

Should the simple answer was in fact "there

[Education](#), [Teaching](#)



Should the police be allowed to stop and search? This question has been widely debated for many years, and a conclusion needs to be reached. In this essay, I will discuss the many views on the law of stop and search, and eventually reach a fair justification, closing this controversial argument once and for all. However, before we begin analysing the sources, I must explain: what is 'stop and search'?

Stop and search laws were first introduced in The Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1994. In order to stop and search someone, the police must have a justified reason as to why they have done this. There have been many arguments about whether stopping and searching people is right, as it is closely linked with discrimination and racism. There have been several riots protesting against this and police have been told constantly to reduce the amount they stop and search unless it is an emergency. The amount of stopping and searching has reduced from 1.

2 million searches a year to 386, 474 searches, but it still happens, for necessary reasons or for purportedly racial reasons. Even though the number has fallen, there is still a large dispute, and therefore, this essay will come to a closure on this issue. In the first source I have to analyse (Source 1 from The Independent), the person interviewed feels like stop and search needs to be abolished, and is against it. The source lets us take an insight into a man's life.

He runs a drama workshop, and in a particular activity, he asked a boy to put his hands to his face and sit down. He then asked the group what they can see. Many children inferred and said that "he is depressed" or "his mum and

dad broke up". However, these were all wrong. The simple answer was in fact "there is a boy sitting down with his face in his hands". This simple activity depicts the daily lives of the police force. Every day they have to put aside and lock away their feelings and instead use their logic to inspect and see whether a person poses a threat to others or not.

Despite this rule being in place, black people are seven times more likely to be stopped by police than white people. Is this a coincidence? I think not. Stop and search is the reason why black people have such wariness around police, and black people feel humiliated by it.

In addition, stop and search has a 9% success rate. If it is so low, why is it still in place? There is not a point, other than having a repugnant obsession with shaming black people. The second source I have to evaluate (Source 2 from a blog post) is against stop and search.

It explains how effective stop and search is at detecting and deterring crime. In the "detecting crime" section, it tells us about the contradicting views of the Metropolitan Police and other parts of society. The Metropolitan Police believe that by reducing the amount that police stop and search, it has increased the amount of crime on streets. Furthermore, they think that it is a fair way of allowing the police to detect crime, without actually arresting them. Statistics in this source tell us that the arrest rate has dropped from 13% in 2003-4 to only 9% in 2009-12. The overall arrest rate - which is persistently lower than 15% - tells us that indeed, stop and search is, in reality, not an effective way of detecting crime.

The arrest rate also depends on what the reason of arrest is. For example: 20% of people who were searched on the suspicion of carrying an offensive weapon were arrested, but in contrast, a mere 9% of people accused for having drugs on them were arrested. In the "detecting crime" section, it informs us of a project that took place in 2008 called "Operation Blunt 2". It tried to prevent the amount the crime rate in London, so as a first attempt at succeeding at this task, they increased the stop and search rate by a significant amount. Unfortunately, by doing this, there was instead a 300% increase in crime! These two factors both go to show how ineffective stop and search actually is and gives two valid reasons why it should be abolished.

The third source (Source 3 from The Telegraph) is a source that has mixed opinions on the law of stop and search. It is an article by someone called Philip Johnson. His opinion is that the chances that you will be stopped and searched depends on your skin colour, age and clothing, for example: you are more likely to get stopped by police if you are a young, black person wearing a hoodie rather than a middle-class white man.

Also, in the article, it provides not only his insight, but also Theresa May and the Tories. The Tories believe that they understand the feelings of the black and ethnic minority voters. They think that our main priority is for us and our kids to be safe on the streets, and that is their reason for having so many police officers on the streets. But this is wrong. Yes, we want safety, but not only from criminals, but the police force themselves. However, in the second section of the article, he makes a contradictory point. He states that the figures that imply that stop and search is more common in black and ethnic

are incorrect. Official facts tell us that black people are 37 times more likely to get stopped, but he says that black and people of the ethnic minorities were stopped 57% of the time, whilst white people were the other 43%.

This does not suggest that the police use stop and search disproportionately. The fourth source that I am analysing (Source 4 from BBC News) says that the drop in police stop and search is causing the higher amount of knife crime. Previously, knife crime in the city rose by 16% whilst stop and search decreased by 41%. The people of the black communities feel that the police are out to get them, however, BBC News disagrees with this. They think that these people are thinking irrationally and need to think logically. The police do not intend to be racist, but they feel that every time they stop someone who is not the same race of them, they are being racist. The police feel that they need to escape from this mentality and that the police officers are just doing their job and don't want to be branded "racist".

The fifth source that I am evaluating (Source 5 from The Evening Standard) is for stop and search, but doesn't give reasons to do with law, but the psychological mind-set of the police force. It says that stop and search rules should be in place, but rather than police using them ineffectively, they are actually afraid to use them in case they get accused of being judgemental towards particular people. A Met Commissioner stated last year that the increase in knife crime is due to the minute amount of stopping and searching because the criminals feel like there is a small chance of getting caught. The last source that I will evaluate is from a website called Equality Human Rights. It says that stop and search is very effective and necessary. It

says that the 'evidence' we see that proves that the police are using stop and search ineffectively is truly false, and there is other, more reliable evidence that proves that by not stopping and searching people that could be a threat to us, the crime levels in Britain would rise greatly. Staffordshire and Cleveland police show that when police abilities are used correctly they can be very helpful in finding criminals roaming the streets. In conclusion, I agree with the first three sources.

In other words, I believe that stop and search needs to be abolished. By allowing this to happen, the police force is becoming a breeding ground for judgemental and racist people. Society today should trust, and not be afraid of the police, but due to all the reports we hear about black people being killed by them, we become weary. I understand that it is human nature to feel naturally protective of your race, but in order to stop and search people, this nature needs to be nurtured into an accepting mind. In order to stop and search people, they need to be judged by their appearance, and isn't that being prejudice? It is teaching people to not trust anyone and it is ruining society today. The damage done is already too hard to repair, but we can try our best to help it as best as we can.

And the first step to doing this is abolishing stop and search - a deed that should have been done decades ago.