

The challenges faced by police in the UK – should all police be armed?

Gear – (may not be all carried at one time)

- Helmet – Eye protection
- Vest – protect against 9m round
- Baton launcher – rubber bullets
- Pistol – Glock 17
- Rifle – G36 carbine – loaded with 556 calibre bullets
- Ballistic shields
- Taser – X2 X26
- Extensive aid kits – to treat on site



Accountability – (public confidence)

Questioning the *legitimacy* of the police in order to restore *public confidence*, under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE). The police are contained and made accountable for their actions in multiple ways, however “police legitimacy is accordingly continuously problematic” (Baldwin, 1987, 105)

- Semi-automatic firearms – accountable for every bullet fired.
- Taser guns dispersing dozen of colourful anti-felon identification numbers.
- Body worn cameras.

Human rights and British policing – (ethics)

Human Rights Act (HRA) 1998 made to enhance and protect citizens rights, in order to give freedom, respect and awareness. However, the “HRA has become institutionalised by the police service into a series of bureaucratic processes” (Bullock and Johnson, 2001), and have unfortunately not encouraged active consideration of human rights issues, focusing on “risks” rather than “rights”, in order to protect officers from criticism and blame.



Would arming the police be deterrent to criminal behaviour?



Yes, not providing police with the right equipment to deal with armed criminals is morally unfair and realistically unmanageable, giving criminals a stronger advantage to commit crimes.

No, criminals may invest in more dangerous weapons as a technique of self defence. Is dealing with situations through violence only encouraging this behaviour? Would police then stop using less harmful devices if equipped with more injurious weapons.