CHAPTER – I

INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades, many police functionaries in India and other parts of the world have lamented the futility of traditional responses to crime and disorder, as well as the misguided view that police officers alone can provide social control. Today, many academicians and police practitioners view this “professional / traditional” era of policing as passé. In the past few years there has been a widespread movement to replace the traditional and reactive model of policing with a radically different approach referred to as “community policing”. However, the varied meanings and high expectations for community policing create enormous difficulties for those actually engaged in implementing such change. The present study is an attempt to answer some of the most fundamental questions, including, (1) What is community policing, and how is it superior to the conventional model? (2) Can community policing, however defined, be translated into workable programs, policies and practices? (3) If implemented, will community policing make a difference; that is, will it have the desired effects on police organizations, cross section of residents, and targeted neighborhood problems? (4) Once implemented, can community policing sustain for a longer period given the limitations of the traditional model of law enforcement that continues to dominate the practices of the police organizations even today? While analyzing the implementation and impact of community policing in the Cyberabad Police Commissionerate in Andhra Pradesh during 2004 to 2007, the present study will mainly focus on the various factors responsible for
the abandonment of community policing in the commissionerate after a brief period of its implementation.

**The Concept of Community Policing**

The word police or policing is derived from the Greek word ‘Polis’ meaning city state and French Police means polity; its English root is ‘Policy’ meaning statecraft, plan or course of action especially in statecraft or administering the laws. According to Edwin Powers (1966: 424-426), as man evolved and formed societies; he also evolved customs that were designed to assure peace among the members of society. Even in so called primitive societies, anthropologists have found rules of conduct and definite enforcement of norms of conduct. As a realist political thinker, Harold Laski opines that the sovereign power of the state, which is exercised through the agency of its government, means, in ultimate analysis, the right to use the armed forces of the state to suppress any opposition or rebellion which may jeopardize its existence. He points out that during every period of crisis in the development of the state; its survival depends upon its ability to dominate the adversaries of the regime by superior use of force. Laski further maintains that the state is a method of organizing “the public power of coercion” so that the will of its government prevails in all social antagonisms. In this way, according to him, the heart of the state sovereignty lies in the armed forces of the nation (Asirvatham 1990: 68). Jack L. Kuykendall and Peter C. Unsinger are of the view that “as societies grew in complexity and became involved with one another, definite specialized law enforcement functions developed and from simple systems of order maintenance, modern forms of law enforcement evolved” (1979: 8).
Of all the developments, which have occurred in the field of policing in the contemporary world, the most significant has been the growing realization about the importance of the role of the community in decision and policy making. “The community’s authorization of police tasks such as order maintenance, negotiation and resolution of conflicts, and an expansion of the definition of police function are significant characteristics of this new strategy and has been termed as community policing” (Raghavan 1999:163). Community policing means many things to many people, but the basic idea underlying the concept is two-fold- “the police participating in the community and responding to the needs of that community, and the community participating in its own policing and supporting the police”. The idea is not completely new. According to G.P. Joshi (2001: 56), before the police emerged as an organized institution, policing in many countries was regarded as a cooperative community effort. Gradually when the police tasks became more complex due to the rapid pace of change in society, the police felt the need to acquire technical competence and professional efficiency and in the process, they lost their ‘community context’. He holds that this community context of policing has again become very significant due to various reasons, two of which are significant. One is the realization that the increasing trend of crime and disorder in society cannot be controlled by police on their own, however well equipped or well trained they may be. The other is the spread of democratic culture, which suggests that policing must also become democratic. Policing, he says, is for the people and they must get the best out of it.

The concept of Community Policing, as it has evolved during the last three decades, has come to be widely recognized in many democratic societies as a potential

---

1 Independent Commission on Policing in Northern Ireland: Report, September, 1999, Para 7.2
alternative to the traditional model of law enforcement which is largely reactive, and often repressive, resulting in police ineffectiveness and alienation from the citizen. Academicians such as Herman Goldstein, Robert Trojanowicz and George Kelling along with law enforcement executives in the USA such as Lee Brown, David Couper and Chris Braiden led the community policing movement in the early 1980s.

According to Abraham Kurien (2000: 3), unlike crime prevention weeks and police-community relations programmes which are generally confined to periodic outbursts of goodwill and dissemination of crime information by the police, community policing is not limited to a special unit of the police or a programme of public relations. Conceptually, the term community policing implies a paradigmatic shift in police philosophy, police policy and strategy based on the belief “that police officers and private citizens working together in creative ways can help solve contemporary community problems related to crime, social and physical disorder and neighborhood decay”. The shift, he says, involves a new recognition by the police that the community is the best resource as well as its greatest ally in the fight against crime and that establishment of a partnership is crucial for drawing upon this resource. The new paradigm also acknowledges that community partnership is important for dealing with problems of disorder and fear of crime which are of equal concern to the community, as crime itself.

Community policing is a new style of policing which relies on a constant presence of police within the community to ensure public cooperation and support in the investigation of crimes, and to encourage the development of values and attitudes that
help to prevent law breaking in the very first place (Heywood 2004: 391). According to Hermann Goldstein (Philip 2006: 5), who has been regarded by many as the “Father of Community Policing”, defines Community Policing as an organizational philosophy and management approach that promotes community, government and police partnerships, proactive problem solving and community engagement to address the cause of crime, fear of crime and other community issues.

The concept of community policing can be said to have evolved out of the total experience of democratic societies like the USA and UK in law enforcement during the last two centuries. But the emergence of the concept as a distinct policing philosophy can be traced to a series of studies and field experiments carried out mainly in the USA during the four decades commencing from the 1960s. They tested the utility and efficacy of existing police strategies to deal with crime and disorder which plagued US cities during these eventful years. Kurien (2001: 17) points to the fact that the traditional model of law enforcement characterized by random motorized patrol, fast response and computerization of police operations on the one hand and by neutrality and impersonal enforcement on the other, was found to be largely reactive and often repressive. As a result of which the community that the police sought to serve and to protect distanced itself more and more from the protector as it grew disenchanted with the perceived police failure in controlling and detecting crime and disapproved of the style of police enforcement which was suspected to be biased or arbitrary. In other words, the police was
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2 Patrol means to go around an area or a building at regular times to check that it is safe and that there is no trouble.
3 Reactive Policing is an approach based on the snap reactions or responses of the law enforcement agencies to problems, situations or circumstances which come to being in any field of crime, law and order, VIP security, terrorism etc.
faulted on two counts: lack of effectiveness and absence of equity, both central values associated with an agency entrusted with public safety. Kurien maintains that the police on its part felt aggrieved that it was the victim of public ambivalence towards law enforcement: everyone wanted to be its beneficiary and resented being its victim. The differing perceptions would only accentuate the basic dilemma between upholding individual rights and maintaining public order\textsuperscript{4} that is inherent in law enforcement action in any democratic society and widen the chasm between the police and the community. The author is of the view that community policing model appears to offer a solution to this vexatious dilemma by fundamentally altering the very concept of law enforcement itself.

Police forms a powerful wing of the executive. Law enforcement is their prime duty. The execution of its lawful duties presupposes public service to the citizens. They need the assistance of the public in the prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of the cases, either for furnishing clues or to help as witnesses for prosecution, in getting the criminals convicted. The police are therefore expected to create an impression in the public that police are their friends and are meant to help them in case of need. The mind to serve, the need to understand the problems of others, the inherent tendency to remember his job requirements is bound to earn laurels for the individual police officer and through him to the entire police force. This will build a beneficial public relationship leading to healthy police public relations. Public relationship is to be built up keeping this in view, more so to remove misapprehension in the public about the police (www.apstatepolice.org).

\textsuperscript{4} Public Order implies maintenance of peace, safety and tranquility in the community.
Under the new concept of community policing, crime control and order management are considered truly participative functions, with the total involvement of the community, more precisely, the local neighborhood as one active partner with an equal stake in the vital issues of social stability and progress. A partnership with the community, according to Kurien (2001: 18), recognizes the value of bringing people back into the policing process. He maintains that policing concepts currently in vogue have tended to isolate policemen from the communities they serve which can hamper crime control efforts. Nevertheless community policing allows law enforcement to get back to the principles upon which it was founded, to integrate itself once again into the fabric of the community so that people can turn to the police for counsel and help before a serious problem arises, not after the act. Crime prevention and crime control become collaborative functions and community involvement gives a new dimension to crime control activities. Kurien points to the fact that “the new paradigm is based on sound sociological principles as crime is basically a product of social conditions which are beyond the scope of effective intervention by a single agency like the police, however elaborate its resources or however ingenious its strategies may be. The new concept therefore acknowledges that the police had seriously erred in creating an impression that they could take upon the entire task of preventing and detecting crime all by themselves”. As links between the police and the community are strengthened over time, the partnership is better able to pinpoint and mitigate the underlying causes of crime.

The philosophy of community policing can be derived from Rousseau’s views on community and legitimacy. According to Jean Jacques Rousseau (Hacker 1961: 303), if
men are to live the good life, they must learn to live in a community. The notion of community is infuriatingly vague; philosophers and social scientists have spent much effort in an attempt to make clear just what this entity is. A definition of social structure can be framed in terms of class or institutions. Society, then, is composed of people and groups, and its major outlines can be perceived by a skillful classification of individuals and institutions and their mutual relations – not so a community. The chief requirement for community, according to Rousseau, is consensus i.e., an unarticulated agreement among individuals on how life ought to be lived, an unspoken concord on what constitutes right behavior. He goes on to maintain that all men are creatures with needs which are, at base, the needs of all other human beings: the need for security, for self-respect, for freedom, and for the good life. If any of these are denied to any citizens, then all suffer. For this reason, he holds that, their attainment must be a common project. Out of this grows the further assumption of consensus that: all men, whether they know it or not, whether they act in ways which show it or not, agree on the basic rules of self conduct for living. A consensus is both unanimous and inarticulate: every member of a community, simply by virtue of living within its boundaries, is attuned to the general body of principles which guide behavior for that community. This unconscious agreement on principles makes a community. Further for Rousseau, democracy and freedom without community are dangerous delusions and as such he builds his conception of legitimacy on a highly individual and highly participative notion of consent.

The central theme of community policing is that the public should play a more active part in enhancing public safety. Neither the police nor the criminal justice system
can bear the responsibility alone. In an apt phrase, as put forward by Jerome H. Skolnick and David Bayley (1988: 6), the public should be seen along with the police as “co-producers” of safety and order. Community thus imposes a new responsibility on the police to devise appropriate ways for associating the public with law enforcement and the maintenance of order. The authors held that if community policing is to mean something distinctive, it must refer to programs that change the customary interaction between police and public. The police can take credit for community policing only when such programs are of their own devising.

The police in India, for instance, have undertaken various programs to improve their image. For example, they sponsor a variety of parades and reviews. They host sports competitions and enter their own teams in national or state meets. An interesting recent development, according to David Bayley (1969: 416), is the organization of neighborhood councils, mostly in urban areas, made up of respectable people of the area, which meet the police to discuss common problems. Police sponsor “courtesy weeks” and “safety weeks”, aimed largely at school children. In some states they have organized boy’s clubs and engaged in “shramdan”, or the gift of labor to a community project. A few states and cities have established information offices and special squads to assist travelers and newcomers to urban areas. Bayley comments that police concern with creating better public relations has led to the development of press officers, responsible for releasing information to the press and acting as permanent liaison with them. However, most police officers are skeptical of the value of these schemes. He insists that real progress can only be made if the rank-and-file policeman behaves more winningly in
daily contacts and they should not be allowed to divert their attention from the harder task of producing a thorough reform in everyday behavior.

**Changes in Policing Approaches**

On the threshold of the twenty first century, India’s policing is on the crossroads. Indian society is facing multi-dimensional challenges on the crime as well as law and order fronts which are threatening the basic thread of national unity, integrity, stability, public peace and order of the country. Ritesh Kumar (1996: 87) draws our attention to the fact that the growing volume of legislations, including the social legislations, rising level of crime, brutality and violence, increasing concern for law and order problems, vulnerability of the public peace due to communal, casteist, militant and extremist feelings etc. have led to tremendous increase in the workload on the police force. On the contrary, he says, there has been an inadequate and almost stagnant level of strength of the police personnel for the past few two to three decades due to which the Indian police have not been able to deliver the services efficiently. It is under these grave circumstances and to meet the future needs and impending problems effectively, there is an indispensable need for a new strategy of policing in the twenty first century India that can be proactive and ably aided by voluntary organizations and other community members.

In order to appreciate the ‘proactive techniques’ in policing, different policing approaches that emerged during the last century deserve brief mention. Though the policing approach in India mostly remained ‘traditional’, with emphasis on centralized administration, rank structure and strong leadership, many changes have come in other
parts of the world. Way back in 1900, ‘Scientific management’ approach came into force with concepts of division of labor and of command specialization, unity and centralization of decision making. In the times subsequent to 1925, ‘Human relations and participate management’ approach has been introduced with focus on personnel management, motivation techniques, morale and stress management, with team approach and communication models.

Subsequent to 1945, ‘behavioral management approach’ came into being with emphasis on fiscal organization, day-to-day budgeting and short range planning. In 1960s, a more pronounced ‘systems approach’ became operative with its main focus on the entire system as a whole. But these systems suffered a risk of creating goals that are too detailed and involved an inordinate delay of paperwork as compared to what is needed to get the job done.

The latest approach, as U.N.B. Rao puts it (2000: 86), has been a ‘community policing approach’ leading to a ‘proactive policing approach’. Basically the proactive policing approach which ultimately gave rise to the community policing approach aims at not only prevention of crime but also equipping the prospective victims of crime to fight back and adopting a consultative approach both within the rank and file and with the public. It is an approach seeking to plan far ahead, where public are associated in both planning and working with the police. The priorities are decided by the public rather than by the police managers.
It is said that the best way to deal with the future is to meet it before it arrives. Rapid changes in the world have redefined the policing agenda so much that one cannot safely say whether any of the traditional policing methods can hold good since with each passing day it becomes evident that tomorrow will perhaps be as dissimilar to yesterday as day is to night. The experts and futurists have predicted that the myth of continuity from one era to the other may be shattered.

Malcolm K. Sparrow (1988) has outlined a very interesting set of queries and then answered them from the point of view of traditional and community oriented policing. The below given table is like an insightful guide map that brings out very effectively the limitations of traditional policing and the obvious merits and relevance of community policing in a democracy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Traditional Policing</th>
<th>Community Policing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who are the police?</td>
<td>A government agency principally responsible for law enforcement</td>
<td>Police are the public and the public are the police: The police officers are those who are paid to give fulltime attention to the duties of every citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship of the police force to other public service departments?</td>
<td>Priorities often conflict</td>
<td>The police are one department among many responsible for improving the quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of police?</td>
<td>Focusing on solving crimes</td>
<td>A broader problem-solving approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is police efficiency measured?</td>
<td>By detection and arrest rates</td>
<td>By the absence of crime and disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the highest priorities?</td>
<td>Crimes that are high value (e.g., bank robberies) and those involving violence</td>
<td>Whatever problem disturbs the community most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, specifically, do police deal with?</td>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>Citizen’s problems and concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What determines the effectiveness of police?</td>
<td>Response times</td>
<td>Public cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What view do police take of service calls?</td>
<td>Deal with them only if there is no real police work to do</td>
<td>Vital function and great opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is police professionalism?</td>
<td>Swift effective response to serious crime</td>
<td>Keeping close to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of intelligence is most important?</td>
<td>Crime intelligence (study of particular crimes or series of crimes)</td>
<td>Criminal intelligence (information about the activities of individuals or organizations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the essential nature of police accountability?
- Highly centralized; governed by rules, regulations, and policy directives; accountable to the law
- Emphasis on local accountability to community needs

What is the role of police headquarters?
- To provide the necessary rules and policy directives
- To preach organizational values

What is the role of the press liaison department?
- To keep the “heat” off operational officers so they can get on with the job
- To coordinate an essential channel of communication with the community

How do the police regard prosecutions?
- As an important goal
- As one tool among many


The table above has missed out on one of the most important queries that need to be posed before the police. It is about the use of technology. This is a hi-tech age. Even the police procedures and functions are bound to be influenced by the cutting edge technology of the times. The prevalence of Information Technology and the wide-ranging options that it provides even a traditional organization like the police makes it imperative
for us to adapt to this new demand which is symptomatic of knowledge and information based society.

**Stages in the Evolution of Community Policing Movement**

Any shift to practicing a full-fledged Community Policing (CP) methodology involves a transition from (a) A Philosophical dimension (b) A Strategic dimension (c) A Tactical dimension to (d) An Organizational dimension. Table 1 gives a breakdown of the key elements in each stage of the transition. While these are not watertight modules and could allow for overlap of any of the elements, they are like the four gears in an automobile: shifting to a higher gear accelerates the speed and ease of change, thereby proving the efficacy of the new principle, process and practice (Philip 2006:9-10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Stage</th>
<th>Initiation Stage</th>
<th>Growth Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philosophical Dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategic Dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tactical Dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>Reoriented Operations</td>
<td>Positive Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Mandate</td>
<td>Preventive Emphasis</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Service</td>
<td>Geographic Focus</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Philosophical Dimension: According to Prateep V. Philip, IPS (2001:9-10), CP in many ways is a philosophy of policing. It is a paradigm shift from the ethos of enforcement to the ethos of enablement, moving away from traditional or conventional incident-based paramilitary model of policing to a more proactive, people-friendly policing style. The philosophical dimension includes the central ideas and beliefs of CP, such as the importance of consulting the community members and accordingly modifying police policies and actions. The three main philosophical elements are: citizen input, broad mandate and personalized service.

Strategic dimension: The strategic dimension of CP translates the philosophy into action. It includes strategies that help the police department set its policies and priorities and allocate its resources in a way that is consistent with the CP philosophy. The three main strategic elements are reoriented operations, preventive emphasis and geographic focus.

Tactical Dimension: The tactical dimension of CP translates philosophies and strategies into specific tactics, programs and actions. Unless CP leads to an improved behavior, it is nothing but a talk. The three main tactical elements are positive interaction, partnerships, and problem solving.

Organizational Dimension: To support CP, agencies may have to make changes in organization, administration, management, and supervision. These changes are crucial to the implementation of CP. The three main organizational elements are structure, management, and information.
The basic assumptions underlying the idea of CP is the conviction that community problems cannot be effectively and efficiently dealt with, without the active involvement, support, participation and assistance of the public in its policy formulation and execution (Philip 2006: 9-10).

**Principles of Community Policing**

Prof. David Bayley (2005: 303) has identified some important principles of the concept of community policing which can be elaborated as follows:

(i) **Consultation and Collaboration:** The community policing concept provides a new police mandate which implies close collaboration with the community in which they work together to achieve common goals which include not only prevention of crime but also promoting quality of life by removing incivilities and disorderly conduct. In fact, the new mandate for the police can be summarized in terms of two key principles, mainly consultation, which includes public consent and accountability; and collaboration, which includes identification of local problems (Kurien 2001: 20).

(ii) **Adaptation:** This means that the police change the deployment of its resources in order to address the problems of particular localities. The problem with policing in most of the countries is that senior officers at headquarters determine the way policing is done whether it is in rural areas or cities, rich or poor neighborhoods, residential or business areas, congested or uncongested areas. However, different localities have different characters and require different approaches. Unfortunately police management often does not
accommodate the diversity of conditions within their jurisdiction. Community policing, when genuinely implemented, allows subordinate officers, such as Station House Officers (SHOs), to determine the character of policing in a particular area (Bayley 2005: 302).

(iii) Mobilization: means that the police, after listening and working out with the local public as to what has to be done, ask the public to help them in appropriate ways. Some of the familiar ways in which this is done are neighborhood watch, crime prevention committees, telephone hotlines, village defence bodies, and so forth (Bayley 2005: 303).

(iv) Problem Solving: means that the police do more than react to crime after they have occurred. Instead, they try to analyze the causes of criminality and disorder in particular places and help communities and government change the conditions that generate the problems. In other words, problem solving involves looking at the roots of crime, not simply the occurrence of crime.

**Typical Methods of Community Policing**

Community police agencies often have distinctive philosophies and characteristics of policing. The style of an agency is the result of different expectations concerning role performance i.e. expectations derived from the police agency, the law, and the community (that is, political, socioeconomic, and racial-ethnic interest groups and the administrative superstructure).
The role conflict generated from different expectations concerning performance requires that the police officer and organization make some kind of adjustment. For the police officer, the adjustment is related to discretionary behavior. For the police organization, the adjustment can be related to managerial decisions concerning the policing methods that will be used.

An assumption of the policing styles model that Kuykendall and Unsinger (1979: 23-26) have discussed is that the most important goal of police is to reduce crime and maintain order in a way that establishes a trusting relationship with the great majority of citizens, and furthermore that the development of this trusting relationship will ensure community support in the effort to reduce crime. The legal expectation of the police role is reflected in the concern for crime; the need for community support reflects a concern for community expectations of the police.

As the police go about trying to reduce crime and maintain community order, they employ a variety of methods. Some of the typical methods employed by community police organizations as discussed by Kuykendall and Unsinger (1979: 27-28) are described below:

1. **Education:** Police organizations can educate members of the community to protect themselves and their property and keep the community informed in such matters as drug problems. The contemporary concept of crime prevention often involves educational programs encouraging the citizen to engage in “target hardening” (that is, increasing protection for home or business). Education is
essentially a positive method because it places the police in a supporting, helping relationship with the citizens in the community.

2. **Apprehension:** Apprehension includes making arrests and giving tickets, applying negative sanctions for behavior. Apprehension is the “catching” role of the police and involves normal investigations (in which the intent is to arrest), undercover work, stake-outs, raids, and so on. Generally, apprehension is negative for the general community because of its punitive nature and because it includes the issuance of traffic tickets, which usually constitutes the most frequent police contact with citizens.

3. **Deterrence:** Deterrence is essentially prevention. One common method is patrolling i.e. having visible police in uniforms and/or marked mobile units to limit both the opportunity and motive to engage in inappropriate behavior. The uniformed walking *beat officer*, the marked police car, and the helicopter are the primary means of deterrence. This is both a positive and a negative method, because while police presence reassures some citizens, it frightens or creates anxiety for others.

4. **Saturation:** Saturation, an extreme form of deterrence, means flooding an area with police officers. It is usually directed at areas that are troublesome from a police viewpoint, and it is directed at both opportunity and motive. The saturation method usually involves very aggressive patrolling and interrogation by police. The usual aggressiveness of this tactic and its frequent emphasis on arrests make it primarily a negative method.

---

5 The police officer who walks around an area regularly for which he or she is responsible.
5. **Mediation**: Mediation is also called conflict management, crisis intervention, or violence prevention. Essentially, it involves police officers acting as mediators in interpersonal and inter-group conflicts. An example is a family disturbance in which the officer acts as mediator by reducing tensions and attempting to discover the reasons for the conflict in order to reduce the likelihood of its recurrence. Since the police are placed in a helping relationship with the citizen, mediation is primarily a positive method.

6. **Referral and Diversion**: Referral is turning over individual problems to community agencies outside the criminal justice system. A referral to a family counseling center might be an alternative for a family disturbance after mediation has taken place. Diversion is providing an alternative to entry into the criminal justice system; it is most common in juvenile and drug cases. Both methods are designed to deal with the motive for inappropriate behavior rather than the opportunity. They are positive because of their helping orientation.

This list of police methods is not all-inclusive, but these methods are the ones most widely used by community police agencies all across the world.

**Tactical Innovations in Community Policing Approach**

‘Community Policing’ has been used to refer to a wide range of programmes and activities that are based on the basic principles of community partnership and problem solving through consultation. As these objectives involve increased police-citizen contacts either through existing community organizations or by building up such organizations where they do not exist, police tactics have been suitably modified or
devised to maintain close and daily contacts between the police and the community. These tactics include foot patrol, victim counseling and services, rapid responses to emergency calls for service, knock-on-door programmes, information sharing, news letters, police mini-stations, problem solving and many such activities that bring the public and the beat officer to close contact and cooperation.

In a cluster of surveys conducted by the Washington State University during the period 1993-96, chiefs of police identified 12 specific programmes as typically community policing programmes and practices. These have been enumerated by Kurien (2000: 14-15) as follows:

1. The use of community news letter.
2. Additional officers on foot, bike, horse patrol.
3. The use of storefront stations.
4. The use of special task units for solving problems in targeted area.
5. Victim contact programme.
7. Fixed assignments of officers to neighborhood or schools.
8. The use of citizen surveys to keep informed about local problems.
11. Block meetings between police and community participants.
12. The use of unpaid civilian volunteers.
These programmes are designed to promote the basic objectives of the community policing philosophy which has been summarized as:

1. establishing trust and harmony between the neighborhood residents and the beat officers;
2. exchanging information which will strengthen rapport and enhance neighborhood safety;
3. addressing problems of crime and reducing the level of fear associated with criminal activity;
4. helping define service needs;
5. helping identify and resolve neighborhood problems;

The Environment of Community Police Administration

Every law enforcement agency is affected to some degree by the environment in which it operates. Each and every action, intended or not, that police undertake influences or alters in some way the world surrounding the agency. In some instances this interaction is highly visible, while in others the impact is very subtle and often goes unnoticed. It is present nevertheless, and must be recognized by the police if they are to be successful in achieving the goals of the organization.

According to Bayley (1969: 12), the passive theory of political development maintains that environment determines the nature of the system and of agency within the
system. He says it is most unlikely, according to this formulation that police would
develop independently of the system.

Jeffrey Pfeffer and Gerald Salancik (Resource Dependency Theorists) argue that all organizations need to draw resources from their environment, whether it is for their labor force, physical inputs, customers or clients, information, investment or funding, or the legal permission or normative legitimacy to operate. They have maintained that an organization’s behavior is mostly a response to environmental constraints or attempts to break free of them. Organizations are not autonomous, but often dependent on other organizations and seek ways to manage those dependencies (Handel 2003: 226).

Kuykendall and Unsinger (1979: 13-14) argue that the police normally consider the community to be their jurisdiction, so the jurisdiction becomes the focus of the environmental analysis in community policing. They hold that with imagination and thoughtful analysis, the police can see the impact their organization has on the community and the impact the community has on the organization, and they can plan those ‘grand strategies’ necessary to achieve agency goals.

Institutions operate in an environment consisting of other institutions, called the institutional environment. Every institution, according to Richard Scott (2001: 57), is influenced by the broader environment (or in simple terms institutional peer pressure) and on the other hand there would also be a pervasive influence of institutions on human behavior through rules, norms and other frameworks. Previous theories held that
institutions can influence individuals to act in one or two ways: they can cause individuals within institutions to maximize benefits or to act out of duty or an awareness of what one is “supposed” to do. Scott maintains that an important contribution to this idea was the perspective of cognitive type influence which adds that, instead of acting under rules or based on obligation, individuals act because of conceptions. The concept of logic in this new perspective refers to broader cultural beliefs and rules that structure cognition and guide decision-making in a field.

Kuykendall and Unsinger (1979: 13-18) have discussed some of the important prerequisites to an understanding of the police organization’s environment which have been elaborated as given below:

• One of the first prerequisites is knowledge of its geography - the streets, housing patterns, traffic generators, meeting places, and centers of human activities. Geographical data are basic to police planning because they define the configuration and activity of the community.

• The police must also have knowledge of the people, or citizens, in the community. In recent years “the people” has had a variety of definitions. In the context used here, “the people” refers to everyone residing in, visiting, and passing through the jurisdiction. Most police officials know very well the individuals they see every day, but they need to have a thorough knowledge and understanding of all the people and their history, traditions, and values. In order to fully understand the environment, the police must come to know the culture⁶ of those in the

---

⁶ Culture refers to the customs and beliefs, art, way of life and social organization of a particular country or group.
jurisdiction, even of those groups who pass through on vacations or for employment. Such information is important, because communities differ and have differing expectations about policing.

- The police must also understand the community’s economic life. Such conditions as chronic or seasonal unemployment directly affect the vitality of the community. Extractive industries such as mining and lumbering often suffer from the vagaries of the marketplace, and, partly because of the dangerous nature of the work, can attract workers who are prone to behavioral excesses. Strikes or other labor problems in industry and business can often create special needs within the law enforcement agency. In addition, each business has its unique problems, ranging from shoplifting to bad checks. Familiarity with market trends will often allow the manager to anticipate problems.

- Another important part of the police agency’s environment is other governmental units. Each unit interacts with other units, and the police must be thoroughly familiar with these interrelationships. A new housing project sponsored by one agency affects not only police services, but water supply, streets, and recreational facilities as well. The police officer must know the effect of each governmental service on the quality of life and the delivery of other services.

- Still another important environmental factor is the politics of the community. Harold D. Lasswell has referred to politics as “who gets what, when and how”. The political directors of communities - the city councils, mayors, boards of commissioners or supervisors, and so on - are those who ultimately approve or disapprove the direction and management of police agencies. Familiarity with the
forces at work in the political sector is important if the police manager /officer is to be responsive to the public. The police must recognize that allocation of scarce community resources is politically determined. The people make a variety of demands, some consistent and some fickle, on their governmental representatives. Police services are only one of the many important services provided, and governmental resources must be shared and applied in ways determined by the people’s representatives. The police officer must provide information for the politician’s deliberations and abide by their decisions.

- The community’s law enforcement system is also a part of the larger criminal justice system. The law enforcement agencies need to know fully the impact of their actions on the other segments - the courts and corrections - as well as the impact of their actions on the police agency. All too often law enforcement personnel state their opinions about the other segments of the justice system without being fully aware of the problems and perspectives of the other agencies in the system. A thorough knowledge of, and trust in, the capabilities of the courts and corrections can relieve some of the joint problems facing the entire justice system and help in meeting the mutual objectives of serving the people.

- Another important consideration related to the environment is community planning. Knowledge of the needs, the kinds of planning activities, the planning processes, the participants, the inter-relationships of agencies and jurisdictions, zoning, land use, capital improvement plans, and public attitudes toward the jurisdiction’s planning function all permit the police official to be aware of the future hopes and aspirations of the people in the jurisdiction. The police official
should be a part of the community’s planning efforts in order to make the experience, knowledge, and desires of the criminal justice system available to others in the community.

- Other aspects of every jurisdiction are also included in the police environment - the health of the people, the provision for special groups (the handicapped, migrants, the elderly), and the friendliness of diverse groups towards one another.

The police official should understand as many of these factors in the environment as possible so that he can know how the police agency is affected by each one. Such an understanding permits the police officials to determine the needs and expectations of the community and to define the role of the police agency.

**Influence of Police on Political and Social Environment**

Police are the leading edge of government regulation; what they do is part and parcel of government’s activity. The role of the police force, according to Andrew Heywood (2004: 395-396), is shaped by the nature of the political system in which it operates and the ways in which the government uses the police. Although the central role of the police is to enforce criminal law and maintain civil order, the police force may also have a political character if social or other biases operate within it, if it is deployed in the event of civil unrest and political disputes, and if there is a police state in which the police force is turned into a private army that serves only the interests of the ruling elite.

David Bayley (1969: 12-15) discusses two theories to understand the role of police in political development. The passive theory of political development maintains
that environment determines the nature of the political system and the agency within the system. Nevertheless, the theory of social process holds that a government may indeed operate differently from what the public expects, requires, or wants. That is to say that the government may be an instrument of elite which may impose its will on the majority by the use of force. However, Bayley maintains that if government is regulation, then police personify government and if government can affect its own environment, the police can do so too since the police are the most visible and important agency of the government even for an average citizen.

Bayley (1969: 14-19) goes on to say that there are several reasons to accept that police play an important role in influencing the social and political life, at least in comparison to other agencies of the government. These reasons may be enlisted as below:

First, because they are thoroughly and more widely visible. Since they are uniformed there activities hardly go unnoticed and their responsibilities permeate all corners of social activity. Other government agencies touch only specialized parts of human life and when they do so they attract little public attention.

Second, police possess a near monopoly on the instruments of force. They are imbued with an emotional significance that does not attach to other agents of the government.

Third, they have a responsibility to safeguard the most basic elements of human life. Police are identified with the greatest of life’s crisis.
Fourth, police are immediately identified with law. In many respects they are more important than the law itself, for they implement its strictures and decide when and how it is to be applied.

Fifth, police bear the primary responsibility for maintaining stable conditions of social life. Whether they do so or not determines to a large extent the fortunes of any development effort. The balance between order and violence, lawlessness and order, security and insecurity, is held by the police since they critically determine whether development will prosper.

Sixth, the police may play a direct role in the political life by participating in top level policy making. The police can also influence politics by failing to support the implementation of policy decisions already made.

Bayley (1969: 30) comments that “whether the government is by the people or by law depends to a marked extent on the nature of the police”. He argues that a democratic government should strive to bridge the gap between the police and the public by engaging the police with the public in the performance of common tasks. For instance, civilians might be brought into police work, as auxiliaries, or voluntary workers, and the police might serve for the welfare of the society.
Community, Crimes and Policing

Despite the interest in communities within the disciplines of sociology and anthropology, comparatively little work has been done at a similar level within the subject area of criminology. Major studies conducted by Joanna Shapland and Jon Vagg (1988: 3), concerning informal social control indicate that “official crime rates may be higher where the possibilities for informal order maintenance are more limited, as for example in urban areas with a high population turnover and greater anonymity”. They maintain that the idea of community is notorious for its vagueness. They point to three broad and overlapping meanings of the term. First, territorial communities defined by geography; second, interest communities, black, Jewish or gay communities; and third, attachment communities in which a sense of belonging to relationships or places is the defining characteristic. Such communities may of course overlap. However, Shapland and Vagg are of the opinion that when we talk of community policing there is often some residual sense of local participation and the word is intended to encourage public support for a policy that is primarily intended to benefit policy makers, in this case the police.

The new orientation to the task of crime prevention and crime control provided by the concept of community policing derives support from a profound understanding of the relationship between societal order and crime which was for long neglected and which casts new responsibilities on the police. In their classic essay entitled “Broken Windows” (1982), James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling (Kurien 2000: 6) pointed attention to the fact that police preoccupation with crime control in the 1960s had led to a costly neglect of the order maintenance role of the police which was crucial not only to control of
crime, but to the creation of a sense of security in the community as well. According to them, “the link between order maintenance and crime prevention, so obvious to earlier generations, was forgotten”. That link is similar to the process whereby one broken window becomes many. The article illuminates our understanding of how order and crime are inextricably linked to each other and focuses attention on how police can help halt social decay and tackle public fear of crime. The truth of this observation was amply borne out by the findings of the ‘foot patrol experiment’ in Newark (New Jersey) of the early 1970s, which concluded that though foot patrolling had little effect on crime, the public in the patrolled area, as compared to those elsewhere, felt more secure and less bothered by crime. The community policing concept suggests that police, if on foot patrol or some other community attachment, can protect communities by reducing these social and physical incivilities. This extended mandate says Kurien, implies that the police have to go beyond the narrow confines of crime fighting as it is understood and practiced today.

**Role of Police in a Democratic Society**

It is generally accepted that the nature of police activities provide an important clue to the character of a political regime. David Bayley (1969: 11) maintains that a government’s evaluation of itself as democratic would hardly be allowed to go unchallenged if the police severely restricted public meetings and political demonstrations or resorted readily to physical force or intimidation in order to prevent crime. He further holds that a police force that conducts its operations openly and with little violence and where the members of the public do not hesitate to approach the police in time of personal need can be
considered as supporting the fact that the political life is free and unconstrained. In such a case it can be rightly said that the nature of police activities and the nature of government are coincidental.

Democracy stands for popular rule. Popular rule implies mass involvement of people in the political process. Mass involvement of people necessitates rules and laws and an agency to enforce it. Here lies the relevance of police in a democracy.

The responsibility of police in a democracy is multifaceted. In its front are national interests and safety and security of the national life. Kumar (2000: 327-328) points to the fact that “one edge of the police organization accounts for policing of the people; the other, for policing the process of governance. Though the two functions towards the well being of the country appear intrenched prima facie, they do make significant difference in the actual process of policing. In one, police the ruled from the side of the government. In the other, police the rulers from the side of the people as true power-wielders. While in one, it is the will of the rulers that prevails in driving the police to police, in the other, it is the will of the people as expressed through the public media that bind the police to police in a particular way”.

One element in defining a police force in a democratic society is that it is:

- Subject to the rule of law\(^7\) embodying values respectful of human dignity, rather than the wishes of a powerful leader or party

\(^7\) Rule of Law is a principle which establishes a framework to which all conduct and behavior conforms, applying equally to all the members of the society, be they private citizens or government officials.
• Can intervene in the life of citizens only under limited and carefully controlled circumstances and
• Is publicly accountable.

A special feature of police in a democracy is involving people in policing. No police organization can succeed in a democracy without people being actively involved. The involvement can be either formal or informal. In formal involvement, services of eligible citizens are enlisted for policing under diverse categories of schemes provided by Police Acts like Special Police Officers (SPOs), Additional Police, Traffic Wardens, Village Police or even Home Guards are provided by the Home Guards enactments. The citizens so enlisted help the regular police in various police duties with special rights and privileges under the supervision and superintendence of the police force. The services are normally voluntary. The informal involvement of the citizens in policing varies from being informers, witnesses and signatories to various witness papers in criminal cases to patrolling in groups in strife-stricken or dacoit-infested areas at night. Involvement breeds a sense of belonging. It brings police and the public closer. This is a major step towards the relevance of police in a democracy.

However, a defining characteristic of police, as M. Amir and S. Einstein (2001: 35-45) point out, is their mandate to legally use force and to deprive citizens of their liberty. This power is bound to generate opposition from those who are subject to it. According to them, this power also offers great temptations for police abuse and abuse on behalf of the authorities controlling them. Law enforcement therefore requires a delicate
balancing act. This conflict between liberty and order receive their purest expression in considerations of democratic policing, which is not necessarily equivalent to ‘policing in a democracy’.

How can a democratic country, while governing itself, provide liberty for the citizens and at the same time allow the police to enforce the laws of that country? The answer, says Bertus R. Ferreira (1996: 1), depends on what role such a country would like to see the police perform. How much power the police should have is a decision that should be made only by the specific community or society involved. The author maintains that it is at this level that community power is displayed through the social, political and economical activities of a group of people that have common goals.

It is easier to specify democratic procedures than democratic content. But at the most general level such content involves respect for human dignity and the ideas associated with universal citizenship, limits on the power of the state to intrude into private lives and public accountability. Amir and Einstein (2001: 40) are of the opinion that “in a democratic society police must not be a law unto themselves. In spite of strong pressures and temptations to the contrary, they are not to act in an explicitly political fashion, such as by spying on or disrupting groups they disagree with or failing to enforce the law against groups they support or to enforce laws they personally disagree with. Nor are they to serve the partisan interests of the party in power, or the party they would like to see in power. Their purpose must not be to enforce political conformity but to strive for equal law enforcement”.
Under the aegis of the Indian Constitution, for instance, the concept of Rule of Law has been introduced. The meaning of this concept is that every one living within the polity is subject to the same law and no one is entitled to claim immunity. The police are a primary constitutional civil authority for enforcing laws framed by the State for regulating its business and its protection and for upholding the Constitution itself. As Mr. J. Hedgar Hoover in his “Story of the CBI” observes, “Law enforcement is not a game of cops and robbers in which the citizens play the trees”. In other words, the Rule of Law cannot be upheld without the complete understanding and cooperation of the community as a whole. However, Shankar Dayal Sharma (2005: 28) comments that even in a democratic Government based on people’s consent the State has to employ coercion to impose its authority on those recalcitrant groups whose activities are prejudicial to the interests of the State and the people as a whole. How far this power of peace-keeping is put to its proper use is again a debatable issue.

**Police Public Interface**

A community’s trust in its police force has a direct effect on the quality of police operations. A hostile public neither hears nor sees anything and thus deprives the police of very vital information. Crime that takes place is not reported; information about suspicious persons or incidents is suppressed; and witnesses do not come forward to give evidence. Thus the police department’s capacity to control crime and maintain peace and security in the society is adversely affected.
G.P Joshi (2001: 1) points to three ways in which the community’s support or lack of it can affect the health of the police organization. First, a police force with bad image fails to attract and retain quality manpower. Second, the absence of public trust causes job dissatisfaction. Third, the police find it difficult to get additional resources from the government even when their demands are urgent and genuine. Fourth, the failure to get cooperation from the public makes the police adopt short cuts and use *third degree* methods to achieve success. A hostile public and a brutal police generally go together. Thus the success of policing and the existence of a healthy and a sensitive police organization, according to Joshi, in any democratic society depend largely on the degree of confidence and trust that the community reposes in its police force.

As early as 1902, the Indian Police Commission had observed: “The police force is far from efficient; it is defective in training and organization; it is inadequately supervised; it is generally regarded as corrupt and oppressive; and it has utterly failed to secure the confidence and cordial co-operation of the people”. There are numerous reasons for the existence of highly unsatisfactory state of relations between the police and the community. The National Police Commission (NPC) found “Police partiality, corruption, brutality and failure to register cognizable offences” as the most important reasons for the dissatisfaction of the people with the quality of policing provided to them. However, poor policing is not merely the cause but also the effect of increasing public distrust in the police force. This vicious circle keeps on widening the existing chasm between the police and the community. Actually the hiatus in the relationship between
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8 To question somebody for a long time by threatening or by the use of violence to get important information.

the police and the public has historical roots. The police as an organized institution in this country owe its existence to the *Police Act of 1861*.

Joshi (2001: 2) has elaborated some of the important features that marked the system that was established by this Act in India. These have been discussed as follows:

Firstly, the British realized that to perpetuate their rule in this country, they must have a police force that was totally subservient to the political executive. The political executive must exercise complete and unquestioning control over the police force. They achieved this by establishing a system of dual control by the executive over the police – one at the state level and the other at the local level. At the local level, they were put under the general direction and control of the District Magistrate, who was not a professional but a general administrator, responsible in those days mainly for collection of revenue. It was his responsibility to ensure that the police force was used to serve the interest of the State and not necessarily of the community. The idea of the police being a part of the community and accountable to it never grew in the Indian soil.

Secondly, in this system, the police remained unacceptable to anyone except its own hierarchy and the executive. The need to make the police accountable to other institutions did not fit into this model of control. No institutional mechanisms of police accountability were therefore set up.
Thirdly, the British structured the organization in such a way that the senior positions in
the force would be occupied by them and the junior slots would be kept for ‘natives’. Even when the senior posts were indianised in due course, the elitist bias was not forsaken. Family background always weighed heavy in picking candidates for senior positions. They realized that system based on feudal values prevalent in the Indian society would work effectively in ensuring that the rank and file, which constituted the bulk of the force, remained loyal and subservient to their seniors within the organization and outside. This gave rise to a managerial philosophy, which was based on distrust of the lower ranks in the organization. The natives were not trusted.

Fourthly, the police was raised on a militaristic and authoritarian pattern. There was tremendous emphasis on maintenance of a type of discipline, which bordered on regimentation, requiring the lower ranks to obey orders blindly. The system did not require the constabulary to put on their thinking caps while performing their duties. They in fact were not supposed to have any.

All the above factors combined to produce a system, which situated the bulk of the police force at a distance from the community.

In fact, the advent of the British and the setting up of their own courts to deal with civil and criminal complaints was the first step that started the process of decline in the influence of the Panchayats which were the indigenous dispute resolution agencies, thereby reducing public participation in the administration of justice next to nothing. Formal drafting of laws such as the Criminal Procedure Code (Cr.P.C.) and the Indian
Police Act further widened the gap between the community and the criminal justice administration system by interposing the law enforcement function of the police to the virtual exclusion of the concept of community partnership in the process.

Discussing the reports of the first truly ‘National’ Police Commission of 1977-81, Kurien (2000: 61) maintains that Section 23 of the Indian Police Act which insists on prompt obedience and execution of all orders lawfully issued by any competent authority underlies the total submission of police to executive authority and is only an assertion of the colonial will expressed earlier in the report of the Indian Police Commission of 1860 which says that “we have arranged for this force being in all respects subordinate to the civil executive government”. There was no trace here of the reforming zeal of Robert Peel who laid down the famous nine principles in 1829 underscoring public support and public approval for the London Metropolitan Force and reminded them that police are only members of the public who are paid to give full time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen, in the interest of community welfare and existence.

The advent of Independence changed the political system in the country but the police system remained unaltered. For a couple of decades after Independence, the need to change the system was not felt very strongly. Joshi (2001: 3) opines that this was partly due to the euphoria of freedom leading to high expectations and partly due to the fact that the standards of leadership, both in politics as well as police, till at least a couple of decades after Independence, were quite good. Gradually, however, the standards started declining, with politics becoming increasingly contentious and criminalized,
leading to a perceptible decline in the quality of control exercised over the police and increasing misuse of the organization by people in position of power for partisan interests. This, according to Joshi, resulted in undermining the rule of law in the country and in obstructing the growth of a professional system of policing. People did not have much faith in the capability and impartiality of the police in any case and they became more disillusioned. This further widened the gap between the people and the community, resulting in loss to both. However, with an aim of establishing good friendly relations with the people and to improve the image of police in the country, the police organizations in India have been experimenting with several policies and programs, the most significant program being community policing.

**Community Policing: The Indian Experience**

Community policing in India has a long tradition, dating back to nearly 4000 years, of conflict resolution through conciliation and consensus firmly established in the panchayat system. Village councils - or Panchayats - have performed adjudicating functions in this country for thousands of years. In fact, ancient texts such as “Neethisaram” and various inscriptions speak about the autonomy enjoyed by the Gram Sabha and the Panchayat in all matters affecting life, permitting direct participation by the village community in all decision making processes.

In ancient India, as in medieval England, the principle of community responsibility was fundamental to the detection of crime. According to Kurien (2000:54-55) from the scanty historical information available about the early Hindu period, there
seem to have been four main elements in the organization of society against crime such as communal responsibility, village watchman, espionage and severe penal provisions. The first source of history for this period, according to him, are the reports of Megasthanese in the fourth century B.C. while the second, and more authoritative record, is the remarkable work known as Arthasasthra, ascribed to Kautilya, counselor of Chandragupta. While the duties of Nagarikas in charge of municipal laws are set forth in detail, this ancient record suggests that in the villages, the responsibility of crime control was entrusted to the village community which operated through its elected representatives in the Panchayat. Since India is and has always been a nation of villages, it is natural that the basic unit of the traditional police system is the village. None of the ancient empires, argues Kurien, namely Mauryas, Guptas and much later Moghuls --- ventured to interfere with the village system which continued until the British came on the scene and introduced the Police Act of 1861 signifying that the fundamental issues concerning the legitimacy of the police and its community context did not interest the British.

The Republican Constitution of free India and the infrastructure that has grown around this constitutional nucleus have carved out a brand new polity, emerging out of the traditional legacies of the past. But in spite of all this, little efforts have been made to amend the police philosophy and transform the police organization into systematic congruence with the changed needs of the new polity and a changing society. P.D. Sharma (1981: 111) argues that “unlike the post-mutiny period of the British days, purposive thinking about police-polity and police-community relationship in the
Republican India has been conspicuous by its absence. Even the Indian Constitution, which engraves the blueprint of the future polity, does not yield any meaningful insight in this regard”.

The National Police Commission (1977), in its Fifth Report (November 1980), expressed its anguish over the poor state of police-public relations. It believed that the 1902 Fraser Commission’s observation that people ‘do all they can to avoid any connection with the police investigation’ held true even after a lapse of nearly 80 years. It went on to say: ‘People now may not dread the police, but they certainly dread getting involved with it in any capacity’. It suggested that the police should not merely highlight the responsibilities of the public, but go beyond this to focus attention on police difficulties and how citizens could help to mitigate them. R.K. Raghavan (1999: 166) opines that it is in this context that it favored more liberal appointment of Special Officers (permitted by Section 17 of the Police Act of 1861) from the community so as to aid the police in especially difficult law and order situations. It suggested that this arrangement should be an on-going process, rather than one invoked on special occasions.

Though not systematically conceived nor empirically tested as done in the USA variants of community engagement for law enforcement have been subjected to experimentation in India both by means of formal legislation and through individual initiatives of innovative police officers in different states in the country. Former Director of Central Bureau of Investigation in India, R.K. Raghavan (1999: 167-170) makes a
mention of some of these state police initiatives in his book “Policing a Democracy: A comparative study of India and the US”. Some of them have been mentioned as below:

In 1985, a scheme of Special Police Officers (SPOs) was introduced by the Delhi Police to involve able bodied adults with a crime record with several tasks such as patrolling, handling de-addiction camps, training young girls in self defence measures to ward off sexual harassment and helping victims of property crime. The Delhi Police also introduced the Neighborhood Watch Scheme in 1989 aimed at reducing property crime and juvenile delinquency\textsuperscript{10}, and bringing about better ties with the community.

The Maharashtra Police floated a scheme in 1990 involving the local bodies in Bhiwandi (Maharashtra State), a town notorious for Hindu-Muslim strife, to promote religious harmony and named it as “Mohalla Committees”.

The Karnataka State Police, in the south of the country, have also been making efforts to take the message of community policing down to the police station level. A Standing Order, issued by the DGP in February 1994, directed the formation of a Citizens Committee at this level to meet at least once a month to discuss matters such as deviant behavior of individuals, patrolling, and distribution of protective duties during outbursts of crime. The Order contemplated grant of incentives to policemen achieving significant results in the area of police-public relations. No material is however, available as yet to indicate the measure of implementation of this order and its impact on the average citizen.

\textsuperscript{10} The act of crime committed by a young person who is not yet an adult.
The birth of a ‘Friends of Police’ (FOP) movement in different parts of Tamil Nadu in 1993 owes itself largely to the dynamism of a young District Superintendent of Police, Prateep Philip. Established as a purely voluntary agency to promote crime awareness and civic responsibilities, the FOP is open to any person, male or female, above the age of 18 who has no police record or involvement in a civil dispute (Philip 2006:14).

Abraham Kurien, (2000: 63-68) in his book “The Concept and Practice of Community Policing in the Indian Context” has also discussed some of these state police initiatives. They can be listed as follows:

In 1998, “Crime Prevention Committees” were formed in Kerala, at the police station level to provide a platform for the local public and the police to discuss crime problems locality-wise and to control crime with the help of the locals. Monthly meetings are held with resident’s associations and the local police in Trivandrum city to devise strategies to control crime and to foster good police-public relations. Kerala Police has also launched a novel programme to educate and train students in matters relating to traffic. This programme is known as “Student Traffic Education Programme”. The “Crime Stopper” facility is another form of community policing, where people can call police on a non-metered telephone number and share information about crime and criminals without disclosing the caller’s identity.

In Orissa a community policing initiative called “Surakhya Samiti” was introduced in 1999 with a view to associating the citizens with the police in solving
neighborhood problems, in enforcing laws of the land, in minimizing crimes, in restoring order and peace in the community, in reducing crimes against women and the weaker sections of the community.

A pilot project on community-oriented policing scheme has recently been introduced in Jammu and Kashmir. The objective of the scheme is to promote positive interaction and establish stronger bonds between police and the public and to involve the citizens in crime prevention and detection. The State police of Jammu and Kashmir has also taken steps to create Village Defence Committees (VDCs) with a strength of 1 to 20 members to check militant intrusion and resist militant attacks on civil population. The members have been provided weapons and have been trained in their use. Some members are ex-army personnel. Though the scheme is largely of volunteers each group has one or two Special Police Officers who are paid remuneration. The VDC scheme has paid rich dividends and VDCs have repulsed a large number of militant attacks in remote areas.

In the year 2000, the Andhra Pradesh Police introduced a community policing initiative called “Maithri” for maintenance of peace, prevention of crime and road safety. Maithri programme aims at making the public and the police partners in the work relating to crime and law and order. It is a proactive technique of policing which allows ordinary citizens a voice in the police process in exchange for their support in order to make society a safer place to live. It creates a positive shift in the role of police from “working against bad people” to “working with good people” in the society (www.apstatepolice.org).
In the wake of the terrorist attacks in 2008 in various parts of the country it was argued that there was an urgent need to develop new mechanisms to fight terrorism and other forms of criminal and anti-social activities. The U.N. Secretary-General’s High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change in its report “A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility” noted that terrorism and other forms of anti-social activities flourish in environments of despair, humiliation, poverty, political oppression, extremism and human rights abuse as well as in the contexts of regional conflict and foreign occupation; and it profits from weak state capacity to maintain law and order.\textsuperscript{11}

Raj Kumar maintains that the role of civil society and other sections of the community like the religious communities in the fight against terror should not be underestimated. He argues that it would be foolhardy to think that the police and law enforcement machinery would be able to reach out to the entire country to create a safe and secure environment. Even the best of intelligence gathering mechanisms will not be able to find out all the information that is sometimes needed in the fight against terrorism. He is of the opinion that the civil society needs to be empowered so that the much needed information available in the public domain regarding terror networks is shared with the police and law enforcement machinery.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} C. Raj Kumar, Terrorism and Indian Democracy, The Hindu, July 30, 2008.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
Potential Obstacles to Community Policing

However positively police executives may regard community policing, it is also true that identifiable and persistent constraints impede its development. Some of these obstacles have been discussed by Skolnick and Bayley (1988: 21-32) as follows:

a. The Culture of Policing: There are certain identifiable commonalities in police culture. Some of these commonalities are especially salient to our understanding of the resistance of police to the introduction of community policing. First is the perception of danger. Police officers are sometimes shot at and killed in encounters. Since community policing demands a degree of extroversion, the tendency toward suspicion and its concomitant tendency toward marked internal solidarity – the division of the world into we and they must inhibit the degree of acceptance of ordinary citizens that is implicit in community policing.

b. The Youth of Police: Men who are attracted to the occupation of policing are very young in chronological age as well as in maturity of temperament and judgment. Training in the use of force and authority to use it, combined with the youth of most police, can well inhibit the capacity of a police officer to empathize with the situation of those being policed in ethnically diverse and low income neighborhoods. Community policing demands a degree of emotional maturity more likely to be present in somewhat senior officers who are also more likely to feel comfortable
with problem-solving, almost parental role associated with community policing.

c. Street versus Management Cops: Streetwise officers are likely to be cynical, tough, and skeptical of innovation within management. By contrast, management cops tend to project a vision of policing that is more acceptable to the general public. The street cop tends to be resistant to all forms of innovation that are non-technological. The management cop is not necessarily more accepting of the idea of policing as a broader social issue, but he is more likely to be receptive to a more expansive vision on the police role. In any case, a broader vision of the police role is a necessary but not sufficient condition for introducing community policing. Its absence is surely an obstacle.

d. The Responsibility to Respond: The perception of crime and danger, whatever its comparative reality, puts increased pressure on police to respond. The more police feel this pressure, either through calls for service or through complaints by citizens groups about rises in crime, the more the immediacy of this pressure is likely to undermine the possibilities of redirecting police resources to innovation programmes.

e. Limitations of Resources: The perception of resource limitation is a constraining factor closely related to the responsibility to respond. Community Policing can not develop without expanding the dimensions of an already sizeable bureaucracy.
f. The Inertia of Police Unions: Police Unions have become more powerful in the United States, Scandinavia, and Great Britain since the 1960s, and for fairly evident reasons. Mostly, the power of police unions has correlated with the rise in crime and the fear of crime over the past three decades. For some union leaders, community policing is seen as a threat to the proper role of the police in a good society. In this vision, the police are supposed to provide the citizen with protection against crime. Neighborhood Watch is perceived as a substitute for the police, one that relieves the state of a moral responsibility to protect the citizen. Finally, community policing appears threatening to police unions if it means or appears to mean that fewer police will be necessary. The unionization of police unquestionably encourages them to claim authority over crime prevention activities, even when interaction with the citizenry might well reduce crime. For police unions, jobs and job benefits are primary concerns. The prevention of crime seems to merit a lower priority. This stance, of course, constraints the development of community policing.

g. Command Accountability: Police organizations are characteristically arranged in hierarchical form. Policy is made by the chief or commissioner and the command staff. Community policing, by contrast, implies a degree of decentralization of authority. As a general proposition, the more centralized and hierarchical the accountability system of a police department, the more difficult it will be to introduce community policing.
h. The Reward Structure: Community policing exaggerates the ambiguity of police performance and, by implication, of measures of evaluation and reward. Police executives recognize the problem even when they do not articulate it. It can be said that the ambiguity of evaluating and rewarding the quality of community police performance constitutes a factor in inhibiting the development of community policing.

i. Public Expectations of Police: Citizens may believe that community policing is actually interfering with standard crime fighting capabilities. This can occur if community policing is permitted to bear the responsibility within the police department for reductions in the patrol force, response time, and so forth. Such a message, if permitted to take hold within the department, will eventually make its way to the general public. Thus, community policing is easily maligned by traditional police who resent change.

j. Failure to Integrate with Crime Detection: Departmental segregation has by now become an almost predictable problem of community policing. Community policing activities are assigned to newly created specialized units – crime prevention branches and community relations squads. Community police personnel may be attached to decentralized commands, but they “do their own thing” and are not integrated into traditional patrol or criminal investigation activities. Serious thinking and seriously monitored interpretation need to be undertaken to solve this problem.
The Ambiguity of Community: Community is an inherently ambiguous, almost elusive idea. It implies a commonality of interest, values, identities, demands, and expectations. Moreover, there can be quite a bleak side to the idea of community when some of its members become overprotective and threaten or engage in violence to perceived outsiders. Police can perhaps resolve the ambiguity of community by themselves conveying broader communal norms of decorum and safety to individual neighborhoods. Like the Japanese police, they can seek to move beyond being merely the law’s enforcers; they can aspire to teach the community’s moral values within self-defined and cohesive neighborhoods.

The Value of Community Policing

Despite the ambiguities of the concept of community and the realities of police resistance, community policing has enduring value. If police forces encourage community-based crime prevention, emphasize non emergency interaction with the public, increase public input into policy-making, and decentralize command, substantial benefits can accrue both to the community and to the police.

Benefits to the community

The possible public benefits of community policing are (Skolnick and Bayley 1988: 37-40):

- Unique opportunity to assist a new area of policing
• Spares the inconvenience of formal inquiries into complaints due to solving of minor disputes by community oriented policing
• Provides a forum for discussion and development benefiting the entire community
• Opportunity for members to do socially useful and productive community work
• Motivating the youth and utilizing their energies for constructive activities
• Counseling drug addicts, eve-teasers, violators of traffic rules and advising their parents
• Helps make the locality a safer, more secure and a happier place.

**Benefits to the Police**

Community policing, according to Skolnick and Bayley (1988: 37-40), also offers potential benefits to the police. Some of these are described below:

1. Political Benefits: If co-production through community participation leads to lower crime rates and higher arrest rates, the police can take credit as foresighted agents of change.

2. Grassroots Support: Community policing offers a magnificent opportunity to build grassroots political support for the police. It embeds the police in the community, giving them an opportunity to explain themselves, associate themselves with community initiatives, and become highly visible as concerned defenders of public safety.

3. Consensus-building: Community policing is a means for developing a consensus between the police and the public about the appropriate use of law and force.
4. Community Morale: Community policing probably raises the morale of the police involved because it multiplies the positive contacts they have with those supportive people in a community who welcome police presence and activity.

5. Satisfaction: Because effective community policing requires that subordinate ranks take more initiative and responsibility, it makes the police job more satisfactory.

6. Professional Stature: Community policing raises the professional standing of the police by broadening the range of skills required. To be successful at community policing, police must be more than large, physical, and tough; they must be analytic, empathetic, flexible, and communicative.

7. Career Development: By enriching the strategic paradigm of policing, community policing creates more lines for career development. Because community policing encompasses and expands on the traditional model, it provides more ways for personnel to be valuable. For community policing to work, police forces must reward a wider range of performance skills. This provides career opportunities to a more diversified group of officers.

When its good intentions have been transformed into concrete programs, community policing displays impressive coherence and offers substantial benefits to communities as well as the police. Indeed, it represents the most dramatic change in the strategic vision since the rise of “police professionalism” in the early twentieth century.
Finally, despite its attractions and importance, there is a concern that community policing will be oversold, both to police and to the wider political community. There are dangers in it. Skolnick and Bayley (1988: 37-40) are of the opinion that it could invite corruption and vigilantism, pitting the police and reputable residents against the disrespectful. The best patrol officers could be attracted to community policing, with the resulting irony that the quality of the regular patrol police force will be diluted. It could de-emphasize the importance of law enforcement abilities (such as knowledge of search and seizure laws) in favor of interaction skills. The authors argue that the classical social and economic correlates of crime - high rates of youth unemployment, family breakdown, social dislocation, violence, gangs, drugs, illiteracy, and historical patterns of racial discrimination can not be completely removed by community policing. Community policing is no substitute for social and economic change. As a crime-control measure, it must be understood in limited perspective, not as a long run or key stone feature of a successful anti-crime policy.

Apart from the above discussed problems and obstacles associated with community policing, there can be several other factors which can influence the implementation and impact of community policing. The present study has been undertaken mainly to study some of the important factors determining the implementation of community policing in the Cyberabad Police Commissionerate in Andhra Pradesh. The major objectives of the present study have been listed below.
Objectives of the Study

The proposed research has been undertaken to study mainly:

- Community Policing strategy and practices in Andhra Pradesh in general and in the Cyberabad Police Commissionerate in particular.
- The use and effectiveness of community policing in a democracy.
- The impact of existing police culture and organizational structure on CP initiatives in Cyberabad Police Commissionerate.
- The impact of community policing initiatives on the community members and crime rate under the Cyberabad police commissionerate.
- Factors responsible for making community policing a success or a failure.
- Common problems witnessed with regard to the implementation of community policing in democratic societies.

Central and Other Related Questions

1. What are the reasons responsible for the relevance of community policing in the twenty first century India?
2. How is community policing different from the traditional model of law enforcement?
3. What are the various human domains wherein community policing can be more effective?
4. What are the various ways in which the community extends its help/support to the police?
5. What are the various modern management techniques introduced in community police administration?

Hypothesis

- Limited community participation and structural defects within the police organization resulted in the abandonment of community policing programs at the Cyberabad Police Commissionerate after 2007.
- Lack of leadership and inadequate training to the Community Policing Officers led to the decline of community participation in community policing activities.
- Inadequate strength of police personnel and community association members resulted in the gradual decline in maithri meetings since 2006-2007, resulting in the dismantling of community policing functions.

Chapterization

The study comprises six chapters which are elaborated as below:

This chapter is a discussion on the concept of community policing (CP), examining its basic principles and how community oriented policing differs from traditional policing model of policing. The chapter analyzes the central theme of CP, including its origin, typical methods of CP, and tactical innovations in the new approach. Finally there is a brief description of the Indian experience in the area of community policing.
The second chapter would help us analyze the various theoretical constructs that explain various community policing practices and also support and strengthen the basic ideas underlying different methods and styles of community policing in India.

The third chapter systematically describes the various community policing initiatives in the Andhra Pradesh with a special emphasis on “Maithri” programme. The focus has also been on the individual initiatives of innovative police officers in different parts of the state.

The fourth chapter gives a detailed account of the Cyberabad Police Commissionerate with the main focus on the introduction of community policing programmes. Profiles of Jeedimetla Police Station and Madhapur Police Station, along with the working of various CP committees and associations under these two PSs has also been given to enable a detailed understanding of community policing at police station level.

The fifth chapter is based completely on the analysis of the data and information collected from a wide range of sources utilizing a variety of methods to ascertain, explain or refute the hypothesis and objectives of the study.

Finally, the sixth and concluding chapter presents the major findings of the present study.