Chapter II

Community Policing – A Pro-active Strategy
- A Conceptual Framework
IDEOLOGY

“Uprooting a sapling is easy than uprooting it as a tree”

“Uprooting bad characters in childhood is easy than uprooting the same from a hardened criminal”

Every sociological cultural way of life is well tuned by ancestor under Formal, Informal law & Tradition, but lack of awareness and wanted “omission or commission” by way of “No use, Misuse & Abuse” creates & paves way for social disturbance on long run.

CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Community policing or neighbourhood policing is a policing strategy and philosophy based on the notion that community interaction and support can help control crime, with community members helping to identify suspects, detain vandals and bring problems to the attention of police.

Community policing is an added new Mission for Police to ensure safety and security of the community, in partnership with the people for providing the community the efficient, transparent, responsive law-enforcement machinery which perpetuates the rule of law.

Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police service that include traditional law enforcement as well as prevention, problem solving, community involvement and partnership. The community policing model balances reactive responses with pro-active problem solving, centered on the causes of the crime and disorder. Community policing requires police and citizens to join together as partners in the course of both identifying and effectively addressing issues.

Community based policing represents not so much a new policing alternative as a re-emergence of the original approach to urban public policing practiced in 18th century England. The central principle underlying community based policing is that it involves a full partnership between the community and its police in identifying and ameliorating
local crime and disorder problems (Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994; Grinc, 1994). Crime and disorder, in other words, are the joint property of both the community and the police, and this joint effort is carried out within an interactive, cooperative and reciprocal relationship. Many police administrators are attracted to the idea of community-based policing, however, the biggest issue in police management today lies in the implementation and operation of community or neighbourhood policing.

Community policing maintains that crime and disorder are the joint property of both the community and the police, and that this joint effort is carried out within an interactive, cooperative and reciprocal relationship. This relationship of partnership and participation contrasts with the professional model of policing in which crime is the exclusive property of the police who operate according to the crime control model (Sacco & Kennedy, 1994; Grinc, 1994). Under this model, the two main criteria for police force performance are the proportion of charges laid to offences reported to the police and the response time to calls from the public for police service. The marginal effectiveness of the professional model in the prevention and containment of crime, coupled with the loss of positive police-community relations, resulted in police executives over the past 20 years beginning to look for a new approach to policing (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994; Grinc, 1994; Sacco & Kennedy, 1994).

Community policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime.

Community policing remains many things to many people. A common refrain among proponents is "Community policing is a philosophy, not a program." An equally common refrain among police officers is "Just tell me exactly what you want me to do differently." Some critics, echoing concerns similar to those expressed by police officers, argue that if community policing is nothing more than a philosophy, it is but an empty shell (Goldstein, 1987).

Community policing is a political philosophy in which the police and police department are seen as members of the community, with police officers being part of where they live and work. Cities and counties that subscribe to this philosophy tend to do
much more community work than traditional police departments. This often includes having more police officers who "walk the beat" as opposed to driving around in police cars. The basic idea is to create bonds of trust and reliance between police and the public.

Community policing is the latest reform in law enforcement and is quite popular among politicians, citizens, and police managers. It evolved, in part, from a growing dissatisfaction with traditional police practices and recognition of their shortcomings. The concept of community policing is rather nebulous, and in the field, it assumes many forms, including foot patrol, ministrations, and community organizing. Both internal and external factors have limited the success of its implementation, and so far, it has never become fully operational on a large scale. Overall, existing evaluations suggest that community policing can have a favorable impact on the perceptions of police officers and neighborhood residents.

Sir Robert Peel (1788–1850) **"The Founder of Modern Policing"**- had worked out his principles named as “The Peelian Principles” on the modernization of Police Force. The nine basic principles are often referred to as “The Peelian Principles.” Upon close examination of each of the Peelian principles, not only are direct connections to policing in today's world apparent, but often the nine principles are cited as the basic foundation for current law enforcement organizations and community policing throughout the world. The Peelian Principles on their community are

**Principle 1** - “The basic mission for whom the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder.”

**Principle 2** - “The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police actions.”

**Principle 3** - “Police must secure the willing co-operation of the public in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the respect of the public.”

**Principle 4** - “The degree of co-operation of the public that can be secured diminishes proportionately to the necessity of the use of physical force.”

**Principle 5** - “Police seek and preserve public favour not by catering to the public opinion but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to the law.”
Principle 6 - “Police use physical force to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient.”

Principle 7 - “Police, at all times, should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence.”

Principle 8 - “Police should always direct their action strictly towards their functions and never appear to usurp the powers of the judiciary.”

Principle 9 - “The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it.”

CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Community policing is a difficult concept to define, a helpful way to understand exactly what it encompasses is to identify its key philosophical, tactical and organizational characteristics.

I. Philosophical Characteristics Of Community Policing

According to the philosophy of community policing, local police should provide citizens with formal access to the department's decision-and policy-making process. Neighbourhood residents are encouraged to voice their concerns to the police and it is the responsibility of the police to thoughtfully address these concerns (Cordner). While police professionalism remains important, this quality is no longer equated with officers' being detached and aloof from local citizens.

Under community policing, police officers are expected to initiate frequent personal contacts with community members on their beats, and to interact in an attentive, friendly, and compassionate manner. Enforcing the law and fighting crime remain important elements of policing, but community policing recognizes that, in reality, most police work is oriented toward non-enforcement tasks such as maintaining order and providing social services (Eck and Rosenbaum). Consequently, reducing community
disorder, helping to mitigate residents' fears about crime, solving problems, and caring for individual victims, are all regarded as equally important to making arrests and solving crimes.

II. Tactical Characteristics Of Community Policing

Community policing demands that police departments reform their relationship with local communities, and that police officers change their attitudes and behaviors toward citizens and police work. The following interrelated programs and activities are oriented toward fostering a closer rapport between the community and the local police department, increasing the quantity and quality of police-citizen interactions, and enhancing the capacity of the police to engage in problem-solving partnerships.

III. Organizational Characteristics of Community Policing

Given its shift away from reactive patrol and incident-based responses (the principal tactics of traditional policing), it is clear that the effective implementation of community policing requires significant organizational change. Under the traditional model of policing, U.S. police departments were highly centralized and bureaucratized. The paramilitary structure of the police department was organized hierarchically, with key operational decisions being made by those at the upper levels in the organization. These decisions were then transmitted down the organization in the form of rules and orders, and enforced via a rigid chain of command. Since supervisors were directly responsible for the decisions made by line officers, decision-making authority at the street level was, in theory, subject to their direct control. However, given that a great deal of police work takes place outside of any form of direct supervision, it is not surprising that line officers continued to exercise a great deal of discretion.

In contrast to the traditional model, community policing recognizes that the knowledge and experience of line officers is of critical importance to the police organization. In order to be responsive to community problems and engage in problem solving, the rank and file must have greater autonomy in making decisions (Sparrow). The independence and freedom of line officers to respond to local community problems is encouraged by the decentralization of the police structure, and the formal recognition that police work is, by its very nature, highly discretionary. The creation of community substations in local neighborhoods and the organization's attempt to provide line officers
with continuous access to resources, increases organizational flexibility and the capacity of the police officer for solving problems (Goldstein, 1987). Less emphasis is placed upon written rules as a means of managing officers, and a higher premium is attached to developing an organizational culture that values mentorship and guidance, and which encourages line officers to be innovative in their attempts to find solutions to problems of neighborhood crime and disorder (Cordner). Finally, those departments committed to a community-policing model must develop alternative measures of police effectiveness and accountability. The number of department arrests, or citations, can no longer be regarded as the sine qua non of a police organization that considers order maintenance and social service as of equal importance to crime control. In addition to crime rates, measures that focus on the quality of police service and the effectiveness of problem-solving strategies are useful indicators of how well the police are performing, and to what extent the police are accountable to the community. Are citizens less fearful of neighborhood crime? Are the police responsive to community problems? When interacting with neighborhood residents, are the police courteous and helpful? Have problem-solving strategies been effective? Without changes in the structure of the organization, its management style, and its measures of effectiveness and accountability, community policing cannot be implemented successfully.

COMPLICATING FACTORS ON COMMUNITY POLICING

In little more than a decade, community policing has evolved from a few foot patrol experiments to a comprehensive organizational strategy guiding modern police departments. It is now seen almost universally as the most effective method available for improving police-community relations. Proponents also believe that it will ultimately prove to be an effective crime control strategy.

The earlier research had identified four complicating factors which have made it extremely difficult to determine the effectiveness of community policing, (Gary W. Cordner, July 1995)

1. **Programmatic complexity** - There exist no single definition for community policing or any mandatory set of program elements. Police agencies around the country (and around the world) have implemented a wide array of organizational and operational
innovations under the label "Community Policing", because community policing is not one consistent "thing," it is difficult to say whether "it" works.

2. **Multiple effects** - The number of intended and unintended effects that might accrue to community policing is considerable. Community policing might affect crime, fear of crime, disorder, community relations, and/or police officer attitudes, to mention just a few reasonable impacts. The existence of these multiple effects, as opposed to a single bottom-line principle, severely reduces the likelihood of a simple yes or no answer to the question "Does community policing work?"

3. **Variation in program scope** - The scope of community policing projects has varied from single officer assignments to department-wide efforts. Some of the most positive results have come from projects that involved only a few specialist officers, small special units or narrowly defined target areas. The commonness of these positive results to full-scale department-wide implementation is problematic.

4. **Research design limitations** - Despite heroic efforts by police officials and researchers, most community policing studies have had serious research design limitations. These include lack of control groups, failure to randomize treatments and a tendency to measure only short-term effects. Consequently, the findings of many community policing studies do not have as much credibility as we might hope.

**KEY COMPONENTS OF COMMUNITY POLICING**

*Community Policing is comprised of three key components:* (Clarke and Eck, 2003).

1. **Community Partnerships**

   Collaborative partnerships between the law enforcement agency and the individuals and organizations they serve to develop solutions to problems and increase trust in police.

   1. Other Government Agencies
   2. Community Members/Groups
   3. Nonprofits/Service Providers
   4. Private Businesses
   5. Media
II. Organizational Transformation

The alignment of organizational management, structure, personnel and information systems to support community partnerships and proactive problem solving

III. Problem Solving

The process of engaging in the proactive and systematic examination of identified problems to develop and rigorously evaluate effective responses.

INGREDIENTS OF COMMUNITY POLICING


1. The role of the police in society is fundamentally that of peace officers rather than just law enforcement officers involved with crime control. Because police officers serve and protect the public, a police organization is primarily a service to the public for crime and disorder problems rather than a force focused primarily on crime.

2. In adhering to a police-community partnership, the police adopt the key strategy of community consultation.

3. There is a proactive approach to policing. Rather than passively waiting for calls or randomly patrolling for a presumed deterrent effect, the police anticipate future calls by identifying local crime and disorder problems.

4. A problem-oriented policing strategy is developed which will address the crime and order problems and their underlying causes. A variety of proactive and reactive policing tactics may be used, depending on the problem and the neighbourhood.

5. Broader police responses to underlying causes of problems are introduced, particularly crime prevention activities.

6. Inter-agency cooperation is fostered, whereby there is a branching out to other service delivery agencies to form strategic partnerships and a more cooperative and productive division of labour. This cooperative response places the police within a service network of agencies addressing urban safety and health.

7. Much of the success of policing depends on how well its personnel operate as information managers who engage in interactive policing by routinely exchanging
information on a reciprocal basis with community members through formal contacts and informal networks.

8. Tactics are developed to reduce the fear of being victimized, particularly among children, the elderly and other vulnerable groups in society. The police have a responsibility to ensure that this fear has constructive rather than debilitating effects, so that those who are vulnerable or who view themselves as vulnerable, may take reasonable crime prevention measures.

9. Police officers are permitted to become career generalists rather than specialists and are responsible for a broader range of activities than permitted under the professional policing model. This would include solving neighbourhood crime and disorder problems.

10. Greater responsibility and autonomy for front line officers to undertake neighbourhood policing tactics is facilitated by decentralized police management and resource deployment, which delivers services based on neighbourhoods rather than on shifts.

11. The police organizational structure is changed so that the hierarchical, paramilitary organizational model is replaced by one in which front line policing, where police services are delivered, is the most important part of the organization.

12. The community supports policing priorities, so there is a degree of accountability to the community in terms of a review of progress on those priorities, possibly conducted through public consultations.

HISTORIC EVOLUTION OF COMMUNITY POLICING

In 1960s: Community policing has been evolving slowly since the civil rights movement in the 1960s exposed the weaknesses of the traditional policing model. Even though its origin can be traced to this crisis in police-community relations, its development has been influenced by a wide variety of factors over the course of the past forty years.

The Civil Rights Movement (1960s): Individual elements of community policing, such as improvements in police-community relations, emerged slowly from the political and social upheavals surrounding the civil rights movement in the 1960s. Widespread riots and protests against racial injustices brought government attention to
sources of racial discrimination and tension, including the police. As visible symbols of political authority, the police were exposed to a great deal of public criticism. Not only were minorities underrepresented in police departments, but studies suggested that the police treated minorities more harshly than white citizens (Walker). In response to this civil unrest, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (1967) recommended that the police become more responsive to the challenges of a rapidly changing society.

One of the areas that needed the most improvement was the hostile relationship separating the police from minorities, and in particular the police from African Americans. Team policing, tried in the late 1960s and early 1970s, developed from this concern, and was the earliest manifestation of community policing (Rosenbaum). In an attempt to facilitate a closer police community relationship, police operations were restructured according to geographical boundaries (community beats). In addition, line officers were granted greater decision-making authority to help them be more responsive to neighborhood problems. Innovative though it was, staunch opposition from police managers to decentralization severely hampered successful team implementation, and team policing was soon abandoned.

**In 1970s: Academic interest:** All the attention surrounding the police and the increased availability of government funds for police research spawned a great deal of academic interest. Researchers began to examine the role of the police and the effectiveness of traditional police strategies much more closely. In 1974 the Kansas City Patrol Experiment demonstrated that increasing routine preventive patrol and police response time had a very limited impact on reducing crime levels, allaying citizens' fear of crime, and increasing community satisfaction with police service. Similarly, a study on the criminal investigation process revealed the limitations of routine investigative actions and suggested that the crime-solving ability of the police could be enhanced through programs that fostered greater cooperation between the police and the community (Chaiken, Greenwood, and Petersilia).

The idea that a closer partnership between the police and local residents could help reduce crime and disorder began to emerge throughout the 1970s. One of the reasons why this consideration was appealing to police departments was because the recognition
that the police and the community were co-producers of police services spread the blame for increasing crime rates (Skogan and Hartnett). An innovative project in San Diego specifically recognized this developing theme by encouraging line officers to identify and solve community problems on their beats (Boydstun and Sherry).

**The importance of foot patrol:** It is clear that challenges to the traditional policing model and the assumption that the police could reduce crime on their own, helped generate interest in policing alternatives. However, it was not until the late 1970s that both researchers and police practitioners began to focus more intently on the specific elements associated with community oriented policing. It appeared that foot patrol in Flint significantly reduced citizens' fear of crime, increased officer morale, and reduced crime. In Newark, citizens were actually able to recognize whether they were receiving higher or lower levels of foot patrol in their neighborhoods. In areas where foot patrol was increased, citizens believed that their crime problems had diminished in relation to other neighborhoods. In addition, they reported more positive attitudes toward the police. With its common emphasis on police-community partnerships, parts of the philosophy of problem-oriented policing were readily incorporated into ideas about community policing.

**In 1980s: The beginnings of a coherent community policing approach:** Interest in the development of community policing accelerated with the 1982 publication of an article entitled "Broken Windows." Published in a national magazine, The Atlantic Monthly, the article received a great deal of public exposure. Drawing upon the findings of the Newark Foot Patrol Experiment, James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling constructed a compelling and highly readable argument challenging the traditional crime-fighting role of the police, and exploring the relationship between social disorder, neighborhood decline, and crime.

According to Wilson and Kelling, officers on foot patrol should focus on problems such as aggressive panhandling or teenagers loitering on street corners that reduce the quality of neighborhood life. Similar to a broken window, the aggressive panhandlers, or the rowdy group of teenagers, represent the initial signs of social disorder. Left unchecked they can make citizens fearful for their personal safety and create the impression that nobody cares about the neighborhood. Over time, this unintended behavior
increases the level of fear experienced by law abiding citizens, who begin to withdraw from neighborhood life. As residents retreat inside their homes, or even choose to leave the area altogether, local community controls enervate and disorderly elements take over the neighborhood. Eventually, this process of neighborhood deterioration can lead to an increase in predatory crime. Wilson and Kelling argue that by patrolling beats on foot and focusing on initial problems of social disorder, the police can reduce fear of crime and stop the process of neighborhood decay.

Goldstein's work and Wilson and Kelling's article sparked widespread interest in problem solving, foot patrol, and the relationship between the police and the community, all of which were becoming broadly associated with community policing. Police departments were quick to seize upon the ideas and publicity generated by these scholars, and in the 1980s they experimented with numerous problem and community oriented initiatives. In 1986 problem-oriented policing programs were implemented in Baltimore County, Maryland, and Newport News, Virginia (Taft; Eck and Spelman). In Baltimore County, small units composed of fifteen police officers were assigned to specific problems and responsible for their successful resolution. In Newport News, the police worked with the community to identify burglaries as a serious problem in the area. The solution involved the police acting as community organizers and brokering between citizens and other agencies to address the poor physical condition of the buildings. Ultimately the buildings were demolished and residents relocated, but more importantly problem-oriented policing demonstrated that the police were capable of adopting a new role, and it did appear to reduce crime (Eck and Spelman).

An initiative to reduce the fear of crime in Newark and Houston through different police strategies, such as storefront community police stations and a community-organizing police response team, was successful in reducing citizens' fear of crime (Pate et al.). Interestingly, the results in Houston suggested that generally the program was more successful in the areas that needed it least. Whites, middle-class residents, and homeowners in low-crime neighborhoods were more likely to visit or call community substations than minorities, those with low incomes, and renters (Brown and Wycoff). These studies further catalyzed interest in community policing and problem solving, and from 1988 to 1990 the National Institute of Justice sponsored the Perspectives on Policing Seminars at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. Not only did this help
popularize these innovations in policing, but it helped scholars and practitioners refine and synthesize the mixture of ideas and approaches labeled community-and problem-oriented policing. One policing seminar paper in particular received a great deal of scholarly attention. The Evolving Strategy of Policing, by George Kelling and Mark Moore, summarized the history of policing and identified what was unique about recent developments in the field. In contrasting three different policing approaches and finishing with the advent of the "community problem-solving era," Kelling and Moore appeared to be sounding a clarion call, announcing the arrival of a complete paradigm shift in law enforcement.

In the face of such bold proclamations, it is unsurprising that scholars began to examine community policing more critically, and queried whether it could fulfill its advocates' many promises. Contributors to an edited volume on community policing entitled Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality? noted that without a workable definition of community policing, its successful implementation was difficult. They also suggested that community policing might just be "Old Wine in New Bottles" or "even a community relations exercise employed by police departments to boost their legitimacy in the eyes of the public" (Greene and Mastrofski). The outgrowth of these thoughtful criticisms was to encourage researchers to design more rigorous methodological studies that could evaluate the effects of community policing more clearly.

In 1990s and beyond: Community Policing as a National Reform Movement: By the 1990s, community policing had become a powerful national movement and part of everyday policing parlance. Encouraged by the federal funds made available through the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), police departments across the country shifted their attention toward implementing community policing reforms. Annual conferences on community policing became commonplace, and researchers began to study community-policing programs in cities all over America. Besides the availability of funds and promising research findings, the political appeal of community policing and its close affinity to long-term trends in societal organization contributed to the widespread acceptance of community policing (Skogan and Hartnett).

Given the large concentration of African Americans and Hispanics in American cities, groups who have historically been engaged in a hostile relationship with the police,
an approach to law enforcement that promised to improve police-community relations by working with, rather than targeting, racial and ethnic minorities held great appeal for local politicians concerned with pleasing their constituents. In addition, community policing reflected a more general underlying trend in the structure, management, and marketing practices of large organizations. In contrast to rigid bureaucracies and their dependence on standard rules and policies, decentralization created smaller, more flexible units to facilitate a speedier and more specialized response to the unique conditions of different organizational environments. Rather than emphasizing control through a strict organizational hierarchy, management layers were reduced, organizational resources were made more accessible, and both supervisors and their subordinates were encouraged to exercise autonomy and independence in the decision-making process. Finally, the extent to which consumers were satisfied with the market produce, in this case police services, became an important criteria for measuring police performance (Skogan and Hartnett).

At the outset of the twenty-first century, the momentum behind community policing shows no signs of slowing down. Even though police departments may have been slow to adopt all the philosophical precepts, tactical elements, and organizational changes commensurate with the entire community-policing model, its slow and steady evolution suggests that it is a permanent fixture on the landscape of American policing (Zhao and Thurman).

HERITAGE ON COMMUNITY POLICING

When man started living in groups primarily for the sake of survival against the onslaught of animals and other rival groups of human beings, the seed for emergence of the concept of family and society, was firmly sown. The emergence of this concept slowly – but, firmly formed the nucleus of the evolution of basic rule of survival of the fittest. A leader who was to be in charge of enforcing the rules of survival and punishing those who infringed them also came to exist. This leader, in order to ensure that his writ ran, gathered a group of able bodied persons under his command. This, one can dare say, was the forefather of the police force of today.

Contradictory to the contention of Chanakya in his magnum opus “ARTHASASTHRA” that “prostitution was the oldest profession of the human race, it is
perhaps the Police, in whatever nascent form it started functioning, is the oldest profession of the society. The primary function of this group was to carry out the orders of the leader, to protect the women, children, infirm and aged members of their Society, while the others went out in search of food, hunting and other pursuits or. This arrangement of organized existence of a particular group of human beings can be loosely termed as a “Community” which delegated some of its Protective needs and powers to a select group of men under a leader, aforesaid. This is the original beginning of the evolution of the concept of “Police” and “Policing” at the primitive stage.

It is well known that the term “Police” actually takes its origin from the Greek word “POLiS” which means City or Town. History records that, in the course of the evolution of ‘society’ the human race started living in what is called “city states” = like Sparta for example - which were nothing but fortified townships under a leader, who later come to be styled as “King”. The king invariably recruited and trained a body of men who carried out the functions of guards (to ensure the security of the royalty, the Fortress etc), Army (to fight against external aggression and fight for territorial expansion) and the Police (to ensure internal security of the state and citizens). It is not the intention of this paper to elaborate on the formation, administration and functioning of the city states our interest is limited to the evolution of Police and the system of Policing in the early stages of our civilization.

The important point to note here is that the Community in the course of development of human civilization had formed the Police in order to ensure its own internal security. In this process, the community had delegated some of its social responsibilities like maintenance of general peace within the community itself to the police. Laws and rules were eventually framed to ensure the common goal of the Community and enforcement of these rules were also delegated to the Police. Enforcement inherently meant apprehension of offenders and imposing due punishment on the members of the community who endangered the general safety of the fellow members of the community.

As civilization developed, the king / the society (community) found that the power of enforcement of the rules and the punishment of those who infringed these rules should not be in the hands of a single authority. Eventually, in the form of its existence to-day throughout the world, the system of governance can be summarized thus:
(i) The King/ Parliament
(ii) The Legislature to frame rules / laws etc,
(iii) The Executive including the police to enforce these rules and laws as well as to bring the offenders to book
(iv) The Judiciary to render fair justice and punish those found guilty.

Thus, the Police which form the back-bone of the executive have been entrusted with the following responsibilities, by the community:

i. Maintenance of Law and Order
ii. Prevention and Detection of Crime and to bring offender to justice
iii. Regulation of Traffic
iv. Gather intelligence on matters affecting the security of the state.
v. Render existence to the community during natural calamities.

How these duties are enforced or abused or how the functions of the police are coloured by those involved in the governance of their state, or how corruption and corrupt practices have eclipsed the effective functioning of the system of policing in any country is a matter of debate. The point is to reiterate that the system of policing in any civilized society is but a delegation of the powers and responsibilities of the community at large to the police which expected to discharge its functions freely and fairly.

It therefore becomes the responsibility of the community to bear the cost of policing in a particular state/ country / nation etc. this involves recruitment of personnel, training them, maintaining them, paying them, as well as acquisition of modern equipment, transport, forensic support and a plethora of other things which are essential for the sustenance of policing in its peak form. In the modern context, it is the tax payer of the community who bears unavoidable and inescapable cost. With the advent of advancement of civilization and science, the population graph and the crime graph keeps rising enormously making the cost of Police and Policing also rise correspondingly. New forms of crime like cyber crime, white-collar crime terrorist offences, extremist violence etc. not only boost the cost of policing tremendously but also increase the burden of workload of the police. The Net result is the gap of police: Population keeps the gap ever expanding, adversely eating into the efficiency of the police force.
The situation today is both the community and the police once again find themselves at historic cross roads and are compelled to rethink on the role of the police in the modern context; with the two pronged motive of cutting the cost of policing on the one hand and increasing the efficiency and competence of the police on the other.

It is in this context the magic concept of “Community-Policing” has taken birth. In simple terms, the community which at its nascent stage, had delegated some of its functions concerning its own collective or individual security to the Police in whatever form and name it started functioning – has identified some of these functions which have lost their relevance and priority over the years. Some of these non essential responsibilities have been taken back by the community from the core duties of the present day Police. Such responsibilities have been and are being reassigned to some other less experienced and/or voluntary formations, thus releasing the Police to take up their other important duties and new responsibilities with renewed vigour. This concept of participation of the community in matters touching upon Policing is aptly named as “Community Policing”

In India, in general and the UT of Pondicherry in particular, some of the well known formations drawn from amongst the public/society/Community sector are the Home Guards (Which has since blossomed into almost a regular supplementary group of the Police), CLG (Community Liaison Group), FOP (Friends of police), the CTC (Children’s Traffic Corps), FWG (Fisherman Watch Group) Traffic volunteers & Traffic wardens and SPOs (Special Police Officers). Many members of the public are not even aware that these voluntary or honourary or semi-legal organizations are indirect forms of community policing. It must be said that, these limbs of community-policing are at the moment in various stages of evolution and are yet to be channelized into proper, empowered, fine-tuned legalized organizations to take up their assigned roles in Community Policing.

In addition to the above formations, the community residing in a particular sector of a residential colony is also enrolled by the local Police to assist them in aspects of micro-management of Policing in that area/location. But, such activities are not really structured and are largely left to the initiative of the local residents or to the local police officers of the cutting-edge level like the SHO,s. Normally, such aspects of community policing start with a bang in some places and end with a whimper. The main reason for
this state of affairs is, more often than not because the interest of the participating community fades away due to many reasons like internal squabbles, vested interests political interference and the transfer of the SHO concerned.

As far as India is concerned, since the colonial powers were interested only in the perpetuation of their rule at low cost, they let the community especially in sub-urban and rural areas, to look after their own local policing requirements. The office of the village-head-man is an ingenious invention in this direction. Normally this prestigious appointment was held through hierarchical succession by the most prominent family-head of the village-usually by the landed gentry. Besides carrying out routine, revenue / administration functions, the village headman carried out many Police functions like control and prevention of petty crimes keeping a tab on movements of suspicious strangers and passing any useful information to the occasional visiting beat police constable. When a serious crime like murder occurred it was his duty to report it to the Station House Officer (SHO) of their concerned police station, He was also of immense assistance in the investigation of criminal cases and production of eye-witness including stock witnesses etc. Naturally, he wielded considerable influence with the local Police and thus commanded respect and fear of the local population. The village head-man was an essential bridge between the community and the police. The SHO used this office as an effective tool of community policing. After the advent of freedom, the entry of local politicians who sought to share power in his affairs of the locality, has ended the authority and usefulness of this aspect of community policing.

An interesting form of "POLICING THE POLICE" by the community was also in vogue in the system of policing, for example, a "point book" or a "visiting book" was placed in some important houses of the village. Any visiting police man is expected to sign this register whenever he visited the locality on beat duty. The visiting police was also expected to discuss the general law and order situation in the area and gather any useful information on the movement of suspicious elements in turn to he reported to the SHO. A member of the public who is the holder of the point- book signed in the beat-book carried by the policeman. A "sample signature book" was maintained in the Police Station containing the signatures of the point-book holders for cross-check verification, whenever the SHO or other senior officers visited the village. They also had discussions on crime and criminals with the point-book holders who were usually tasked to carryout simple police functions like surveillance, apprehension of wanted officers. It can be seen
that in this system there is an underlying aspect of police-community relations as well as community policing.

In urban areas, **Community policing is being promoted** here and there in a much disorganized manner without any legal support as said earlier. These activities which are purely as the **initiative of individual police officers** fade away soon after they came into existence. In conclusion as it stands today Community Policing in India can be summed up as follows.

(a) **Night Rounds:** In places where crimes like house-breaking are rampant, normally the youth of the locality arrange for patrol either along with the police or with their permission. This goes a long way in the matter of preventing crime in a particular area. It must be noted that such voluntary groups have no by all authority paved.

b) **Neighbourhood watch:** In some urban cities, where normally both the spouses are away at work during this day, the neighbors keep a watch on their houses / area and report suspicious happenings to the nearest police station.

c) **Special Police Officers / Friends of Police / Community Liaison Group, etc:** These groups are basically voluntary organizations which operate in tandem with the concerned police. Special police officers are, however, appointed under the Indian Police Act to perform some delegated functions of the police. In states like Jammu / Kashmir, SPOs function in large number as a supplement to the regular police.

The bottom line of all this is, the community participation in policing-Community Policing- has already taking roots in various forms although most of them do not enjoy any legal power, or protection.

In brief, policing and community Policing find themselves at the cross roads of evolution today. The time has come when many of the conventional attributes of to-day’s Police which are nothing but gradual delegation of the powers and responsibilities of the community are to be put on micro-examination. **It is time that the community takes back some of the inessential duties from the Police and delegate fresh responsibilities which are in keeping with the evolution of society to-day.** It is time that Community Policing is given its due recognition and importance that it deserves. There is an urgent need, to define the parameters of community policing and arm them with necessary legal and executive powers to take on additional police functions and duties. The regular police
also should pause and ponder and identify areas of responsibilities which it should happily share with the community without standing on false prestige. The various groups of community Police which are in existence today in various parts of the country should be brought together under a **codified uniform umbrella** in order to achieve the best results.

**THE CHARACTER AND ROLE OF A POLICE OFFICER FOR COMMUNITY POLICING**

**Honour** - When you wear the badge, you represent not only yourself and your department, but an ideal your community expects from its police. By wearing the uniform you are held to a higher standard; using your best behavior with people using their worst behavior, and treating everyone - even those you are arresting - with respect and professionalism.

**Courage** - It is a very special person who is drawn to a life of public service. By taking an oath to protect and serve, you bravely agree to face danger yourself to save others. You are willing to enter situations that other people flee. As a first responder, you symbolize hope, rescue and safety for someone on what is often the worst day of their life.

**Commitment** - People who are right for policing have a real passion for the job. You are the person a community comes to know and rely on to solve on-going problems. With creativity, communication and commitment, you will often see a very real and tangible result for your efforts. It is one of very few jobs where you really have a chance to make a difference in people's lives every day.

**Communication Skills** - Good communication involves two skills: talking and listening. When you get a call to investigate an incident, the victims, witnesses, and perpetrators often will be upset and inarticulate. Listen to everyone and listen carefully. First impressions of what happened at a crime scene may not always be correct. Also, a police officer should be able to speak to others politely, briefly and firmly. Speech, not force, is often the best means of resolving a volatile situation as expeditiously as possible.
Integrity - A police officer faces constant temptation both inside and outside the department. Not a few criminals have tried to bribe their way out of an arrest. Officers may also handle large amounts of cash at a drug bust before the actual amount has been counted in the evidence room. At the same time, many departments observe a "code of silence" in which officers protect corrupt coworkers even if they do not indulge in misconduct themselves. And an officer will encounter incidents in which witnesses or offenders accuse him or her of not following proper law enforcement protocol. In all of these situations, only integrity will allow an officer to do the job. No amount of supervision can substitute for honor and honesty.

Community Policing - Community Policing is an attempt on policing business to bridge the deviation with the assistance of the society presuming that society adopts ideal business while society and criminals adopt real business.

Bridge the deviation - It is also observed that Policing is an Ideal business as “In accordance to Law”, while the society engages in real business as “In accordance to Sentiments” with hybrid social cultural leaning towards SENTIMENTS. Society mutually adopts 50% of their formal & Informal law mixing with 50% of sentimental feelings with knowledge. The various deviated business mutually conducted and well known to all but spoken ideally where Police & its agencies emerging as a small wing from the society could not be blamed and they could not part to play alone. The existence of ”In accordance to Law” & “In accordance to Sentiments” totaling for a hybrid law reflects that the policing concept and constitutional frame needs modification to bridge the deviation.

The only difficulty arising from the expectation to maintain a crime control orientation, while being asked to perform other duties of the public is the creation of considerable confusion and uncertainty among police officers about their proper role.

The discrepancy between the traditional perception of the police as “crime fighters” and the reality of police activities has given rise to debate on whether policing services should be reorganized to more accurately reflect the tasks most officers are performing or whether the police should maintain their current organization which is based on crime control as the primary function.
COMMUNITY POLICING IN INDIA

In India we are not able to understand and follow our own social culture but transfused by the attraction of western culture for easy pleasure and to draw the attention of the society as fantasy. The society had gradually become polluted with the above hybrid individual, who forms part with every arm of governments and other agencies.

COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAMMES IN INDIA

Over the past few years, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiatives (CHRI’s) police unit under access to justice programme has been collecting and compiling experiments on Community Policing and Outreach Programmes in the different states of India.

1. Community Policing: Friends of Police, Tamil Nadu

The Friends of Police is a holistic and pro-active concept that lends a psychological approach to policing. It is a true example of police public partnership, where citizens have been empowered and with the help of the police.

Friends of Police provide opportunities for ordinary citizens to effectively contribute to the prevention and detection of crime. Any member of the public, male or female who is not involved in civil or criminal case can become a member of FOP. The members of FOP can provide useful information leading to solving of crimes. FOP members can also prevent any abuse of Police power because of easy accessibility to the station house officer and other senior personnel.

Role of FOP:

- Beats and night Patrols
- Assistance in traffic
- Crime prevention
- Information collection
- Assistance in Law and Order Maintenance
- Involvement in Prohibition Work
“Friends of Police” movement has been found helpful in creating channels for receiving the right information at the right time. It has also helped the police to come closer to the community. It has tried to impart fairness, transparency and impartiality in the working of the police. This system is functioning effectively in all districts of Tamil Nadu over the last five years.

2. Samarth Yojna Community Policing Experiment, Coimbatore City:

Coimbatore City, rightly called the ‘Manchester of South India’, is a city which has witnessed two communal holocausts, religious and ethnic riots, rampant violence, inhuman brutality and increasing criminal activities etc. It was because of this appalling situation that, Mr.K.Radhakrishnan, IPS, decided to implement the community policing experiment to bring the situation under control. The main objective of this experiment was to perceive and resolve the communal problem and also to win the confidence of the people whose faith and confidence in the police had gradually eroded.

3. Trichy Community Policing:

Before the advent of community policing initiative in Trichy, the crime rate was very high. There were racial and religious conflicts, rioting, murder, mayhem and other anti social activities. The police not only had to challenge forces of fundamentalism and lawlessness they also had to instill a sense of confidence amongst people. To achieve this, Mr. Tripathy, an IPS officer introduced the following community policing strategies.

➢ Beat Officers’ System
➢ Complaint/Suggestion Box System
➢ Wide Area Network (WAN)
➢ Help line for Women in Distress
➢ Slum Adoption Programme

4. The Tuticorin Experiment:

In this experiment, a number of police camps in the form of Spot Redressal of Public Grievances were organized in communally sensitive villages. The main objectives of these camps were to restore the confidence of the people on the police force, to improve the police public relationship and to maintain law and order situation. In these camps nobody is allowed to act as a mediator between the police and the public .The police officers sit on the ground with the village people and petty matters which have the
potential of becoming law and order problems or even grave crimes are settled on the spot
to the satisfaction of both parties. As a gesture of goodwill, the police attend and
participate in the religious festivals and also arrange sports activities to build rapport with
the community.

5. ‘PRAHARI’: The Community Policing Initiative in Assam:

Community Policing in Assam was started on 3/7/1996 when a meeting of the
citizens under Panbazar Police Station in Guwahati was convened by the S.P. city Shri
Kuladhar Saikia, to discuss the concept and launching of “neighbourhood watch scheme”
to promote policing through community participation. The community policing initiative
was also aimed at changing the attitude of the average policeman at the police stations
towards the public, to make them people friendly and to improve their living and working
conditions. The goal of PRAHARI, was to tackle social problems and bring the police
and community closer.

6. ‘AASWAS’: Assam Police

This initiative was taken by the Assam police to combat violence and insurgency
and also to extend a gesture of affection towards children and those undergoing trauma.
The Project Aashwas was launched on the 14th November 2001, coinciding with the
Children’s Day, by the Honorable Chief Minister of Assam, Shri Tarun Gogoi. The nodal
officer is Mr. B.J. Mahanta who can be contacted at: 0361-2456971. Sensitization
campaigns have been undertaken in several districts of Assam. Aashwas has identified a
cluster of seven villages in each of seven districts where there is a history of ethnic or
terrorist violence and such campaigns have integrated the community with the police and
have evoked a tremendous response.

7. Community Policing Initiative in Himachal Pradesh

In order to mobilize public support and involve active public participation in
prevention and detection of crime and maintenance of law and order, a Community
Policing Scheme was introduced in Himachal Pradesh in November 2000. It was initially
introduced in 22 out of 83 police stations in the State.

Under this scheme a police station is divided into sectors corresponding to wards
of Panchayat / NAC. Bigger wards have more sectors. All the household members in a
particular sector constituted the People’s Policing Committee of that sector. Each sector
has an Active group consisting of 6 respectable persons of that locality, one Home Guard, one Chowkidar, and one Police Constable / Head Constable as Secretary. One member of the Active Group is the convener of the group. As a result of positive feedback of the State, the scheme was introduced to all the police stations of the state.

8. Community policing experiment in Punjab, Ludhiana

The community policing experiment in Ludhiana was launched on October 12, 2002. Thirty member community groups were set up in 400 beats and community members were to sit together every fortnight or once a month to discuss major problems confronting the area. Each group comprising a beat officer, associated with the resource center was to “police the community”.

9. Community Policing in Punjab, Amritsar

In Amritsar, Mr G.S. Sahota, DIG, Border Range took them to provide a single-window redressal cell facility to solve various problems of the people. Since a lot of people visit police stations for passport verification, arm licenses and for grievances such centers were equipped with computers, telephones and a senior SP was appointed as in charge of the one-stop service. It was proposed that the centre would have help-lines, have doctors of the Health Department to take care of the accident cases etc. The centre would also establish women and children help lines and in addition improve the police public relations. Subsequently, Community Policing Centres were opened in six police ranges in the state.

10. Community Policing Initiative in Kolkata, West Bengal

The community policing initiative in Kolkata involves the civil society and the police personnel. These programmes are:

A. Drug Awareness Programmes:
B. Sports Activity:
C. Nabadisha:
D. Prabaha:
E. Bravery and Honesty Award:
F. Counseling Centres:
G. Claude Martin Fund:
H. Poor Box:
13. “MAITHRI”: Community Policing In Andhra Pradesh

“Maithri” a community policing initiative was launched in the year 2000, by the Andhra Pradesh Police throughout the state of Andhra Pradesh. The mission of Maithri was to ‘render courteous, compassionate and caring responsive police personnel and increase public confidence in police with respect to maintenance of peace and order and a feeling of safety from crime.’ It rests on the belief that contemporary community problems require a decentralized and personalized police approach, which involved citizens in the process of policing themselves.

14. Mohalla Committee Movement Trust, Mumbai:

Citizen-police committees were set up in the wake of the 1992-93 Hindu-Muslim communal riots that paralyzed Mumbai (Bombay) and killed 1000 people. The Mohalla Committee was formed under the initiative, of former Mumbai Commissioner, J.F. Ribiero. The chairman of the Mohalla Committee Movement Trust was Mr. Deshmukh. After the 1992 riots, people from all walks of life who were the survivors came together and along with the police worked out a simple workable idea that became a reality. The Mohalla Committee which is also known as the Peace Committee, has now become a part of the civil society structure in a city that usually has little time or mental space.

The concept works on the simple principle: Give people some power and make them responsible for it. Every Mohalla Committee and there are 24 in the city-has a sizeable number of people from the area who are regarded as elders, or who have a standing of their own, or have the charisma to make others listen to them. The primary task of the committee members is to maintain more than cordial relations between the two communities, largely Hindus and Muslims. The members intervene in disputes, even personal or domestic quarrels if need be, organize little meetings or a variety of programmes and liaison with the nearest police station in their efforts to maintain peace. If trouble breaks out they broker peace too. If rumours go around they defuse them before it can cause any harm.

15. Community Policing Initiative in Pune

In Pune Community policing initiative was taken up by the police after the 1992 riots which killed thousands of people and destroyed the confidence of the people on the police system. To prevent future communal flare-ups and to restore the public confidence
Mohalla committees were set up throughout Pune. There are 30 odd Mohalla committees in Pune where committee members work with the police to maintain peace and order. Mohalla committee meetings are held before the onset of every festival to maintain peace and communal harmony in the locality. In this way, every beat officer should hold a meeting of the Mohalla Committee once in every month. Likewise, the Senior Inspector of Police of the concerned police station holds a meeting at least once in every three months which is attended by the Assistant Commissioner of Police.

16. Chhattisgarh

Over the last two years or so, there has been some attempt in community policing in Chhattisgarh.

17. The Parivar Paramarsh Kendra, Raigarh District, Madhya Pradesh

A unique effort in community policing where the Kendra focuses on resolving family conflicts, by identifying the causes that contribute to family discord. Here the Kendra takes up a social decision making role and strives to save a family from being broken. It mainly acts as a center for counseling family problems. The idea behind such a venture is to improve the social environment, in a city by solving family disputes. By solving personal problems at an early stage, the police personnel have found that this often prevents criminal tendencies within an individual to further violate the law.

The Kendra was formed under the umbrella of the District Police, Raigarh and was initiated on 26th October 1996. Though the programme lacks statutory backing, the Kendra has been functioning successfully over the last seven years and has contributed a lot to society. By satisfying the community by involving them in performing such an important service as saving families from breaking, the police has also effectively improved their image from being authoritarian and be a more people friendly police.

18. Gram / Nagar Raksha Samiti, Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

In this Community Policing experiment, Core Groups or CLGs are formed at the S.D.O.P level, Police Station level, Beat level and Village level. At each of these levels the Core Group comprises of 15/20 members, 4/5 members, 2/3 members and 5/15 members respectively. The main coordinator in this system is the S.D.O.P. At the village level, the Head Rakshak coordinates the core group, which is called the Raksha Samiti.
It was felt that it was imperative that the police are sensitized about their need to interact with the public and to cater to the expectations of the public. Likewise it was considered necessary that the public be educated about certain things like Cognizable and Non-cognizable offences, Bailable and Non-bailable Offences, basic laws, rights of general public and the conditions under which the police work.

In this experiment, the community’s support was sought,

- To help police in any type of crime prevention
- Giving information to police about any anti social or criminal activity in the area.
- Taking care of villagers and properties of every villager
- Helping police in arrest of proclaimed offenders
- Disaster Management
- Maintaining law and order

Apart from that the police along with the public took initiative in organizing:

- Nasha Mukti Abhiyan (Drug de-addiction Programme)
- Parivar Paramarsh Kendra (Family Counselling Centre)
- Blood Donation Camps
- Tree Plantation
- Jan Jagran Abhiyan (Mass Awareness Programmes)
- Chalit Thana (Mobile Police Stations)
- Meetings and Conferences

Together with the community the police has been able to prevention and detect crime. The community has helped the police in solving several cases, apprehending criminals and recovering stolen goods. Involving the community and educating them about the origin and purpose of the Naxalism effectively addressed the Naxalite menace in this area. Drinking water huts were opened and village patrolling was initiated in the villages. To assist the police in their work, the Village Rakshaks have been given whistle, lathis and torches by the up-sarpanchs. 42 members have also been given awards by the honourable minister of the district on the occasion of Independence Day 2002, for putting forward their honest efforts in assisting the police in crime control.
19. Puducherry Police

A. **Fishermen Watch Group**: Fishermen Watch Groups were formed in every fishermen village to prevent infiltration through sea without any payment or remuneration or sundry expenses. This was very active against LTTE during crisis. Need based periodical review is being conducted.

B. **Community Liaison Group (CLG)**: Local Volunteers were grouped to form CLG, eliminating political persons for close interaction between Community and Police without any payment or remuneration or sundry expenses. Need based periodical review is being conducted. There is no active participation, however it is SHO based. This scheme becomes fruitless on the influence of various ambient factors, politics and groupism.

C. **Neighbourhood Watch Scheme**: Team of youths assisted by village head and beat constables is formed in every village / colony / Nagar to conduct daily night patrolling on rotational basis without any payment or remuneration or sundry expenses. This scheme becomes fruitless on the influence of various ambient factors, politics and groupism.

D. **Special Police Officer @ Special Friends of Police**: Voluntaries were invited and admitted as SPO @ SFP. Their voluntary willful participation for the conduct of regular duties such as beat patrolling, bandobust, investigation, collection of intelligence, etc is invited without any payment or remuneration or sundry expenses. There is no active participation, however it is SHO based. This scheme became fruitless as most of the volunteers want to move with Senior Officer for social Status.

E. **Traffic Warden**: SPO’s @ SFP’s who volunteer to do traffic duties were posted to man the traffic points by terming them as Traffic Warden without any payment or remuneration or sundry expenses. There is no good response, however the volunteers were utilized during festival seasons but the turnover is very less.

The schemes specified above were introduced since 1991-92. It faces ups and downs in synchronization with interest of the top leader DGP / IGP or SHO of Police Station for timely help and assistance with no support from the Police sub-culture. No guidelines / law to regulate them and they were not legally implemented nor legally
accepted. The participants have to participate as without any payment of remuneration or sundry expenses. They have no legal support. There is no scope of encouragement to the participants. Some of such team members are interested only to interact with senior officers as part of their social status. Some even misuse or exploit it in various ways to which they have opportunity / chance.

IMPLEMENTATION STATUS COMMUNITY POLICING

The concept of community policing is relatively new to the Commonwealth countries. Due to their colonial past, people never saw the police as a friendly force. Instead, the mutual trust quotient has always been low as policemen in these countries were seen not as protectors but as tools of a foreign power to keep people under control and in awe of their colonial masters. Thus, historically speaking, people have always feared the police, and this fear, this gap, this widening mistrust between the police and the public has remained intact till date to a considerable degree.

Community policing is a policy and a strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved police services and improved police legitimacy through a pro-active reliance on community resources that seeks to change crime-causing conditions.

Common to all social outbursts is an underlying tension precipitated by a perception of social and economic deprivation and a sense of injustice due to unpopular judicial decisions or law enforcement behavior act as a triggering event. Such outbursts are not unique to democratic societies, as is evidenced by the Tiananmen Square incident in China and the recent riots in Thailand. What is common to all societies is the enactment of formal and informal mechanisms of social control; what are different are the method used and its degree of acceptability. When the jury in the Rodney King trial found the police officers not guilty, that verdict became the triggering event for the crowd's collective behavior and the ensuing rampage, which far surpassed the damage to life and property caused by the riots of the 1960s.

In the last few years, attention has been given to a new form of policing strategy that has come to be known as community policing. The "professional" trend in policing
that was typical of the 1950s resulted in a greater sense of isolation of police officers from the communities they served. In the early 1980s, in reaction to this isolation, it seemed as though police chiefs and commissioners in several countries (most notably Canada, England, Israel and the United States) jointly decided to adopt this new community policing strategy.

Although the trend toward community policing is growing in the U.S. and throughout the world, it is still actively practiced by a relatively small number of forces, and it suffers from the lack of a clear definition, consistent programmatic implementation and measurable criteria for success. There are some encouraging signs of serious community policing efforts in cities such as Baltimore, Houston, Kansas City, Madison, New York, Newark, Portland, Santa Ana and Savannah in the U.S.; Edmonton, Halifax and Toronto in Canada; Exeter and Manchester in England; and in Israel. Communities have to set up its official law enforcement arm to deal with criminals, with order breakers and law violators, yet most law enforcement activities focus on service delivery that is largely non-criminal in nature.

For better Community policing implementation is sensitized as follows.

“Uprooting a sapling is easy then Uprooting it as a tree”, likewise “Uprooting bad characters in childhood is easy then uprooting the same from a hardened criminal”

Every sociological cultural way of life is well tuned by ancestor under Formal, Informal law & Tradition, but lack of awareness and wanted “omission or commission” by way of “No use, Misuse & Abuse” creates & paves way for social disturbance on long run.