CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introducing Community Policing

Community policing is the collaboration between the police and the general public or community which detects the problems in the society and solves those problems and also it’s a joint vigilance on forthcoming anti-social elements in the society. In community policing only police are no longer having the responsibility of maintain the law and order, but all the members of the community or society also become the active associates in the attempt to improve or develop safety and security of the society and in improving the quality of living. It is found on close, mutually beneficial ties between police and people.

Community policing has far-reaching implications. The expanded outlook on crime control and prevention, the new emphasis on making community members active participants in the process of problem solving, and the patrol officers’ pivotal role in community policing require profound changes within the police organization. The neighborhood patrol officer, backed by the police organization, helps community members mobilizes support and resources to solve problems and enhance their quality of life. Community members voice their concerns, contribute advice, and take action to address these concerns. Creating a constructive partnership will require the energy, creativity, understanding, and patience of all involved.

Police must treat people with respect and sensitivity to build this trust for an effective community partnership. The use of unnecessary force and arrogance, aloofness, or rudeness at any level of the agency will reduce the willingness of community members to ally themselves with the police. The effective mobilization of community support requires different approaches in different communities. Establishing trust and obtaining cooperation are often easier in middle-class and affluent communities than in poorer communities, where mistrust of police may have a long history. Building bonds in some neighborhoods may involve supporting basic social institutions (e.g., families, churches, schools, government and private institutes, banks etc) that have been weakened by pervasive crime or disorder. The creation of viable communities is necessary if lasting alliances that nurture cooperative efforts are
to be sustained. Under community policing, the police become both catalysts and facilitators in the development of these communities.

1.2 History and Geneses of the Community Policing

Community policing has been developing 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.

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 (Boydston and Sherry).

**The importance of foot patrol (1970s).**

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. The major catalyst for this change was the reimplementation of foot patrol in U.S. cities. In 1978, Flint, Michigan, became the first city in a generation to create a city-wide program that took officers out of their patrol cars and assigned them to walking beats (Kelling and Moore). Meanwhile, a similar foot patrol program was launched in Newark, New Jersey.

The difference between these two lay primarily in their implementation. In Flint, foot patrol was part of a much broader program designed to involve officers in community problem-solving (Trojanowicz). In contrast, the *Newark Foot Patrol Experiment* (NFPE) in Kansas City was the model of study of preventive patrol on the study of preventive patrol. The results of this attempt were encouraging and helped
deter crime and criminals. Foot patrol in Flint considerably 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. Similarly, those officers in Newark who were assigned to foot patrol experienced a more positive relationship with community members, but, in contrast to Flint, foot patrol did not appear to reduce crime. The finding that foot patrol reduced citizen fear of crime demonstrated the importance of a policing tactic that fostered a closer relationship between the police and the community.

As foot patrol was capturing national consideration, Herman Goldstein proposed a new approach to policing that helped synthesize some of the key elements of community policing into a broader and more innovative framework. Foot patrol and police-community cooperation were integral parts of Goldstein's approach, but what distinguished problem-oriented policing (POP) was its focus on how these factors could contribute to a police officer's capacity to identify and solve neighborhood problems. By delineating a clear series of steps, from identifying community problems to choosing among a broad array of alternative solutions to law enforcement, Goldstein showed how increased cooperation between the police and community could do more than reduce fear of crime. A close familiarity with local residents could also provide the police with an invaluable resource for identifying and solving the underlying causes of seemingly unrelated and intractable community problems. With its common emphasis on police-community partnerships, parts of the philosophy of problem-oriented policing were readily incorporated into ideas about community policing.

The beginnings of a coherent community policing approach (1980s)

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 untended 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. 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 home owners 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.
Community policing as a reform movement (1990s and beyond)

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).

**Historical Developments in India**

India has always been a traditional and feudal society, here there was no association of people or civilians with the governance during ancient times. Establishment of a police organization and specific powers of law enforcement, with preventive, investigative and prosecuting duties can be traced back to “Kautilya”. Later during the times of Mughals, police was given secondary importance, but collection of revenue and military being the focused areas. People were always busy with their community life and self sufficient and in order to the rules and regulations of the rulers, they used to obey without any reluctance even for the issues like collection of revenue and governance, this system between the rulers and ruled continued during the time of Mughals and the British. Later in due course replaced the semi military of policing with civil police system. All the professions were distributed on the caste basis, meeting the overall needs of the agrarian society, people were nevertheless not involved in the affairs of governance either during the period of British or Mughal.

In the agriculture dominated Indian society policing was in any case not a major issue, due to the peaceful nature. There were Panchayat like systems to provide a Law in local levels, which were accepted by the people. It was felt necessary only in the times of violent crimes like Dacoities or Robberies, which increased during the time of British rule that a need for creation of formal police force in India was felt. Initially the police was carried out in a rudimentary and later in a more developed form.

During the time of Maharaja Mummudi Krishna Raja Wodeyar (1799 - 1811) at old Mysore region, Sri. “Poornmaiah” was Dewan “Hukumnana” was issued for the policing system. The soldiers in Mysore Maharaja’s infantry were given the responsibility of policing, who were supervised by the European soldiers. The present “Tehasildhars” (Revenue Officers) were then called as “Amaldhars” were Taluk Chief Offices of Police, headed or assisted by “Faujudhars”. Police system worked in various names such as Talwars, Thotigars and Kavalgars. Later in 1817 as per Bengal regulation model law was enforced. In 1853, Police Act was enacted across the country. When lord Cubbon was posted as Commissioner of Police there were 8
districts, divided into 3 divisions, each district headed by the Magistrate (DC- District Collector) and Superintendents were posted without any form of training. The District Magistrates were Police Chiefs assisted by Superintendents of Police in those days.

In 1860 the Police Commissioner recommended a homogenous police system with more effective methods. Is recommended civil constabulary with district based police system and abolished military police. District superintendent and inspector General was to be the over all in-charge of province who were to work under the general control and supervision of the district magistrates. Posts like Police Inspectors, Head Constables and Constables were created in this system. Preserving the village police was one more important feature of this system. To make a efficient criminal justice system in the country Indian Penal Code 1860 was introduced with accurate definitions and punishments for each crime. Also enacted Police Act 1861 based on the recommendations of Police Commission 1860. For running effective and disciplined working system of police system in state Inspector General was made responsible. Later the organization and system proved to be effective in controlling violent crime like robberies and dacoities. The law of evidences in form of Indian Evidence Act 1872 was introduced for supporting the investigation carried out by police and presenting it in the courts or law. Till today the same system is continued with some minor changes and amendments.

**Second Police Commission - 1902**

Criminal Investigation Department (CID) and posts of Deputy Inspector General (DIG) are created in second Police Commission by dividing province into ranges. Later Railway Police, Sub Inspectors and Armed Police in every district head quarter.

Islington 1912 and Lee Commissions 1924 were announced. Their recommendations led to substantial recruitment of Indians in the police force. Independence of India in 1947 and proclamation of the constitution 1950 are major landmarks in the journey of Indian police. Protection of Fundamental Rights became the most important duty of Indian police. This shift from foreign rulers to democracy changed the atmosphere completely. Law enforcement considered to be a tool for suppressing the local populace became accountable to public. This change in police role has taken considerable time to consolidate and citizens continue to fear the police despite its efforts to portray itself as a “service” and not “force”.

The appointment of the Kerala Police Re-Organization Committee in 1949 was followed by a succession of Police Commissions appointed by different State Governments, mainly during sixties and seventies. Local Acts, compilation of State Police Manuals also continued, law enforcement being the state subject. Criminal Procedure Code 1973 was another major attempt to streamline the investigative and court trial procedures. It brought uniformity and clearly laid down the restriction on state vis-a-vis rights of citizens.

After the independence the first National Police Commission in 1977 was headed by Shri. Dharam Vira, recommended overhauling of police functioning in its eight reports. This Commission suggested measures that would reduce political interference, bring transparency and accountability in working system of police, and aimed at professionalizing whole law enforcement agency.

Many programmes of community policing were initiated by Police Departments from various states and were either at the state level or focused on specific cities, communities or towns to establish closer contact with citizens to build police-citizen relationship across the country. Some of these include following:

- Friends of Police Movement (1993), which began in Ramnad District in Tamilnadu and eventually spread to the rest of the state.
- Samarth Yojana Community Policing experiment in Coimbatore and Trichy.
- Bishwas in Himachal Pradesh (2000).
- Mohalla Committee Movement Trust in Maharashtra.
- Community Liaison Group in Uttarakhand.
- GramMagar Raksha Samiti in Chattisgarh and

1.3 Meaning and Definition of the Community Policing

As if see the meaning of Community Policing, first let’s separately understand both the words, “Community” which means “Society”/“Social Group” and “Policing” which means “Law Enforcement Agency” / “Police System”. When we see both together we can understand that Community policing is nothing but “Community
Police system” which is the police system of the people, By the people, and For the People in the society. Here citizens are taking the initiative in identifying the issues of crime, law and order in their area with the police playing the main role of facilitators for enabling the citizens to attend to those issues. And it has been very effective tool which is been tried by the police all over the world in prevention of crime. Fortunately for Indian police it started these initiatives in with the help of other countries and in that many of the projects were successful. We can say Community Policing is a joint venture of Police and Public in order to prevent crimes, solve issues, vigilance, awareness, making a society safe and secure place.

Definitions of community policing:

- Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police services that includes aspects of traditional law enforcement, as well as prevention, problem-solving, community engagement, and partnerships.

- The community policing model balances reactive responses to calls for service with proactive problem-solving centered on the causes of crime and disorder.

- Community policing requires police and citizens to join together as partners.

Trojanowicz defines community policing as

Community Policing is a philosophy and an organization strategy that promotes a new partnership between public and their police. It is based in the premise that both the police and the community members must work together as equal partners to identify, give importance, and solve contemporary problems such as crime, drugs, fear of crime, social and physical disorders and overall neighborhood decay, with the goal of improving the overall quality of life in the society. Community Based Policing requires wide commitment from everyone, sworn, non-sworn and civilian, to the community policing philosophy. It challenges all personnel to find ways to express this new philosophy in their jobs, thereby balancing the need to maintain an immediate and effective police response to individual crime incidents and emergencies with the goal of exploring new proactive initiatives aimed at solving problems before they occur or escalate. Community Based Policing rests on decentralizing and personalizing police service, so that line officers have the opportunity, freedom and mandate to focus on the community building and
community based problem solving, so that each and every neighborhood can became a better and safer place in which people can live and work.

According to “Bertus Ferreira” - "Community policing is a philosophy of full service personalized policing, where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems".

Bureau of Police Research and Development (BPR&D) - while recommending a model for community policing during 2003, has referred to it as “normal policing of a society in consultation, cooperation and partnership with the community at large”. Objectives of community policing as per the Bureau are, To minimize the gap between policemen and citizens to such an extent that the policemen become an integrated part of the community they serve and they earn the acceptance and trust of the community, leading to spontaneous co-operation from people in crime prevention and security in local area and resulting in a lasting partnership between the police and the community. As for the mission of community policing the Bureau recommends “To prevent and detect crime, maintain order and ensure safety and security of the community in partnership with the people and to provide the community efficient, transparent and responsive law-enforcement machinery which perpetuates the rule of law”.

Utarakhand website

Elaborating on Community policing describes it as “A collaborative effort between Police and Community to identify problems of crime, disorder and involves all elements of the community in the search for solutions to these problems. This concept brings the police and community into a closer working relationship and calls for greater responsibility on citizens.”

Andhra Pradesh police website describes Community Policing – as the philosophy that “provides an organizational strategy that motivates police officers to solve community problems in new and innovative ways. It envisages that the police must closely work with the people in the community by allowing average citizens a say in the police process, in exchange for their support and participation.” The above definition highlights community policing as an organizational strategy, thus it is not a philosophical, theoretical proposition but an effective tool. Another attribute
mentioned above is innovation that is the natural byproduct of community policing as each field officer with help of citizens finds innovative and specific issue related solutions. There is no imposition from the top.

**Wikipedia** describes

Community policing or neighbourhood policing as “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, and bring problems to the attention of police.” However this is a very limited definition in its scope as citizens are expected to only “interact and support” police. The term as envisaged in the current study has a wider role for the citizens who not only identify their problems and issues but also solve them and police are the facilitators.

**John Riley** in his study Community Policing:

Perspectives from the Field describes Community policing as “a philosophy of policing that requires police officers to act with increased levels of autonomy and professional discretion to solve problems and to develop partnerships with the community. It is true that community policing also involves delegation to the field level officers who take on the spot decisions thus decentralizing policing. It also encourages officers to respond fast and in a transparent manner as they are held accountable by the local community. Therefore logically delegation, decentralization, quick response, transparency and participation become essential ingredients of community policing. And all these are hallmarks of good policing”.

Community Policing as defined by the **U.S. Department of Justice**, is “a philosophy that promotes and supports organizational strategies to address the causes and reduce the fear of crime and social disorder through problem-solving tactics and police-community partnerships. Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police services that include aspects of traditional law enforcement as well as prevention, problem-solving, community engagement, and partnerships. The community policing model balances reactive response to calls for service with proactive problem-solving centered on the causes of crime and disorder. Community policing requires police and citizens to join together as partners in the course of both identifying and effectively addressing these issues.”
The above definition reinforces traditional law enforcement model but adds the problem solving attribute of community policing. History of US law enforcement shows that the old method of a cop taking rounds in his beat with friendly relations with citizens was replaced by a cop in the car, distant from the community but available in case of emergencies. The traditional bond with the community was replaced with modern gadgets that ensured speed in response but severed the bond between the citizens and the police man. Over a period of time US model of policing became reactive than proactive. Community policing is not only a proactive model but emphasizes citizens participation in problem solving of crime/disorder related issues. It thus means identifying the causes of such crime/disorder by the community and the cop together. In this way community policing is long term strategy that goes in to the cause instead of merely reacting to the symptoms.

**Skolmick and Bayley (1988)**

It was identified that community can be attributed in approach to community policing. These common attributes are –

- A growing shift to “community based crime prevention” all over the worlds through the use of citizen education, neighborhood watch and similar techniques, as opposed to relying on police patrol to prevent crime.
- A change in direction from emergency response to proactive strategy such as foot patrol.
- Increase accountability by the police towards the citizen and community at large.

**Kelling and Moore (1988)**

Stated that “we arrived at this era of community policing with the call to re-establish close community relationships. According to them we have passed through the "political" era (with intimate police and community relations) and the "reform" era (with professionally neutral and distant relationships).”

**Friedmann (1992)** noted that

"community policing became a 'buzz word' that is taken for granted by professionals and scholars who used the term to replace other terms such as foot patrol, crime prevention, problem-oriented policing, community-oriented policing, police-community relations and more."
Koch and Bennett (1993)

Defined a community policing philosophy as "A belief or intention held by the police that they should:

(1) Consult with and take account of the wishes of the public in determining and evaluating operational policing policy and practice; and

(2) Collaborate with the public whenever possible in solving local problems."

Stipak (1994)

Defined – community policing as a management strategy which aims to promote joint responsibility of community members and police for the purpose of safety. In other words, community policing is about police – citizen partnership.

Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994)

Suggested that, with the trend of short sound-bite media coverage of events, we must attempt to create a simple and concise definition of community policing. If we do not define community policing ourselves, then others, who do not understand the concept, will do so. They suggested the following definition and called it the "Nine Principle's" of community policing: "Community policing is a philosophy of full service personalized policing, where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems."

Manning (2003)

In an application however, “Visibility and acting became the operational role of the police officer who tries to ensure that disorder and crime are managed properly. On the part of community information, support and feedback are require and police should respond to all concerns”

Allender (2004)

Sated that the community policing represents a philosophy of full time service, personalized policing in which a particular police officer patrol and work in area on a permanent basis from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems.
Telley (2008)

Observed that the importance of the policing has to do with the people and for the community rather than policing of the community, it aspires to improve the quality of life, aiming to solve community problems alongside the community and by the community. Beyond this, it has proven difficult to pin down what specifically is involved in implementing community policing.

COPS office (2009) defines - 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.

Website of common wealth human rights Initiative Chhattisgarh Project describes Community policing as “developing successful strategies and problem solving techniques to effectively combat crime. Community policing is both an organizational philosophy as well as an operating strategy both to control crime and bridge the growing psychological divide between the communities on the one hand and police on the other”. That community policing is a bridge between police and common man is very true as far as India is concerned. Having been used by the British to curb citizens during pre independence days, citizens in India still look upon police as a tool of state harassment rather than a friend. Therefore in the Indian scenario, community policing can become a very important tool to win over the support and confidence of citizens.

Hazel Blears MP,

Minister of State UK talks of community policing as “not policing done to people; it is policing done with people and with their active co-operation. This is about driving organizational and cultural change in the service. The public is entitled to feel that as users of the service their views are important, they are listened to and their feedback is acted on to improve the service and drive the change. The trend therefore is on recognizing the citizen’s right to demand participative policing and to look upon police as a service provider; the cultural change envisaged in this process is painful for law enforcing agencies in various countries including India. However in tune with the egalitarian thoughts of the modern world, police all over are involved in the process of change that emphasizes community participation.”
The concept of community policing is comparatively new to the 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, if we speak on the basis of its history, 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.

1.4 Working system of the Community Policing

Commitment to community participation

Community Based Policing needs continues sustained contact with all sections of the local community so that together, the community and the police they work in and belong to, can identify local solutions to local issues or problems. It requires partnership, collaboration, co-ordination, and a pro-active approach from both police and public. It also requires an ongoing mutual support between the police and other criminal justice institutions. When it comes to ‘partnership policing’ it needs to understand that Community Based Policing implies a new contract between the police and the public they are there to serve. It seeks to reverse heatedness, apathy and opposition to the police whilst restraining the impulse for the public to take the law into their hands. This relationship is mainly based on mutual trust and respect, also suggests that the police can serve as a channel challenging people to accept their share of responsibility for the overall growth and quality of life in their society. Both side of the partnership of Police and Public have to know their responsibilities and commitments towards the community.

Community Policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues as crime, social ills, and fear of crime. It is not only just to attend the crimes once they are committed to community policing they have to concentrate on preventive measures to stop crimes before it takes place and eliminate the atmosphere of fear. Development of good relationship and understanding between police and public make both trust each other, where they never hesitate to address each other’s needs and contribute to the fulfillment of each other’s needs.
Commitment by Police. Source: SALW community policing study (15 Oct 2003)

➢ Community Based Policing needs an organizational policy that ensures that everybody in the police system translates the philosophy into practice. The basic principles of Community Based Policing are that ‘all policing is community based policing’ and that ‘all the police personnel are community based policing officers’.

➢ The traditional and hierarchical and where the power is vested in rank and position kind of organization needs to change to allow operational Front Line officers great autonomy to make decisions that implies enhanced respect for their judgment as police professionals.

➢ Community Based Policing works on a commitment on the part of police organization to concentrate its resources to the ‘point of service delivery’.

➢ Everyone in the organization accepts and focuses on solving community problems in ways that are not only innovative but enlighten the public in the process of the policing itself.

➢ Both police personnel and local people trust each other and use their experience, expertise and knowledge to seek and find local solutions to local problems.

➢ Community Based Policing meet the needs of all group in society, particularly the vulnerable, women, children, elderly, and poor. It makes efforts to reduce the level of crimes to improving the quality of life for all sections of the community.

Commitment by Community Source: SALW community policing study (15 Oct 2003)

➢ The public must not only share in the rights, but also the responsibilities implicit in identifying and setting priorities and solving problems in a ‘partnership’ approach. Community Based Policing requires continuous, sustained contact with all sections of the local community so that together they can identify local solutions to local problems. It requires a proactive approach in which partnership policing will predominate.
Community Based Policing promotes the judicious use of technology but it also strongly promotes the belief that nothing surpasses what dedicated individuals can achieve through talking and working together. Positive initiatives such as Victim Support, Neighborhood and Business Watch, Schools Involvement Programmes and indigenous crime prevention/community safety structures all play their part in problem-solving and improving the overall quality of life for all citizens.

Within different communities there will be different structures (organizations, associations, groups, both statutory and voluntary) that are already well established and that can be used (tapped into) to harness community safety and partnership. For example, public and private housing associations; resident associations; the business community (Chambers of Commerce); trade unions; voluntary organizations working with the poor, elderly, youth, vulnerable and disadvantaged; charitable organizations; international organizations such as Rotary; public utilities – water, gas and electricity – and particularly local public administration (local government/authority) etc. In some cases these will be informal structures, e.g. heads of clans or families. In time representatives from these various organizations/bodies can be used to set up a Police-Community Consultative Group/Committee that has a real influence on the development of Community Based Policing and on holding the police accountable for the service they provide.

Mobilizing and harnessing the knowledge, expertise and considerable resources of these organizations/structures to consider and focus on community safety issues and to solve problems and work in partnership with the police can be a very challenging and difficult task. This is particularly so when there is a history of distrust towards, or even fear of the police.
1.5 A) **Community Policing an International Scenario**

**USA –**

COPS is the constituent of the United States Department of Justice responsible for the advancing the practice of the community policing by the nations state, local, territory and tribal law enforcement agencies through information and grant resources and help community leaders better understand how to work co-operatively with the law enforcement agency to reduce crime.

**London –**

Community Policing is at the very heart of our daily duties to protect and serve the 300,000 people who live in, work within and visit the City of London. Police officers and PCSOs work with City communities across three specific teams – Residential, Business and Street Intervention.

This structured approach helps focus our work within both the residential and business sectors of the City, while maintaining an active presence on the streets and helping to prevent crime.

Positioning our teams in this way makes for smarter, more efficient working with communities.

The teams have an integrated approach and share their knowledge and skills to help each other - to help you. This style of policing is designed to meet today’s and tomorrow’s challenges in an ever evolving vibrant City culture.

**China -**

Other forms of Community Policing are like “Gated Communities” (Creating safe private zones through physical inaccessibility) and “Neighborhood Watch Schemes” especially in United States. These are the type of Community Policing which is more attracted by the people and they like to stick to these. Community Policing as discussed by Wong (2000, 2007), corresponds also to a bottom-up process deeply anchored in the traditional values of Confucianism. It emphasizes policing through the inculcation of social norms by families and other social groups. The model has been institutionalized in imperial China through the “Massline” ideology of Popular China and, in the process, involves a degree of control by the state of the informal as well as its transformation.
Switzerland –

In Serbian Police, there have been many projects concerning Community Policing, most of the development have been successful. In 2009, the MOI adopted a draft strategy of Community Policing in Serbia, which allowed for the establishment and development of community police, the powers invested in this force are similar but different from those of the regular police. To the large extend Community policing programs in Serbia resemble those commonly seen in the developed Western countries. But the history-related issues and some programs in the past are similar to these new proactive measures, such as the police constables, and there has been a discourse speculating that, in the past, Serbia had a Community policing measure. This of course is not true due to different political perspective and regime change, but positive things from early history of Serbian policing can now be freely used.

Chicago –

Community Policing program in Chicago began in 1993. The city supports and markets community policing assertively. “A survey indicates that awareness levels increased from 53% to 79% of the adults who are aware of community based policing efforts. 61% are aware of the community meetings and 28% people attended at least one of the meetings in the past year. Participants attend an average of 4 meetings per year. More than half of the residents contacted the police and 80% of the people think police were helpful and treated them politely and 70% were satisfied with the outcome of the community policing system. There is a joint police – people training program that provides training and education for the civilians and incorporates this training into the law enforcement departments’ training. People involved in training were more likely to get involved in the problem solving”.

Computerized crime mapping and analysis is a key component of their program, police officials can access this information to discover crime patterns, match crime trends with other events and conditions and ultimately develop prevention strategies through the use of ever developing technology. Chicago is planning to make this information available to the public via the internet. This allows residents access to create their own crime maps as well as obtain the top ten crime list. This information is important because it allows the residents to know what is occurring in their neighborhood or in an area that they may consider relocating. It is also a change from
traditional policing in that it allows people access to the information that department previously to give. It also does not require the citizen to request this information from the department nor does it require an office to obtain it. Thereby eliminating the need for additional personnel to perform or report their duties. Evidently Chicago has made community based policing a high priority program. “Chicago is also one of the few cities which is attempting to substantive reform in the police organization. Other cities have limited community policing to a select group of volunteer officers and kept experiment small, which would not disturb the larger organization of the policing.

Community based policing plan seems to be working well in Chicago city. They are continuously moving forward in their efforts. “for patrol officers, community policing has became an essential way of life because the police department has left them no choice. The community has a high level commitment to the program. The community has a high level of commitment to the program. The department has appreciated that the program hasn’t been without its problems, but they are continuing to learn from them and rethink the strategies needed to improve the relationship of police and community. The community appears to be well represented. They’ve also noted the important role that other city agencies play in making this program successful. Nothing that citizen concerns are not always crime related.

B) Community Policing an Indian Scenario

Crimes in India have shown a steady increase over the last couple of years and needless to say to engage with the police and to find ways of building better communications between the people and the police in order to tackle the situation, civil society groups in India have taken initiatives in building synergies between police and civil society for better governance. Maharashtra lead the trend community policing when it set up the Mohalla Committee Movement Trust formed post the communal riots that engulfed the state in 1992-93. While these initiatives were taken up by the police, however, for the first time a unique initiative was started by a few concerned citizens.

One of the community policing initiatives is the Public Concern for Governance Trust (PCGT). This was an experiment which had the capability to mobilize public opinion and increase public participation and activism towards
creating more transparent and efficient governance. The mandate was to ensure enactment of laws and policies, to promote honesty, transparency and accountability in governance. The movement took up causes, which affected large segments of society, particularly the poor, and it promoted islands of integrity and excellence among government and civil society actors. As a part of its ongoing strategy on community policing, the PCGT has initiated a Participative Policing Project. The First Phase of Project intended to plan and implement activities at three levels i.e. by building public awareness, secondly through professional backup and lastly through synergy.

The Friends of Police from Tamil Nadu 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 along with the police. Friends Of Police provides 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 Friend of Police (FOP)**

- Beats and night Patrols
- Assistance in traffic
- Crime prevention
- Information collection
- Assistance in Law and Order Maintenance
- Involvement in Prohibition Work.

This experiment has been able to create channels of information flow between the police and the citizens. This has often been useful while locating information and solving cases. The experiment has also helped the police to come closer to the community. It has tried to impart fairness, transparency and impartiality in the working of system and has been effective over the last five years in Tamil Nadu.
An initiative of the Assam police to combat violence and insurgency and also to extend a gesture of affection to the children and those who have undergone the trauma of facing violence was the AASWAS Project. It was launched on the 14th November 2001, coinciding with the Children’s Day, by the Honorable Chief Minister of Assam, Shri Tarun Gogoi. Sensitization campaigns were undertaken in several districts of Assam. Aashwas identified a cluster of seven villages in each of seven districts where there has been a history of ethnic or terrorist violence and such campaigns have integrated the community with the police and have evoked a tremendous response to enable its continuity.

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 was divided into sectors corresponding to wards of Panchayat /NAC. Bigger wards had more sectors. All the household members in a particular sector constituted the Peoples Policing Committee of that sector. Each sector had 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 was the convener. As a result of the positive feedback of the State, the scheme was introduced in all the police stations of the state.

Community Policing Resource Centers (CPRCs) were set up in Punjab, which were autonomous registered societies jointly managed by representatives of the community and police officials. The CPRCs were designed to make law enforcement services more friendly and accessible to ordinary citizens and more responsive to their needs and as a result, to build public confidence in the police. These units included one for victims of crime, one for nonresident Indians, and a unit set up specifically to serve women. As a result of this experiment, the reporting of domestic violence tripled in Punjab.

Due to an increase in criminal activities in Diamond Harbour area of West Bengal, the police in South 24 Parganas district along with local business community set up local resistance groups known as RG party to deal with the crime in the rural areas.
The main objectives were:

To stop villagers from committing crimes when they were idle. The idea was to involve these people in guarding the villages instead of arresting them after they have committed some crimes.

Members of RG parties had been provided with torches and caps as sponsored by local businessmen. According to the Sub-divisional police officer, Mehmood Akhtar, the idea was based on community policing as it makes the people confident and involves them in maintenance of law and order. The initiative was also to make the people realize that policing does not mean beating up and terrorizing the public but to work with them to solve their problems.

Maithri was an initiative which was launched in 2000, by the Andhra Pradesh Police throughout the state. 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 build in a feeling of safety from crime. It rests on the belief that contemporary community problems require a decentralized and personalized police approach, which involves citizens who finally learn how to police themselves.

Objectives of Maithri

- Meet the needs of small and varied groups of people in the community by actively involving them in the process.
- Organize proactive measures to prevent and detect crime.
- Provide personalized quality service to the people at the decentralized level.

Andhra Pradesh – Police Mee Kosam in Adilabad District.

This experiment was initially undertaken to control the extremism of CPI (Maoist) group of naxalites under the leadership of the then Superintendent of Police of Adilabad Mr. Mahesh M. Bhagwat IPS. This experiment was the recipient of 2004 Community Policing finalist award of international Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), USA and IIT Industries Limited.

Due to the poverty, backwardness and unhappy with the efforts of government to their progress many tribal’s became antagonistic toward the government. The Andhra Pradesh government tried to tackle the problem on two fronts, Firstly through
development and rehabilitation. The primary plan in this whole initiative was to make the police partners in development in remote areas while tackling extremism. Reforms were inducted into policing system and police tried to project its human face in while discharging their duties. In Adilabad, the police department brought about rapid reforms and took up developmental programmes in rural areas under the name Police Mee Kosam (Police For You). The major reform in policing was to respect tribal customs and sentiments by the personnel through gestures like greetings like Ram Ram (Like Hello) or by removing programmes were taken up in collaboration with the district administration and the ITDA.

Andhra Pradesh - Project Aasara in Nalgonda District is another spirited police officer, Mr. Mahesh Bhagwat. The objectives of this project were to prevent organized human trafficking and immoral trafficking. This project based on two prong strategy

C) Community Policing a State (Karnataka) Scenario

On 1st November 1965 Mysore State was created it’s a predecessor to Karnataka State. Before that there was no police system as such in the province. Before this there was no status, structure and powers as such for the state police of Karnataka and the first Inspector General of Police was appointed in 1965 Sri. L. Rickets. During 1883 and their was the rule of Maharajas of Mysore, the police were existed in different variants, like Talwars, Thotis, Neeragantis, Kavalugararu, Amaragararu, Ankamaale, Patela, Shyanubhogas etc.

Karnataka Police Act 1963 came into force from 2nd April 1965. Hence a uniform Police regulation across entire state was enforced. Yet the problem was not solved. Thosis, Talwar, Patels etc. were part of policing. Hence the Karnataka Village Defense Parties Act was passed and enforced in 1964.it can be considered as the initiative step of giving a flavor of Community Policing in the regular police system.

CHIKMAGALUR: H.N. Nagaraj, Superintendent of Police, has said that the Police Department has been successful in setting right several personal and community problems in the naxal-affected areas of Chikmagalur district through community policing. In a press release, Mr. Nagaraj has stated that a 15-member community interface team was formed in Sringeri in October 2005 in addition to the
community interface teams consisting of two police personnel from all police stations in Koppa and Chikmagalur sub-divisions.

MYSORE: A total of 400 men have been roped in by the police to assist them in ending the menace of chain-snatching in the city. The men are called community police officers. The concept of community policing was thought of owing to increasing number of chain-snatching incidents in the city. The police had invited applications from interested persons in this regard. One of the conditions imposed by the police for the applicants was that they should have a two-wheeler and a mobile phone.

“It took us two months to select the men. They will join hands with the police by providing information necessary for investigation,” The Commissioner said that nearly 30 men had been selected in the limits of every police station in the city and they had been given identity cards.“Their first assignment was Dasara. They were deployed at venues of cultural programmes during the 10-day festivities.

The community police officers had been asked not to handle the crowd on their own as it might create problems, he said. They had been asked to move around the venues watching activities of people behaving suspiciously.

These were a few of the community policing attempts made in India which turned out to be helpful and individually successfully for these states. When an initiative was taken in the area of Karnataka, observing the success of the above mentioned community policing attempts the researcher purports to observe the success of the attempt made by the city of Bengaluru.
1.6 Role of Research in Policing

In each and every field research plays a vital role, same in the Police system research examines the organizational system, loop holes, accountability, new strategies, system impact and citizen perceptions of police legitimacy. In the modern era police even after so many researches in the field, still are facing many problems and not able reduce the crime trend, so it keeps on working on research and development. Due to development in science and technology many latest and advanced crime are being introducing in the society, to overcome or prevent them police need to work hard and keep on researching in the field, It is like the ‘ENDLESS LOOP’. Many of the past researches suggests that most people obey the law and the commands of law enforcement agency because they perceive police and their actions lawful. In other words, when the police are viewed as legitimate, people are more likely to defer to police decisions, commands and instructions.

In some cases people don’t trust the police and their performance. On the other hand, negative police citizen encounters can threaten police legitimacy, can perceptions that police are not doing everything they can to ensure compliance with procedures and policies and to address police misconduct.

Community policing is the newest terminology for law enforcement. It is a initiative taken by the Government. Built on the premise that everyone should be working to reduce the fear of crime. A glimpse at police departments across the nation who have implemented community policing, will reveal if there’s been any change, real or otherwise.

Thus we believe that it is clear from all we have seen so far in the past researches or studies done on policing are mainly on “Police – Community relationship”, so the current study is based on the lacunas observed in the earlier studies specifically pertaining to awareness, perception, participation of the public into Community Policing, and also focuses on the implementation and the results for the implementation of the system.

Community Based Policing mainly focuses on Crime and Social disorder through the delivery of Law Enforcement service which includes the aspects of traditional law enforcement, as well as prevention of crimes, problem-solving, community engagement, ad partnerships.
1.7 Characteristics of Community Policing

Decentralization –

Decentralization of decision making as Community Policing gives power to ground level police officers to identify the problem with the help of localities, develop and execute strategies to overcome the upcoming problems. Here officer takes a decision on the spot without waiting for instructions from the top. Tackling of problems at local levels leads to speed and efficiency. Field officers welcome this system of decentralization which empowers the local citizens and police officers.

Participation –

Citizen’s participation is a vital content in community policing. People decide the problems they want to take on, priorities them and the police officer is either a catalyst or facilitator. Its important that community policing is an inclusive concept and involves people from all strata and walks of life in dialogue and problem solving. It is a wide concept and gives space to the weaker section of the society including women, youth, and senior citizens. Community Policing projects that are not inclusive in their approach remain limited in their output.

Problem Solving –

Solving Problems is at the core of this system. People and Police meet not for simple interaction but with the specific purpose to delineate the problematic issues and resolve the same. Initially most community policing initiatives are rambling exercises till a clear pattern of problem solving emerges. Forums which fail to have this approach slowly fade away. Thus problem solving is very essential element to the Community Policing.

Transparency –

It is an essential characteristic for the success of any community policing project or citizens tend to lose faith it. Identification of local threats and the process to tackle them are to be debated and discussed in open forums before embarking on a particular strategy. Consultative process by definition is expected to be transparent.
Consultation –

The process of consultation is adopted for community policing, a police officer is not expected to decide the issues unilaterally, nor is it expected to be so on the part of citizens. The earlier semi military models of law enforcement had no place for consultation with citizens that is the basic ingredient of modern day policing.