on drugs policing and police brutality. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *50*(8-9), 1188–1194. https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2015.1007669

Delehanty, C., Mewhirter, J., Welch, R., & Wilks, J. (2017). Militarization and police violence: The case of the 1033 program. *Research & Politics*, *4*(2), 205316801771288. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168017712885

Dubal, V. (2016, May 7). *The demise of Community Policing? the impact of post-9/11 federal surveillance programs on local law enforcement*. Asian American Law Journal. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://www.academia.edu/25118502/The_Demise_of_Community_Policing_The_Impact_of_Post_9_11_Federal_Surveillance_Programs_on_Local_Law_Enforcement

Events of the day. Module 1: Events of the Day | National September 11 Memorial & Museum. (2021). Retrieved June 8, 2022, from

https://www.911memorial.org/learn/resources/911-primer/module-1-events-day

Fortenbery, J. (2018, June 13). *Police militarization in a Democratic society*. FBI. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://leb.fbi.gov/articles/featured-articles/police-militarization-in-a-democratic-society

Fox, B., Moule, R. K., & Parry, M. M. (2018). Categorically complex: A latent class analysis of public perceptions of police militarization. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *58*, 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.07.002

Gillham, P. F. (2011). Securitizing America: Strategic incapacitation and the policing of protest since the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks. *Sociology Compass*, *5*(7), 636–652. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00394.x

Hall, A. R., & Coyne, C. J. (2012). The militarization of U.S. domestic policing. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2122384

Hartig, H., & Doherty, C. (2022, April 1). *Two decades later, the enduring legacy of 9/11*. Pew Research Center - U.S. Politics & Policy. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/09/02/two-decades-later-the-enduring-legacy-of-9-11/

Jiao, A. Y., & Rhea, H. M. (2007). Integration of police in the United States: Changes and development after 9/11. *Policing and Society*, *17*(4), 388–408. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460701718047

Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H. (1988). *The Evolving Strategy of Policing*. Retrieved June 9, 2022, from https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/114213.pdf

Kerton-Johnson, N. (2008). Justifying the use of force in a post-9/11 world: Striving for hierarchy in International Society. *International Affairs*, *84*(5), 991–1007. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2008.00751.x

Kraska, P. B. (2007). Militarization and policing--its relevance to 21st Century police. *Policing*, *1*(4), 501–513. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pam065

Lieblich, E., & Shinar, A. (2018). The case against police militarization. *Michigan Journal of Race & Law*, (23.1), 105. https://doi.org/10.36643/mjrl.23.1.case

Lockwood, B., Doyle, M. D., & Comiskey, J. G. (2018). Armed, but too dangerous? factors associated with citizen support for the militarization of the police.

Criminal Justice Studies, *31*(2), 113–127.
https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601x.2017.1420652

Meeks, D. (2006). Police militarization in urban areas: The Obscure War against the underclass. *The Black Scholar*, *35*(4), 33–41.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00064246.2006.11413331

Meitl, M. B., Wellman, A., & Kinkade, P. (2020). Armed and (potentially) dangerous: Exploring sheriffs' perspectives of police militarization. *Policing: An International Journal*, *43*(5), 845–859. https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-05-2020-0079

Moore, M. H., & Kelling, G. L. (2001). *To serve and protect - learning from police history*. To Serve and Protect - Learning from Police History | Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from
https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/serve-and-protect-learning-police-history

Moule, R. K., Burruss, G. W., Parry, M. M., & Fox, B. (2018). Assessing the direct and indirect effects of legitimacy on public empowerment of police: A study of public support for police militarization in America. *Law & Society Review*, *53*(1), 77–107. https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12379

Mummolo, J. (2018). Militarization fails to enhance police safety or reduce crime but may harm police reputation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *115*(37), 9181–9186. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1805161115

Nacos, B. L., Bloch-Elkon, Y., & Shapiro, R. Y. (2007). Prevention of terrorism in post-9/11 america: News coverage, public perceptions, and the politics of Homeland Security. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, *20*(1), 1–25.
https://doi.org/10.1080/09546550701734028

Not enough training. The Institute for Criminal Justice Training Reform. (n.d.). Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://www.trainingreform.org/not-enough-training

Radil, S. M., Dezzani, R. J., & McAden, L. D. (2016). Geographies of U.S. police militarization and the role of the 1033 program. *The Professional Geographer*, *69*(2), 203–213.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2016.1212666

Reaves, B. A., & Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). (2016, July). *State and local law enforcement training academies, 2013 (re-issue)*. State and Local Law Enforcement Training Academies, 2013 (Re-issue) | Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/state-and-local-law-enforcement-training-academies-2013-re-issue

Rezvani, A., Pupovac, J., Eads, D., & Fisher, T. (2014, September 2). *MRAPs and bayonets: What we know about the Pentagon's 1033 Program*. NPR. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://www.npr.org/2014/09/02/342494225/mraps-and-bayonets-what-we-know-about-the-pentagons-1033-program

Scott, D. P. (2020). *A qualitative study exploring: Police militarization effect on the police-community relationship*. Guide books. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://dl.acm.org/doi/book/10.5555/AAI28024072

Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics. National Institute of Corrections. (2017, October 16). Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://nicic.gov/sourcebook-criminal-justice-statistics-0#:~:text=%22The%20Sourcebook%20of%20Criminal%20Justice,justice%20in%20the%20United%20States.

Stewart, D. M., & Morris, R. G. (2009). A new era of policing? *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *20*(3), 290–309. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403409337225

Surveillance under the USA/Patriot Act. American Civil Liberties Union. (n.d.). Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://www.aclu.org/other/surveillance-under-usapatriot-act

The wars are here: How the United States' Post-9/11 Wars helped militarize U.S. police. The Costs of War. (n.d.). Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/papers/2020/wars-are-here-how-united-states-post-911-wars-helped-militarize-us-police

Weine, S. (2019, October 31). *How local law enforcement uses community policing to combat terrorism*. Lawfare. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://www.lawfareblog.com/how-local-law-enforcement-uses-community-policing-combat-terrorism