CHAPTER - V
In a democratic society, every organ of the state is expected to be accountable to the people. This applies more appropriately to the police than others. As per *Encyclopedia Britannica*;

"Police is the executive civil force of a state, which is entrusted with the duty of maintaining public order and of enforcing regulations for the prevention and detention of crime". ¹

The police should not therefore take amiss any wholesome criticism of their conduct in this regard. Any criticism with a view to improving the image of the police should therefore ensure better “Police-Public Relations”.² Police in today’s society is empowered to use legitimate and situationally justified force against law-breakers and offenders. This mandate of the police to use violence to curb or prevent violence raises the key issue that the people themselves should not indulge in unnecessary or excessive use of force, although there are laws, rules and number of instructions which lay down norms for the use of force by the police. This, however acts as a check on the use of their powers. Yet, at times the police in situations of grave emergency may override their prescribed limitations, where by, the excesses are committed. Treading the liberty of
those whom they protect under law even under these grave situations is an unpardonable offence. Therefore, in order to keep police under constant surveillance the maxim "Safety of the people is the highest law" is highlighted.\(^3\)

However, in a democratic society protests and right to strike are (enshrined) a part of the implied meaning in the discourses on fundamental rights. It is expected that the society takes these instruments to fight the exigencies of a state or other institutions for the purposes of seeking justice in a way as prescribed by *Rousseau*.\(^4\) While doing so, it is possible that the state uses its coercive force to repress and suppress these reactive movements often leading to an impression that the forces initiated by state like police performs in the interest of the state as observed by *Lenin*.\(^5\)

However, no amount of rights enshrined in the constitution permits any movement or protest in an organised society beyond certain limitations prescribed for reasons of maintaining peace and order. If liberals argue that they have a right to protest against any harmful act of the state, it is not without certain pre-requisites and limitations. Keeping in view these arguments among liberals and the left leaning reactive groups the present study is designed to have a balanced view on the issue and therefore an attempt was made here with a purpose to understand the limitations of both the police, as representing the coercive power of state and the Human Right as representing the organised liberal state. Further, an attempt is also
made here to establish any relationship that may exist between Human Rights and Police Administration in order to understand whether these two agencies of the state are mutually supportive or mutually repressive. More so, in a globalised world where the need for a civic society is seen as a necessity.

Studies conducted in the areas of Human Rights and Police Administration, however have confirmed the much discussed subject matter that the lack of awareness about Human Rights among Police is clearly an indicator of the fact that there is need to make deeper study of the Human Right concept not only as an independent concept but also, as an important component in the police organisation.

Thus, this study of Human Rights and Police Administration in Hubli-Dharwad Commissionerate in Karnataka based on the hypotheses drawn earlier, is an original empirical work which is in conformity with the sample size given in Chapter one.

In order to collect the data and to know about the position of the concept of Human Right as a factor in the Police Administration this field work was undertaken by using stratified sampling method keeping in view the necessities of doctoral dissertation. A schedule was used to elicit the opinions of police personnel on the issues related to Human Rights in their
day-to-day functioning and while stress was laid on informal discussions with Human Rights activists to collect their opinion about Police Administration. Altogether out of 123 selected Police Personnel, about 119 respondents have responded; starting from the Commissioner of Police down to constabulary level Police Personnel have shown their concern for this study by responding to our requests. These respondents were in the age group falling between 20 to 30 years which is about 23 percent. 24 percent of them were in the age group of 30 to 40 and a good number of respondents which is about 53 percent were in the age group of 40 and above. In matters of education which was taken as another important variable, 3 percent of the respondents had post graduation, 20 percent had graduation, 22 percent had completed pre-university college (PUC) and majority of them up to 55 percent had passed out SSLC, which is the minimum qualification required to enter into this service at the cadre of a constable. The total number of respondents consisted of 87 percent men and 13 percent of women.

In this study, Police Administration has been taken under the close scrutiny. An attempt has also been made to unveil the relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration. Emphasis is laid on informal discussion held while administering the schedules apart from formal discussions held with police personnel and Human Rights activist groups.
To begin with, the schedule was designed to start with the basic question of awareness about Human Rights, especially amongst the controlled stratified group of police personnel. We asked them whether they had heard of the concept of Human Rights, nearly 85.71 percent of them responded to the question positively, while about 7.56 percent of them responded negatively and another 6.72 percent of them replied as "do not know". By any yardstick this response is quite impressive and strengthened the initial attempts at understanding the level of basic information of this group about the much publicised Human Rights. ‘Awareness’ of one’s own field of working has been in Indian context greatly referred to as a reliable indicator of the commitment of those who are in the field concerned. This total percentage of response though impressive, in this respect does not represent a clear picture of the respondents level of commitment, which is rather very important in the stratified sample studies (see graph No. 1).

Testing hypothesis determines the validity of one of the two assumptions, technically described as null hypothesis $H_0$ and alternative hypothesis $H_1$, with a view to choose between two conflicting hypotheses about the value of a population parameter. Testing hypothesis helps to decide whether a hypothesis about population parameter is likely to be true or false on the basis of the sample observations taken from the population
# GRAPH 1

Have you heard of Human Rights?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
under the study. For this purpose statisticians have developed several
methods to test hypothesis and these have been broadly classified into two
categories:

a) Parametric Tests of Hypothesis; and

b) Non-Parametric or Distribution Free Test of Hypothesis.

Here in the present study, we use Z-test statistic to test two
contradictory hypotheses which fall in the category (a) as described. Z-test
normally applies when the assumption of normality holds true and generally
it holds true whenever the sample size is large. Let us call the hypothesis
to be tested as null hypothesis $H_0$ and the conflicting hypothesis as
alternative hypothesis $H_1$.

The Z-Test statistic for testing hypothesis such as:

$H_0$: Yes against $H_1$: is given by:

$$Z = \frac{P - p}{\sqrt{PQ/n}}$$

where $p = \text{Proportion of the sample says 'Yes'}.\$

$P = \text{Proportion of the sample says 'Yes' or 'No' are equal to } 0.5.\$

Since $P + Q = 1$, $Q = 1 - P = 0.5$

$n = \text{size of the sample}.\$

By comparing the value of $Z$ (i.e. calculated $Z$), with table value of
$Z$ (observed from normal table) at $5\%$ ($1\%$) level of significance a decision
regarding accepting $H_0$ (or $H_1$) is arrived. For most of the problems to be tested in the study Z-statistic suits well and we prefer this to test various hypotheses under study and are given below:

Considering the question: Have you heard of Human Rights?

In the present study, sample about 92 percent have said ‘Yes’ and remaining 8 percent have said ‘No’. To know the sizeable people in the sample heard about Human Rights or not.

Let, $H_0$: Proportion of Police heard of Human Rights are equal.

Against, the alternative hypothesis is:

$H_1$: Significant number of police personnel have heard of Human Rights.

To test $H_0$ Vs. $H_1$, first we shall compute population of police heard of Human Rights from the sample, that is,

\[
p = \frac{\text{Number of police heard of Human Rights}}{\text{Total number of persons in the sample}} = \frac{102}{111} = 0.9189
\]

Since the sample size $n=111$ is large, we use z-test, defined as,

\[
Z = \frac{p - \bar{P}}{\sqrt{PQ/n}} \quad (1)
\]

where the value of $P$ under $H_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, therefore $Q = 1 - P = 0.5$

Substituting all known values in equation (1) we found that the calculated value of $Z = 8.8183$. 

\[
Z = \frac{0.9189 - 0.5}{\sqrt{0.5 \times 0.5 / 111}} = 8.8183
\]
Now the table value of $Z$, denoted by $Z^1$ at 1 percent level of significance is 2.58. Since calculated $Z = 8.8183 > Z^1 = 2.58$, the null hypothesis $H_0$ is rejected. Hence, the alternative hypothesis $H_1$ is accepted viz., significant number of police personnel have heard of Human Rights.

However, a break-up of these responses was further attempted to locate and to see how the stratified groups namely higher level officers, middle level officers and lower level officers responded to this question. Of the small number of higher officers who constituted about 2.52 percent of the total respondents, nearly all of them were aware of Human Rights. While of the 8.40 percent of middle level officers, all of them had shown their awareness about Human Rights and of the 88.24 percent of lower level officers who actually deal with public and interact only 74.79 percent of them had heard about Human Rights. Yet, there was almost 7.56 percent of this group who responded as having 'not heard' about Human Rights. While nearly 5.88 percent from among the lower level officers have responded as 'do not know', to this question. This is represented in sub-graph No.1.

Although not much of work on Human Rights and Police Administration in particular have been made so far, any judgement on this result can be taken as an indicator of the growing socialisation of the
Have you heard of Human Rights?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>74.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
concept of Human Right in developing society. Many of the socialising agents like political parties, media, both electronic as well as print, activist groups and other needs can be held as taking active part in this process. As noticed many of them are consistently holding a number of discussions in this area of Human Rights on a regular basis. However, in case of the current study, the controlled groups as the respondents were expected to know and hear it from within the organisation either through the literature supplied or during their training period. Since Police Administration is a formidable part of the criminal justice system anything related to their operational jurisdiction is considered to be an integral part of their pre-service or in-service training curriculum apart from them being the contents of circulars and codes for the organisation. In order to ascertain this, out of the total 119 respondents, 85.71 percent of the respondents consisting 2.52 percent of higher officers, 8.40 percent of middle level officers and 74.79 percent of lower level officers were asked to identify their sources through which they had herd about this concept. Not surprisingly, 2.52 percent of them had heard about Human Rights from police manuals, 24.37 percent of them from police academy training centres and more than half of the total respondents i.e. 51.26 percent had heard about it from mass media/newspapers. Only 7.56 percent of them had heard of Human Rights either during their formal education or on their own specific interest (see graph No.1 A). The break-up of this response however, threw a surprise in the sense, that 2.52 percent top officials had heard about Human Rights
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If ‘Yes’ from where have you heard about it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Police Manuals</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Police Academy / Training Centre</td>
<td>24.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Media / News Papers</td>
<td>51.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing the distribution of responses](image)
during their recruitment period, that is from the academy/training centres where they received pre-service training. Since most of these officers are recruited from the Indian Police Service and State Police Services, they had a definite mode of training and they had heard about Human Rights during their training. In case of middle level officers, nearly 5.04 percent of them had heard about Human Rights at the time of their recruitment and training period, while 2.52 percent of these officers had heard about it from the media. In case of the 74.79 percent of respondents belonging to third category, about 2.52 percent of them had learnt from police manuals such as "Manuals on Human Rights Training for Police Personnel" and "Training Programme on Human Rights for Police". Nearly 16.81 percent had heard about it during in-service training and 47.90 percent of them had heard it from mass media/newspapers. About 7.56 percent of them had this information right from their school education itself and most of these police personnel were the newly recruited ones to this field (see sub-graph No.1A).

Two interpretations can be offered to this kind of data at this stage:
(a) that the media/newspapers are still the largest socialising agents of Human Rights; (b) that because the newspapers are the most common information sources amongst the lower cadre of police administration, there is a growing consciousness of Human Rights in this group.
SUB-GRAPH 1A

If 'Yes' from where have you heard about it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2.52%</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0.00%</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>47.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While, these officials are being educated through media/newspapers about Human Rights, the training component also has made good dent on these groups. Apart from this, the National Human Rights Commission (1993) which is circulating regular circulars to the police stations in order to create awareness about Human Rights has also had its impact on spreading consciousness about Human Rights amongst these groups. Despite knowing the fact that the training input had quite an effective impact on the police personnel in giving them an idea about Human Rights, keeping in view the objective of the research undertaken more specific question about input of training in relation to Human Rights amongst the police personnel was taken up. A question pertaining to this was, whether police personnel were given training/orientation/refresher courses in Human Rights. Such a question was specifically designed to learn from the respondent whether there was a trend amongst the police to ignore the prescriptions of Human Rights knowingly or unknowingly or whether there was any weakness in the process of investigation itself that did not allow the police personnel to be conscious of Human Rights. These hypothetical notions were thought to react on the mode of training imparted to these police officers. A possible explanation for these kinds of attitude amongst the Police was also thought of to throw light on one time training i.e. pre-service training imparted to the police for all the cadres which is not followed by an in-service or on-the-job training at regular
intervals. Apart from that, the question also attempted to know if the police organisation provides updated information to those who work within their own organisations which is rather hierarchical well organised and in which order flows from top to the bottom having similar characteristics of British Police system. Nearly 82.35 percent of respondents as against the 24.37 percent of response for the previous question opined that they had not been given orientation/training/refresher course for the last 10 years except their pre-service orientation. This indicates that training especially of the lower cadre has been sadly neglected. 15.13 percent of respondents responded positively. They said that they had been given training. About 2.52 percent of them have responded as “do not know” (see graph No.2).

Of the total of 15.13 percent of respondents who responded positively, nearly 6 percent belonged to middle and top level officials and 8.40 percent of respondents were from the lower cadres. This 6 percent consisted of officials belonging to middle and top levels who had recently been given refresher course on Human Rights. The 9.24 percent of respondents belonging to the lower cadre were probationary constables (see sub-graph No.2).

Talking about the training aspects in any organisation, they constitutes two types of training viz., ; (a) pre-service training and (b) in-service training. Pre-service training is generally defined as a preparation for entrance into the public service, while in-service training is defined as
GRAPH 2

Have you been given Orientation / Training / Refresher Course in Human Rights?

1. Yes 15.13%
2. No 82.35%
3. Don’t know 2.52%
Have you been given Orientation / Training / Refresher Course in Human Rights?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>9.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the training imparted to a person after his appointment to the Government service. The terms like orientation and refresher course falls under the respective training periods. As such, orientation course is supposed to be the training imparted during the in-service training period only and the refresher courses are supposed to be conducted during the intensive field training period.10

Further, an attempt was made to learn from the respondents about their familiarity of the concept of Human Right (see graph No.3). Nearly 35.29 percent of respondents replied that they had learnt about Human Right concept very recently. They came to know only after the establishment of the National Human Rights Commission in India. About 20.17 percent of them said that they were aware of it for the past 10 years and 15.97 percent responded as having known about Human Rights in the past 5 years, 15.13 percent replied as 'do not know and 13.05 percent of respondents responded as having known of this concept for the past 20 years. Category-wise responses to this question revealed the fact that 3.52 percent of higher officers are aware of Human Rights from a longer duration. While in case of middle level officers, 8.40 percent of them were familiar with Human Right concept from a reasonable period ranging between 10 to 15 years. While a meagre of 0.84 percent of them said that they came to know about it recently and as do not know respectively. In case of lower level officers, about 34.45 percent agreed that they were
**GRAPH 3**

Since how long are you familiar with Human Right Concept?

1. Last 20 years 13.45%
2. Last 10 years 20.17%
3. Last 5 years 15.97%
4. Recently 35.29%
5. Don’t know 15.13%
familiar with this concept only recently and most of them expressed that their entry into service was the point of their learning about Human Right. 11. 16.81 percent were familiar with it for the past 10 years, 14.29 percent responded as do not know, 11.76 percent were familiar with it for the past 5 years and 10.92 percent for the past 20 years. These responses infact helped us to measure further the in-depth knowledge of Human Rights these respondents may have had vis-a-vis the length of service they had put in. It was only at the bottom level that could give us a clear picture about the correlation between the length of service and depth of knowledge about Human Right, which ofcourse was not as anticipated (see sub-graph No.3). Relating to this James Vadakumchery explains in his book on 'Indian Police - 2001: What Went Wrong Here? (1998)"12, observed that it is the duty of the organisation concerned to give information on the subject to all members in the service and for that purpose only qualified experts should be appointed. He further states that the lower cadre need a very effective interaction with their higher echelons since, the idea of Human Right is to humanise the administration.

These aspects of training that are supposed to be built into the police organisation does not seem to exist in reality. This indicates the need for upgrading the training methods, especially of the teaching contents and modules. There is also a felt need that training should include lower cadres on regular intervals combined with higher echelons because within
Since how long are you familiar with Human Right Concept?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>34.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the organisation if “Human Dignity”, is recognised undoubtedly, the human being who is functioning in that organisation will definitely carry the same attitude or approach towards the people whoever comes to seek assistance from them.¹³

To a question about what according to the respondents was the concept of Human Rights, substituted with the following options: (a) University concept of Human right; (b) Protection of Human Rights Act 1993,¹⁴ and (c) Textual definition of Human Rights as ensured in Universal Declaration of Human Rights.¹⁵ Nearly 68.91 percent of them opted for definition of Human Rights Act (1993) as enshrined in the fundamental rights under articles 14 to 32 in the Indian constitution which are enforceable in courts of India. Since this is the most routine activity that the organisation of police come across in their day-to-day activity, this seems to be their most favourite choice. 23.53 percent of them preferred what is enshrined in basic document of Universal Declaration of Human Rights, although in our discussions with them the respondents failed to identify the basic documents connected to this. About 2.52 percent of them responded to the concept of Human Right as universally understood, while the same percent preferred ‘all the above’ as an answer and ‘do not know’, respectively (see graph No.4). What is most interesting is the break-up of these answers. Amongst the top officials, 1.68 percent of them preferred constitutional context of Human Rights and 0.84 percent of them
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What according to you is concept of Human Right?

1. Human Rights are those that belong to an individual as a consequence of him being human. 2.52%
2. Human Rights are those related to life, liberty, equality and dignity of an individual, guaranteed by the Constitution or embodied in the international covenants and enforceable by the Courts in India. 68.91%
3. Human Rights are those, which every human being is entitled to enjoy and to have it protected. 23.53%
4. All the above. 2.52%
5. Don’t know. 2.52%
referred to the response all the above. Among the middle level officers, nearly 7.56 percent of them preferred constitutional aspect of the Protection of Human Rights Act 1993. 0.84 percent each agreed to the context of basic document which is in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and all the above responses. Variation came up with the lower level officials, nearly 59.66 percent preferred Protection of Human Rights Act (1993) i.e., constitutional aspect, 22.69 percent preferred basic document of Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 2.52 percent preferred the Universal context of Human Rights as well as 'do not know' and 0.84 percent preferred 'all the above' (see sub-graph No.4).

However, an analysis of this clearly indicates that Human Rights content coming under all the three aspects is only understood by a very few respondents in all the levels. Protecting an individual as consequence of him being human and his rights being a citizen of a country and to have it protected by the organisation in-charge is only understood by the respondents because they are familiar with this in the day-to-day media. As noticed earlier, familiarity and day-to-day consequence of their administration seems to be dominating in minds of most of the respondents as against the other choices, clearly brings to the fore the issue that Human Rights is a comprehensive concept understood by the police in only limited context, that too in the context that affects them in their day-to-day affairs.
What according to you is concept of Human Right?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cetegory I</th>
<th>Cetegory II</th>
<th>Cetegory III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1.68%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>59.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>22.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is possible that either these officers have not attempted to learn about this or simply do not believe in attempting to know more about it as they feel that it is of no consequence to them, unless they are on the wrong side of the law.

To penetrate further, a question that was posed to respondents to elicit from them the depth of their knowledge and familiarity about the basic documents that govern the matters connected to Human Rights in India and its status in the international scenario. The respondents were asked to name the Acts/declarations that govern Human Rights in India and three options were given to them. Primarily, India being signatory to the decisions of the United Nations Organisation had given its consent to Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the year 1948. As a consequence of this the Indian constitution had enshrined under its fundamental rights these components. With the beginning of globalisation and growing concern for Human Rights around the world, India too had initiated recently the Protection of Human Rights Act 1993. For an agency like Police all these options are of consequence and it was anticipated that they would lead all of them together. The response however, not surprisingly was an overwhelming 84.87 percent of 'do no know'. While 10.92 percent preferred fundamental rights as governing Human Rights in India, 1.68 percent each preferred Protection of Human Rights Act 1993 and all the above responses and only 0.84 percent believed Universal
Declaration of Human Rights as governing Human rights matters in India (see graph No.5). Although it is true that fundamental rights as consequences of day-do-day administration as said earlier is the most popular answer amongst police, only 10.92 percent of the total respondents had preferred this. If read together the responses to questions posed earlier (No.12 & 13) there is a clear gap that a researcher can notice between the understanding of the ‘concept’, of Human Rights by Police and its operational aspects. Although there are about 2.52 percent of higher officers, as respondents their response is also divided in this case between Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Fundamental Rights as governing Human Right matters in India. While a meagre 0.84 percent have responded correctly as all the above. In case of 8.40 percent of middle level officers who are otherwise seen as active participants in maintaining law and order in society and who often are accused as violating the limits of Human Rights including issues like custodial death etc., nearly 6.72 percent of respondents responded as ‘do not know’. While mere 2.52 percent saw fundamental rights as governing Human Rights in India. Similarly, those who are active as the field level i.e. the constabulary category of police organisation which is the lowest rank among the organisation had not surprisingly responded as ‘do not know’ amounting to 78.15 percent. Only about 7.56 percent of respondents in this category believed that fundamental rights governing Human Right matters in India and while 1.68 percent responded Protection of Human Right Act 1993 as
Can you name the Acts / Declarations that govern Human Rights in India?

1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) 0.84%
2. Fundamental Rights (1950) 10.92%
3. Human Rights Act in India (1993) 1.68%
4. All the above 1.68%
5. Don't know 84.87%
governing Human Right matters in India. Only 0.84 percent have responded in this case also as all the above. This is indeed quite a fearing response, because this explicitly speaks of the input of Human Rights in police organisation. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, the expectations of response for this question and the responses of the officers at all levels, not only is indicative of the dearth of knowledge of Human Right but also speaks of the needed socialisation of Human Right and orientation required. If 84.87 percent of the respondents including the top brass officers can say that they are not aware of what governs Human Right matters in India than this would leave us gaping at the violations of Human Rights without any surprise (see sub-graph No.5).

In order to strengthen this kind of belief a further penetrating question was asked about some of the Acts/Declarations which cover the Human Rights content that are specific to Police Administration with a view to find out how close these issues are to ‘police’. As can be seen in the graphical presentation (see graph No.6). About 0.84 percent of the total respondents did speak of United Nation’s Declaration on Rights of Offenders (1955) and same percent have knowledge about Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman degrading treatment or Punishment (1984). 1.68 percent of policemen are aware of Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (1977). 2.52 percent of respondents are aware of the Code of Conduct for Police in India (1985).
SUB-GRAPH 5

Can you name the Acts / Declarations that govern Human Rights in India?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cetegory I</th>
<th>Cetegory II</th>
<th>Cetegory III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td>78.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can you name some of the Acts / Declarations, which cover Human Rights content but are specific to Police Administration?

1. United Nation’s declaration on Rights of offenders (1955) 0.84%
2. Standard Minimum Rules for the treatment of Prisoners (1977) 1.68%
3. United Nation’s Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials (1979) 0.00%
4. Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading treatment or punishment (1984) 0.84%
5. Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power (1985) 0.00%
6. United Nation’s Standard Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (1985) 0.00%
7. Code of Conduct for Police in India (1985) 2.52%
8. Don’t know 94.12%
An analysis of this response reveals that the responses for this question has mainly come from higher officers and the middle level officers belonging to Sub Inspector and above cadres. Although one could consider this as a positive sign, what is regrettable is the fact that the ‘police’, which is most significant sub-system within the criminal justice system does not seem to be up to the expectations of an elite organisation. Any functionary performing in an organisation is expected to know the laws that govern their activity. Ignorance on their part in these matters can only be considered as a ‘negative’ point, while stress will have to be laid on the necessities of orienting the functionaries about the laws that govern them. However, in this focused research it is noted that this is an overwhelming percent of 94.12 respondents have responded as ‘do not know’. A break-up of this response indicates that every higher level officer who constitute nearly 2.52 percent of respondents also have little knowledge of these Acts/Declarations which are specific to police. Because 1.68 percent of respondents from this cadre responded as ‘do not know’ and only one (0.84) percent have responded as knowing about the one of the seven alternatives provided, while in case of the middle level officers nearly 6.72 percent of respondents have given a negative reply by responding as ‘do not know’, and about 1.68 percent responded as knowing about Acts/Declarations that cover Human rights context like Standard Minimum Rules for Treatment of Prisoners (1977), only 0.84 percent is aware of United Nations Declaration of Rights of Offenders (1955). Where as in
case of the third category consisting of constables, response is almost negative, i.e. 85.72 percent, while 2.52 percent of respondents discussed about Code of Conduct for Police in India (1985) (see sub-graph No.6).

Although, it would be very difficult to believe the negative response coming up from the organisation in-charge of law and order viz., police in the country and it is also true as informal discussion revealed that most of these officers at the higher/middle level have barely any time to familiar themselves with documents or with the changing time and affairs that are occurring at the global level. As a result of this, those men who are functioning under this organisation have very little time to update themselves. Engrossed in their mundane activity of day-to-day administration like writing beat book, adhering to regular attendance and concentrating on routine offenders or attending to higher officers at lower levels, while at middle level their pre-occupation with their routine round up beats and monitoring activities seems to hinder their understanding, although many of them in these cadres showed their keen interest in knowing about these acts. Higher officers who actually have more or better opportunity to spare time to learn and impart, are engaged in social functions or other obligatory activities both personal or otherwise. Their pre-occupation with administration rather than concentrating on upgradation of their knowledge and imparting the same to the lower level officers or to juniors does not seem to interest them more. Although, the
Can you name the Acts / Declarations, which cover Human Rights content but are specific to Police Administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td>85.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents were not very clear about the acts that govern them, being conscious of the fact that experience is a great teacher, a further question to this was asked to know from the respondents by virtue of their experience if they were satisfied with the contents of above Acts/Declarations. The responses to this question was also quite shocking in the sense that the respondents were not at all in a position to offer their opinion on this. A very meagre 5.04 percent of respondents have responded to this question as being satisfied with the contents of these Acts/Declarations which in fact, is not a very encouraging reply. Further analysis of this question see in graph No.7 and a break-up of the responses to this question represented in sub-graph 7, one can see the poor responses. In continuation to this question, a sub-question was put before these respondents whose response was also not very encouraging. 2.52 percent of them expressed the reason for ‘not satisfactory’ is that these Acts/Declarations are unsuitable for Indian conditions (see graph No.7A) and category-wise responses also can be seen in sub-graph No.7A.

After ascertaining from the respondents their level of understanding of the various documents connected to Human Rights, a further attempt was made to know about the matrix the possible relationship that may have existed between Human Rights and Police Administration. Human rights today has outgrown in proportions encompassing a large operational area, involving nations beyond the border, covering the national/local interests
GRAPH 7

Are you satisfied with the contents of those Acts / Declarations?

1. Yes 5.04%
2. No 2.52%
Are you satisfied with the contents of those Acts / Declarations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If ‘No’ give reasons

1. They are elite in content. 0.00%
2. Formulated under ideal conditions. 0.00%
3. There is need to change in the content of these Acts / Declarations to realize them in full. 0.00%
4. Not suitable for Indian conditions. 2.52%
5. Don’t know 0.84%
## SUB-GRAPH 7A

If 'No' give reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph Image]
and also the rights of communities down to an individual. This enlarged version of Human Rights at the outset gives an impression that it also covers the rights of the citizens, may have and also those interest groups that are fighting against the state to restore the rights. Such juxtapositional counter view often confuses any researcher pursuing Human Rights perse and also its inter-relationship with various other agencies that is operating within the society.\textsuperscript{16} This being the crux of the problem, Human Rights and Police Administration from the angle of rights gives an impression that they are two sides of the same coin. However, if the rights are deleted then the operational area of Human Rights will demand a re-defined position. This being the relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration, it is important to study how each of them behave towards the other in a context that demands differential functioning of police. Having said this, let us discuss a bit about the rights as defined earlier. Infact, it is an accepted fact that rights are those privileges of every human being in a given social system to facilitate blossoming of his complete personality. The primary job of any organisation within and under the jurisdiction of the state therefore, is to work positively towards this and protect this right of an individual from being harmed by any of the existing relationships within the society. Administration being one of the more specifically established agencies with their jurisdiction falling within the broad criminal justice system is expected to work towards this goal with greater commitment. To facilitate such a committed performance, police also like any other
organisation under the state is established as a clearly defined organisation attributed with various characteristics of an organisation like hierarchy, accountability, span of control etc., controlled by the in-built discipline, imparted social values and an operational methodology. With these attributes, Police Administration in a civilized society is expected to perform the role of a law implementor, who respects the rights of its citizens using coercive force whenever necessary to threaten those who may cause apprehension within the peaceful social atmosphere. However, given to the socio-cultural milieu of a society like India, it is possible that an organisation in-charge of law and order may not always succeed in fulfilling its given ideal role by being totally law bond because of the demands of the circumstances within which they are performing. To exemplify this fact, we can examine a context where enforcing law and order might also call for the use of coercive powers which is sanctioned legitimately for this agency. However, in the normal circumstances this legitimized power is not revoked by the organisation. But if the situation challenges this and the ability to control is beyond their peaceful law implementation, then the police will in order of ascendancy use its coercive force to quell the problem confronted by them thus, involving actions beyond the stipulated jurisdiction of operation. Here, the action of police as an agency of the state will be subjected to scrutiny leading to the questions involving rights and for justice compensation etc. In order to establish the fact the individual in a society has the sovereign right to
protect himself as per the fundamental law of the land these actions will have to be evoked by those agencies that are charged with the task of bringing about justice. It is such a context that Human Rights often gets involved with police breaking with it even the minimal relation it has with Police Administration consensus in these matters therefore will be the need under such circumstances to avoid any feeling amongst these agencies that one is overlapping over other's jurisdiction. The ideal relationship between Human Right and Police Administration therefore, is expected to be as represented in this diagram, an equal one and possibly, mutually contributory.

Since various constitutional rights similar to Human Rights come under the direct supervision of Police, from law and order to arrest of the criminal etc., in a country like India, protection of these rights becomes a major concern of Human Rights activism. Inspite of all these ideal conditions, due to various reasons beginning from education to constabulary level to that of the orientation and regular training intervals, there is always the likelihood of abuse of powers by the Police. Therefore, a realistic approach should be thought of to reconcile the individual rights,
liberties and privileges with individual duties, obligations and responsibilities keeping the collective interest as utmost. The diagram below represents this kind of an interest.

(b) Matter of Consensus:

Human Rights Groups and Police Administration therefore, are expected to work together understanding each other towards one purpose in a democratic set up. If police on one hand is expected to uphold the constitutional rights and civil rights, Human rights on the other, should ensure that the police as an agency does not overstep their powers and if done so, must help the citizens to restore their faith in the state and their rights that are bestowed upon them not allowing domination of any one over the other which often happens. Diagram below represents this.

(c) Matter of Domination:

As a result of such circumstance, Police often do think that Human Rights is dominating over their administration. And this fact is revealed in our research too. A police officer with a sense of discipline, respect to his
self, decorum to his role in society, morality in his profession, honour to human beings is expected to show respect and honour to Human Rights. However, this in not always the case. Often, one finds that there is some resistance from police officers to show due respect to Human Rights. They often express themselves saying that police work will become ineffective if Human Rights are fully honoured. Many a time the police always found themselves at the point of getting blames. The people at large also show their concern for Human Rights despite the fact that in many cases police are found to be on the right side. What is therefore needed is a relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration that defines it as a co-operative one (see diagram).

(d) Matter of Co-operational/Ideal:

Misconceptions about each other between these two agencies is the primary reason for this. This is evidenced in our study too. Ofcourse one cannot anticipate these things to happen overnight, but definitely can hope to find a synthesis in due course when everything will be balanced. As days pass by, the police will become more receptive to the Modern Concepts of Human Rights and Human Rights will soon reciprocate.
Having this preconception, a question was posed to the respondents who are functioning within the organisation of police to find out if there exists any relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration. This of course, was the content of formal discussions with Human Right Groups in the study area. To this question majority of the respondents i.e., nearly 75.63 percent of them favoured the positive reply and they said that they believed that there exists a relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration. About 16.81 percent of respondents gave a negative reply for this and 7.58 percent of respondents replied as 'do not know'. Apparently, since respondents had agreed to the fact that there exists an undefined relationship between Human Right and Police Administration (see graph No.8). As described in the analysis of statistics in previous question, we have tested other question also applying the test Z-statistic and are described.

Considering the question:

Do you see any relationship between the concept of Human Rights and Police Administration.

Number of individuals said ‘Yes’ - 82% and ‘No’ - 18%.

Based on this the hypotheses to be tested are:

H₀: There will be one to one relationship between the concept of Human Rights and Police administration.

H₁: There is no such relationship.
Do you see any relationship between concept of Human Right and Police Administration?

1. Yes 75.63%
2. No 16.81%
3. Don’t know 7.58%
The computed test statistic Z value (procedure as described in previous test) is 0.3182, which is greater than table value of $Z = 2.58$ at 1% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_0$ is accepted, implying that, significant number of police personnel have accepted that there is one to one relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration.

All the 2.52 percent of top officials, 7.56 percent of the middle level officers and about 65.55 percent of lower level officers believed that there exists a relationship between the Police Administration and Human Rights. Perhaps, this is the reason why irrespective of what Human Rights actually means, that nearly 85.71 percent of respondents had said that they had heard about Human Rights. The high profile propaganda given to introduce Human Rights in India might have induced these to believe that there exists a relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration. Only 1.68 percent of middle level officers and nearly 15.13 percent of the bottom level category responded negatively to this. About 7.56 percent of constabulary category replied as 'do not know' (See Sub-Graph No.8) to this question.

In order to get an answer and ascertain from the functionaries who have responded positively to the question about the relationship between Human rights and Police Administration, a further rider was added to learn
Do you see any relationship between concept of Human Right and Police Administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>65.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>15.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from them the nature of such a relationship that exists between Human Rights and Police Administration. As many as seven options were given to choose their responses that included; friendly relation, co-operative relation, mutually influencing or dominant relationship and so on. Interestingly, 28.57 percent of respondents believe that the nature of this relationship is co-operative, while 10.08 percent have identified it as friendly. About 8.40 percent of respondents agreed to the fact that relationship is mutually influencing and 0.84 percent believed that relationship was unfriendly. 10.92 percent said that it is a non-co-operative relationship and nearly 16.81 percent believed that Human Right is dominant. This mosaic of responses clearly indicates that there is a need to give a definitive frame work to this relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration (see graph No.8A)

Further, if one observes the variation in the above responses closely it also gives an impression that the respondents are not clear about the kind of relationship that exists between Human Rights and Police Administration. The respondents belonging to the top officials category seem to suggest that this relationship is a kind of one sided dominance, apart from this in our informal discussions these respondents out-rightly argued that Human Right is a dominating force over Police. In case of middle level officers nearly 2.52 percent each believed that between Human Rights and Police Administration there exists friendly and co-operative
GRAPH 8A

If ‘Yes’ is it.....

1. Friendly 10.08%
2. Unfriendly 0.84%
3. Co-operative 28.57%
4. Non-co-operative 10.92%
5. Mutually influencing 8.40%
6. Human Right is dominant 16.81%
7. Police Administration is dominant 0.00%
8. Don’t know 0.00%
relationship. While 1.68 percent of them joined their top officials and agreed to the fact that Human Right is dominant over Police Administration, mere 0.84 percent of them believe that relationship between these two as mutually influencing. Among the lower level officials consisting of constables gave a surprise, since they have a totally different shade of opinion about the relations between Human Rights and Police Administration. To them this relationship is rather co-operative and 26.05 percent of them have opted for this response, while quite a sizeable majority i.e., 12.61 percent believed that Human Right is dominant over Police Administration. Nearly, 10.92 percent opined that the relationship between Human Right and Police Administration as non-co-operative, 7.56 percent of them each believed that it is friendly as well as mutually influencing relationship that existed between Human Right and Police Administration. The response of top officials who are actually expected to have a complete knowledge of Human Right and related matters some how gives a feeling that it was a calculated response that they gave to sort publicise of their allergy to Human Right which often seeks to play a major role in the jurisdiction of Police Administration (see sub-graph No.8A).
**SUB-GRAPH 8A**

If 'Yes' is it.....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>26.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since, Police Administration like most governmental organisations is also hierarchy ridden in structure, where towards the apex the power concentration is high, this response (see above diagram) that Human Rights is dominating the police seems to be a conscious attempt of these higher officers to avoid Human Right participating and intruding in their power jurisdiction and thereby diluting this power. In the current study, it was noticed that the police were aversive to the excessive exposure given to Human Rights. In our formal discussions it was revealed that they were finding it uneasy to accept the fact that Human Rights was slowly but surely enlarging its operational jurisdiction by assuming and usurping powers of those agencies which were in-charge of law and order viz., Police.

Added to this the number of cases against police officers including the latest issues of “lawyers” strike at Delhi or the case of “Idga Maidan” in Hubli where higher officers were targeted by activists for their decisions, also came up in the course of the discussions held with them. Apart from this, these officers also brought to the centre of discussions the lacuna that exists in Indian Civil Service even to this day, where an officer holding the authority of a revenue district or taluka will have more powers over an officer of almost the equal rank merely because he carried with him the
Magisterial powers to dispense justice. Citing this as an example, they voiced their disgruntlement about Human Rights in a similar fashion because Human rights with it also carried an image of an authority that can dispense with 'justice' while, police is seen merely as an authority incapable of dispensing 'justice', despite the fact that Police Administration in India is operating under the umbrella of Criminal Justice System.21 The respondents further said that perhaps it is this edge over dispensing justice that gives the feeling that Human Right is better than police that helps the Human Right to dominate over Police Administration, were rather critical of this and were very vocal about it. However, this did not seem to be the case with the middle level officers. Although, in reality it is these officers in the hierarchy of Police Administration who are responsible to implement the law and if need be to initiate necessary action at the field level. The possible disposition of these middle level officers in having a role to receiving orders from above and executing them and if needed to use coercive powers may have prompted them to locate the relation between Human Rights and Police Administration as being friendly and co-operative. Their presence at the field level and their interactions with the Human Rights group as suggested by a leader of the Human Rights Group may have been the cause for such a response. It was evident from their response that the middle level officers were aware that it would be difficult for them to perform in a society, where Human Right is given a higher
value and greater degree of acceptance combined with much wider understanding publicity as compared with Police Administration, which by their own actions over a period has earned a disrepute. The middle level officers agreed to the fact that Human Right Groups have an advantage to identify themselves as an agency flowering at the people's level itself and that this legitimacy out beats the traditional position of police administration which is likely to change according to them if a civic society surfaces in the future with a third power called the NGO's can grow between state and the society, they said that in the debate of globalisation where rolling back of the state becomes the agenda and also more particularly the composition of the state will slowly reduce the importance of state, the majority of middle level officers were sure that they will have to accept the domination of Human Right over Police Administration. What is really hurting at this level of discussion is the fact that a very meagre percent of respondents at this state believed that relationship between Human Right and Police Administration is mutually influencing. While it should by any yard stick have been the correct response. Further, if one observes the responses of the third category (see sub graph 8A) which in fact in reality has direct access to public, by working on the areas such as keeping the track records of habitual offenders or criminals of all sorts defined the relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration as being co-operative. Thus, if one observes the overall
responses to this question it is very clear that a majority of them believed that the concept of Human Right has a very close co-operative and friendly kind of relationship with Police Administration and there are no hassles between these two. While there is a second opinion that Human Right is dominant over Police. A negligible percent of respondents however, believed that there is non-co-operative relationship between the two to a greater level. This is a satisfactory reply so far as our research is concerned, since it strengthens our hypotheses.

However, to support this observation, a question was posed to learn from the respondents as to how the concept of Human Rights mattered in their day-to-day administration. This question was designed to see whether Human Right was a cognisable part of Police Administration to establish the kind of interface that may exist between Human Rights and Police Administration. It is needless to say that Human Rights interest despite any amount of barriers has the ability to sneak into the arena of Police Administration especially at the operational level to lay check and balance, while the use of coercive powers vested in Police Administration in put to use. Out of the total 119 police personnel, 84.03 percent of respondents have agreed that Human Rights matter in day-to-day Police Administration. This is a very crucial response which helps us to notice the established control mechanism on use of force in police activity. Although,
it is difficult to substantiate this argument with necessary statistical input*
the fact revealed in our informal discussion is that there exists amongst the
rank and file of police officials a conscious consciousness regarding the
activism of Human Rights. As against this many of the Human Rights
activists believe that they et involved in the issue connected with the police
only when they are sure they are playing safe. Most of the Human Rights
activists interviewed here have the 'law' background. Some of them are
also practising lawyers. They, like any other ordinary citizen also share the
apprehension that dealing with police is not easy. They are as agreed by
most of them influenced mostly by the success stories of Human Rights
activism elsewhere, but on their own would think twice to get involved
unless they are assured of a good support base to fight. This timidity is
ofcourse not revealed completely before the police by them. Their
background of 'law' as they opined often comes to their rescue rather than
their activism was ofcourse a revelation. In this regard, they also pleaded
for Human Right education at the University level too. This being the
story behind Human Right activism, the response of police relating to
Human Right as a matter of concern for police can be seen from another
angle too. Only 7.56 percent of respondents replied as 'no' and 8.41
percent responded as 'do not know' also (see graph No.9) The break-up

* Since nobody is worthy to share.
GRAPH 9

Does Human Right concept matter in day today Administration of Police?

1. Yes 84.03%
2. No 7.56%
3. Don’t know 8.41%
of these top/middle/constabulary levels reveal the fact that 2.52 percent of top officials have agreed to this fact and a substantial percent (i.e. 8.40) of middle level officials also accepted that Human Right matters in their mundane administration. Approximately, 73.11 percent from constabulary group also accepted the view expressed by their higher officers and only 0.84 percent from middle level and 6.72 percent form the constabulary level have responded 'no' and while 8.40 percent from constabulary have responded as 'do not know' (see sub-graph No.9), these respondents although agreed to the fact Human Right matters in day-to-day administration but they did not reveal the nature of this kind of relationship.

In order to understand the delicacy of this statement about the interface of Human Rights with Police Administration and also to counter check their response to earlier question about the nature of relationship that exist between Human Rights and Police Administration much more straight question was asked to learn about the possible kind of interface that Human Rights and Police Administration may have and the nature of such a relationship. Four options of such relationship was given as a choice to the respondents to choose. They included; stumbling block, bottleneck, bureaucratic and humanizing relationships. 31.93 percent of respondents saw the interface of Human Rights with Police Administration as a humanizing one. While, the same percent of respondents saw this relation as a stumbling block. From top officials to the bottom level constabulary, this kind of response was mostly focused to a particular area. The area
Does Human Right concept matter in day today Administration of Police?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>73.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
falling under maintenance of law and order and the question of investigating crime. In the formal discussions held with police personnel belonging to all three categories, they expressed their difficulties in their functioning, especially while handling the allegedly accused/criminal, because of the instructions given by the Supreme Court of India in case of D.K.Basu Vs. West Bengal (instructions to protect the Human Rights of accused (see appendix No.VII)). Courts imposition of a lot of responsibilities on them in these matters they felt was hampering their activity and making them feel uneasy in their functioning of day-to-day administration. 22.69 percent of respondents believed that it was a kind of bottleneck relationship that existed between them and nearly 12.61 percent responded as 'do not know'. Only 0.84 percent saw it as a bureaucratic relation (see graph No.10). It is pertinent here to mention that world watch in the era of globalisation is a very important activity and only an act of ignorance on part of any organisation in their guard could only push them out of race. Infact, the Police Administration in India will have to be sensitive to this kind of criticism because it is becoming increasingly evident that today Police Administration is becoming increasingly reactionary while, the most pressing need that is essential for ensuring a better functioning of the police is the question of improving their public image. Unfortunately, the reputation of the police for integrity and behaviour as it exists today, is not what is expected of them. The recommendations of various committee reports in this regard set up from
Do you consider that Human Rights and Police administration as having.....?

1. A stumbling block relations. 31.93%
2. A bottleneck relations. 22.69%
3. A bureaucratic relation. 0.84%
4. A humanising relation. 31.93%
5. Don't know. 12.61%
time to time, has not yielded any result or brought about any radical change. Certain pre-requisites required for efficient police administration needs to be effected. They include; proper leadership, team work among various police ranks, honesty, discipline, high moral standards etc. Referring to the recommendations made in the *sixth report of the National Police Commission* which in fact focused upon the strong police leadership in administration calls for greater public co-operation also, which of course, is another important factor for its successful functioning. Since without public assistance it will be difficult for the police to perform. Leadership being of paramount importance helps the subordinate officers to follow the directions of their superiors if the superiors cut a niche above the rest as leaders. It is therefore imperative that the higher echelons of the police force are not only expected to be efficient but also are expected to be capable to provide leadership of a very high order. Similarly, the team work, the officers and the men in the police force must work with team spirit avoiding personal gains and publicity. The goal of all police activities must be to ensure maintenance of law and order. Since, functioning of police organisation largely depends on proper co-ordination between different police ranks within the force itself. Proper liaison among the police force between their own personnel and public will support Police Administration. Another factor which plays an important role in Police Administration is the relationship between senior officers and with their subordinates. In other words, successful administration depends upon
cordial relationship between the senior officers and junior officers of various ranks. The senior officer should not only be feared but respected. The relationship should be as such that of a senior and subordinate officer. There should be no misunderstanding and mistrust as that would result in “transferred loyalty”. The officers must be able to repose confidence among their subordinates because of their efficiency and professionalism. They must watch their interest and reduce heavy load work and initiate steps to improve their service conditions.

Proper liaison with Magistracy: It is pertinent to mention that there should be close co-operation between the district Superintendent of Police and the district magistrate. The former is responsible for maintenance of law and order and the latter is considered to be his director in the matter of wide policies, powers that be, must ensure that district magistrate does not over-rule the district Superintendent of Police and browbeat him in the matter of transfer of subordinate officers as dual control would not be workable.

Scientific Methods: Police should not resort to third degree method as the same do not play and usually land the investigating officers in trouble. In order to bring reforms in administration, the mechanism of investigation should shift from the traditional methods (such as beating, concoction, framing of changes, podding, institution of false cases) to new
scientific methods. To workout the cases and look for finger prints, blood stains, in-depth inquiries, studying of modus operandi adopted by the criminals, sustained questioning of suspects, collection of criminals intelligence, watch on the activities of the criminals, surveillance on bad character etc., would certainly pay dividends. To meet these new methods it is necessary that the forensic science laboratories are well equipped for examination of certain materials like blood stains, inks, remnants of explosions, fire arms, blood, earth bullets etc. Even latest equipment for the force will be an absolute necessity, but also the force would need to be adequately manned. In case the force is not well equipped, it would not be able to face the hostile groups and challenging situations.23

In order to attract good and qualified men in the police force, the service conditions need to be improved. The police, as is known have to perform long hours of duty which affects their efficiency. They, being on duty for all the 24 hours, remain under constant tension, anxiety and mental strain. It is therefore necessary to improve service conditions and are to be given more benefits. In this regard, the National Police Commission in its second report has been dealt, with this in detail about improving service conditions i.e., welfare measures in two categories.24 This effort not only brings the good and qualified persons but minimise chances of corruption also. Apart from these, other factors like extensive training for policemen, periodical courses may be arranged which should
include training in handling of explosives, lifting of finger prints, foot prints and scientific methods of investigation. Resistance to political pressures and supervision are the other important factors which are essential for Police Administration to function effectively.

Since Human Right has recently picked up the conscious of an average individual, Police Administration will have to be sensitive to this and act upon. About 22.69 percent officers even to this day believe that Human Right has a bottleneck relationship with the Police Administration as referred to earlier. There is a need for working towards changing this kind of a relationship between Human Rights and Police organisation who tend to presume that any agency that performs to safeguard rights of an individual seems to be having an opposing stand in relation to Police Administration. In this connection, it is pertinent to bring out the feelings expressed by the officers. They feel that unlike their organisation Human Rights beyond its statutory status also has its existence in the form of NGOs and this has not only restricted their free atmosphere but also have dwindled their horizon of operation and police activism by shrinking their arena. They opined that Human Right in fact has allowed little breathing space for them thereby choking their activity. When discussed further and asked to illustrate, they exemplified their experience with number of cases. To put on record they are of the opinion that Human Rights existence shrinks their primary activity of ‘suspecting’ an individual in case of a crime
committed, despite his known history. In today’s context, having known
the suspect with whom the police have been interacting in the past, it is
making it extremely difficult for them today to push him into police custody
beyond 24 hours during which various degrees of investigation takes place
to extract the needed information from him. Even if they are permitted to
retain the alleged/criminal they are apprehensive about employing any harsh
methods to extract information, consequences of this the police believes in
enlargement of criminal nexus and activity. They pose two reasons to
strengthen their argument in this regard. (a) Human Rights activism is
trying to empower the criminals by treating them as gentlemen, which
according to police will not solve the problem and (b) police do their duty
of tracking the alleged anti-socals within the society and producing them in
person in the court. But, now-a-days in the name of Human Rights, police
are not in a position to do this because of their apprehension of being made
to face the trials of law by Human Right Groups. Infact, the police fee that
they should be left to operate with their own experience and any reform
introduced within a society should also find an exception and also safety
valve for the performing police themselves. The police also were
concerned when they said that they were a part of the same society and
treating them as people without heart as wrong. About 0.84 percent of
them said that it was a bureaucratic relation that existed between Human
Right and Police Administration. These officers expressed their concern
about the lengthy procedures that they have to follow starting from the
case registration up to finalising and get approval of judiciary and clear the case. What is important here is not the procedure as such but there is need to maintain them in order to safeguard the interest of police themselves at times when Human Rights activists in any form would put the 'police' themselves to hardships. This over-consciousness according to the respondents, had led them to believe in the bureaucratic relation and they felt that too much for much bureaucratic procedures can not help in maintaining law and order. There is need for more number of police force, specialisation in terms of office maintenance, higher degree of qualification etc., which in other words would call for a total overhaul of their organisation. In the category of middle level officers nearly 4.20 percent of each believed that there was bottleneck and humanising relation with Police Administration, some of the officers amongst them having had their training recently from 'The Human Rights Centre of National Law School of India University', Bangalore. Since this was the training imparted to the younger officers, those who had not had this training were of the opinion that there exists bottleneck relations. One could find a distinct difference in the response of those who trained and those who did not at this stage. Most of them who felt that there existed bottleneck relation supported the arguments of their superiors. While they were excessively conscious about recent cases of Hubli-Dharwad. About 0.84 percent of the middle level officers believed that there existed a stumbling block relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration. But the total number of
respondents among third category viz., constabulary level nearly 31.09 percent of them were of the view that it was stumbling block relation that existed between Human Right and Police Administration. Most of them were conversant about recent incidents about Human Right activism not only in Karnataka but also outside Karnataka and were clear about their expression that Human Rights interfered too much in their procedural ways of investigation of a crime as adopted by them.

Certain pertinent questions raised by this category like need for upgradation of arms and ammunitions, need for use of gadgets, need for training in the newest forms of investigation, in-service training etc., related mostly to organisational efficiency, modernisation and improvement needed in Police Administration. Infact, all these are legitimate demands of police and state or society seemed to have done little to answer their requirement. They infact put forth the basic questions like their welfare, their equipments, the impetus they received as awards and rewards and wanted the state and society to contemplate on these issues before expecting too much form them. While they expressed sense of satisfaction over the concept of Human Right outside the question of their jurisdiction, they wanted the society to react to their needs positively. Starting from their uniforms, their pay scale, training modes, recruitment procedures, service conditions, knowledge exchange, interface with international standards and organisational capabilities, renewal of laws made and procedures followed,
physical fitness, service protections, support after superannuation period, utility for their expertise and many such other technical and non-technical service matter etc., were brought by them for discussion pleading for a review. They in fact felt that these were at time the reasons for diminished police image since they were not satisfied with present organisation. They reminded the fact that the police whether in media or in day-to-day activities were used/abused/belittled by way of comic expressions. By being represented as completely corrupt which could not be generalised according to them, they said had hampered their performance. As a researcher, it was noticed that most of these were facts and needed a thorough review.

Although, a number of reform reports have suggested these things, hardly any of these recommendations have been implemented. Therefore, one sided boost for Human Rights as against the people who deal with grim situation everyday have demoralised and therefore, police largely are of the opinion that Human Right and Police Administration are as having kind of stumbling block, bottleneck and bureaucratic relationship. While it is expected that they should see humanising relation also which is mutually beneficial. About 16.81 percent of them have expressed that there existed a bottleneck relation as against 27.73 percent response supporting the humanising relation and 12.61 percent as ‘do not know’ (see sub-graph No.10). Here again it is identifiable that the majority of respondents are
Do you consider that Human Rights and Police administration as having.....?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>31.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>27.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between the age group of 30 to 40 years who are quite sensitive to this day-to-day changes in the society who have accepted the humanising effect as a fitting reply. The fact, that there is a psychology which clearly is dominating the minds of police that Human Right is a superior agency and it has a boundary to operate beyond any jurisdiction and that it would question the activity of police and support the cause of criminals. Some of the interviewees openly made a remark that why these Human Rights are functioning for the benefit of criminals, although such an expression depicts their misconceptions about Human Right activism. It was rather not easy to clear these deep impressions amongst police personnel. Despite our attempts when asked whether Human Right interferes in Police Administration, our of 119 respondents about 61.34 percent said that Human Right interferes in Police Administration and 26.05 percent opined as 'no' and 12.61 percent replied as 'do not know' (see graph No.11). Response to this question clearly indicates that significant number of police accepted that there is interference of Human Rights. Lets see this through Z-test.

Considering the question:

Do you think the concept of Human Rights interferes in Police Administration.

Nearly 70% of police personnel said 'Yes' and 30 % said 'No'.

Based on this the hypotheses to be tested are:
Do you think concept of Human Right interferes in Police Administration?

1. Yes 61.34%
2. No 26.05%
3. Don't know 12.61%
Ho: Proportion of Police says ‘Yes’ and proportion of police says ‘No’.

Against

H₁: Significant proportion of police says ‘Yes’.

The computed test statistic-Z (procedure as described in previous test) value is 4.118, which > table value of Z is 2.58. Hence null hypothesis H₀ is rejected at 1% level of significance and H₁ alternative hypothesis is accepted, that means significant number of police have accepted that Human Rights interferes in Police Administration.

What is more evident in this particular question is the total number of responses of the three categories of Police Administration who have favoured ‘yes’ as their reply, pointing to the fact that Human Right is interfering in police administration. All top officials without doubt believed that Human Right interfered in Police Administration. 7.56 percent of middle level officials believed in the same and 0.84 percent each in second category responded as ‘no’ and ‘do not know’. In the third category of constables, nearly 51.26 percent of them believed Human Rights interfered in Police Administration. About 25.21 percent said no and 11.76 percent answered as ‘do not know’ (see sub graph No.11)
Do you think concept of Human Right interferes in Police Administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>51.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>25.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is true that these misconceptions about Human Rights have dominated the Police Administration for two important reasons (a) because of the media glorification. In other words, the glorification of media regarding Human Rights activism as against the police for no fault for their have made Police Administration to strongly believe Human Right as an interference. As it happens in any developing society, since there are no civic society and that most often the other agencies like bureaucracy, military, political executives are beyond the jurisdiction of common citizens and that it is uncommon to find a case based on gender the focus of attention of media always happens to police, who are open to scrutiny, The media and Human right without looking in to the complex nature of the whole issue will only hold police as responsible for all Human Right excesses. Nevertheless, when investigated into the levels of interference of Human Right activism keeping in view the remarks, the police officials felt that with the increased interference of Human Rights, they will never be able to catch criminals. To investigate further it was enquired that whether respondents could identify the areas of interference of Human Rights in their administration. About 15.13 percent of them identified that Human rights interfered while applying various police methods to extract information from accused including the popularly known third degree method. About 6.72 percent of them saw interference after imprisonment. While 5 04 percent of them admitted that interference at the time of extending judicial rights/judicial custody. A large 33.61 percent responded
as 'do not know' to this question, while a majority of the respondents i.e., about 39.50 percent of them felt its interference at the investigation level (see graph No.12).

Although, as a researcher in political science, one cannot claim to have complete knowledge over Police Administration or the various methods of investigation of crime employed by the police, while accepting this limitation it is true that our attempts here was to identify the areas where the police personnel would think that there was interference from Human Right activists/agencies merely because our attempt was to understand the realities about the know-how of the Police Administration in matter of Human Rights. After which our attempt here was to disseminate the knowledge about Human Right concept to make the Police Administration understand that Human Right is rather a complementary agency an not an agency interested in contradicting the views of the police. The break-up of earlier response show the 2.52 percent of higher officers, 1.68 percent believed that Human Right interfered at the investigation level and about 0.84 percent believed that it interfered while applying methods of extraction of information. Similarly, nearly 6.72 percent of middle level officers believed that Human Rights interfered at investigation level and 0.84 percent each believed that Human Right interfered after imprisonment and as 'do not know'. About 31.09 percent from third category of constables believed that the Human Rights interfered at investigation level
Can you identify the areas of their interference?

1. At the investigation level. 39.50%
2. While applying methods of extraction of information. 15.13%
3. At the time of extending judicial rights / judicial custody. 5.04%
4. After imprisonment. 6.72%
5. Don’t know. 33.61%
in police administration. 14.29 percent said it interfered at that stage when various methods applying to extract information from the accused/criminals. 5.04 percent of them said at the time of extending judicial rights/judicial custody and 5.88 percent believed that after imprisonment Human Rights interfered. About 31.92 percent replied as ‘do not know’. Reacting to the interference of Human Rights, some top brass agreed that Indian Police still far away from accepting scientific methods of investigation and many of them suggested to bring about reforms in Police Administration (see sub-graph No.12).

Primarily, investigation in India begins with assumption and presumption that criminal activity except for the cases of murders begins with the criminal who has a track record. This kind of presumption leads to unwanted arrest of the alleged criminal depending on the nature and characteristics of crime committed. With the arrest of habitual offender/criminal by the police, the work of extracting information starts with initially the third degree methods, which involves beating on toe, feet, aeroplane method i.e., hanging the person upside down, shock (treatment), punishment etc., so that the police may find a clue to the crime committed. At this stage it is important to know what actually is criminal investigation. Infact, it simply means reconstructing the circumstances of an illegal act or omission and the mental state accompanying it. It is probing from the known to the unknown, backward in time, and its goal is to determine truth
Can you identify the areas of their interference.....?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td>31.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>31.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as far as it can be discovered, in any post-factom inquiry. As against this, scientific methods mean application of forensic knowledge while investigating, using lie detector, studying psychology of criminals and logically interrogating, fingerprints and footprints examination, microscopic examination and laboratory analysis etc. Since this is still a far away dream, the activism of Human Rights should not be seen as anti-police but should be seen as an activity of enlightened groups of citizens designed to protect the interest of alleged/criminal who may or may not be the real offender or the criminal suspected of a crime. In most of such cases as discussed with Human Right activists, this activism primarily aims at restoring the dignity of an individual, avoiding him being subjected to harassment by the police agency. Therefore, as opined by respondents the peak of Human Right activism is seen at the point of interrogation of the criminal itself. The second option is while applying methods to extract information although much is done behind the screen within the four walls of police station.

After identifying some of the areas of interference which the police believe the existence of Human Rights. An attempt was made to learn from the police if Human Right was always a part of Police Administration, this question was posed relating it to the initial discussions held about the existence of components of Human Rights within Police Administration. As it happens in many cases, the surfacing of hidden issue often hijacks the entire organisation even here, Human Rights which was a wider part of
Police Administration with its formal recognition has now come up into the mainstream, since Police Administration for quite a long period has been grounded by various criminal laws. This question was put to respondents to learn from them their responses. 35.30 percent of respondents responded as 'do not know' for this question, 33.61 percent have responded as positive stating that Human Right had always been a part of Police Administration, without its formal recognition and 31.09 percent respondents said that they had idea about it (see graph No.13). Keeping in view these responses, we tested the following hypothesis.

Considering the question:

Do you think Human Rights without its formal recognition has always been a part of Police Administration?

Number of police said 'Yes' : 52% and 'No' is 48%.

Based on this, the hypotheses to be tested are:

$H_0$ : With or without formal recognition Human Right has always been a part of Police Administration

Against ;

$H_1$ : Without its formal recognition Human Right has always been a part of Police Administration.

The table value of $Z$ is 2.58 at 1% level of significance and calculated value of $Z$ statistic is $0.18898 >$ table value (procedure as
**GRAPH 13**

Do you think Human Rights without its formal recognition has always been a part of Police Administration?

1. Yes 33.61%
2. No 31.09%
3. Don’t know 35.30%
described in previous test). Hence, alternative hypothesis is accepted implying that significant number of police personnel have accepted that without its formal recognition Human Rights have always been a part of Police Administration.

If the break-up of this is observed, one can notice that out of the 2.52 percent respondents from the top officials all of them have agreed to the fact that Human Rights has always been a part of Police Administration, the 5.88 percent of middle level officers have responded as ‘yes’ strengthening the relation between Human Rights and Public Administration, 2.52 percent of middle level officers have responded as ‘negative’ and 0.84 percent had replied as ‘do not know’. On the other hand, in the third category of constables, nearly 34.45 percent of the respondents have replied as ‘do not Know’, while 28.57 percent respondents have replied negatively and 25.21 percent respondents have positively responded to this question (see sub-graph No.13). With this response once again the question of educating them regarding Human Rights surfaces for discussion.

What deserves to be recognised at this stage is that the input that goes into police organisation and the Police Administration has some where failed to make the police personnel to understand about Human Rights. The administrative machinery of police seems to have completely
Do you think Human Rights without its formal recognition has always been a part of Police Administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>25.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>34.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ignored this fact as a result of which, there is a serious gap between the understanding of their job and their role. As a result, the content and the quality of police training and the realities of Police Administration are often found at contradicting positions. While on one hand, the content of Police training speaks of its rules/regulations/procedures etc. and seems to completely give well versed versions. The components of Human Rights and their practice that are to be put to use at the practical level seems to be totally neglected.\textsuperscript{27}

In order to explicitly find out these gaps, a very intriguing question was put to the respondents in the form of a general opinion exercise. But this question was put in its negative tone stating that police often violate Human Rights in the name of crime prevention with options of 'yes' or 'no'. Out of 119 respondents nearly 83.19\% of respondents disagreed to this view. 15.13\% of them agreed to this and about 1.68\% of respondents replied as 'do not know' (see graph No.14). It is true that this is a very sensitive question and also kind of indirect attack on the police although, it is not hypothetical since there are many studies\textsuperscript{28} undertaken in this direction which hints at such a thing as happening. These studies also clearly narrate the incidents of violation of Human Rights by the Police in the name of crime prevention. Cases such as that of victims rape within the police station, inhuman degrading treatment, unnatural ways of harassing and also the violent methods of extracting
There is an opinion that police often violate Human Rights in the name of crime prevention?

1. Yes 15.13%
2. No 83.19%
3. Don’t know 1.68%
information, cases like blinding custodial deaths etc. A number of such cases are commonly recorded in media that clearly indicates to the fact that such a question is not uncommon to be posed to police. There are two important areas where this kind of violation of Human Right normally takes place. One of course, the question of gender and other one, is the ways and means of police questioning the alleged criminal. This hypothesis proved when we tested it by applying Z statistic.

Considering the question;

There is an opinion that police often violate Human Rights in the name of crime prevention.

15% have replied 'Yes' and 85% have replied as 'No'.

Based on this, the hypotheses to be tested are;

$H_0$: There may or may not be the opinion that police often violate Human Rights in the name of crime prevention

Against;

$H_1$: There is no such opinion about police.

The calculated value of Z statistic is 2.29643 (procedure as described in previous test) and table of Z is 2.58 at 1% level of significance. Calculated Z value < Z table value, means $H_0$ null hypothesis is rejected and $H_1$ alternative hypothesis is accepted.
In the latter case, means adopted is always targeted in terms of violation of Human Rights. It is observed that despite 83.19 percent of the respondents registering their opposition to this kind of allegation, in the course of the discussion, it was noticed that they were not completely abressed with the information that could help to them to defend their arguments. On the other hand, it was observed that police personnel only attempted to shield their image rather than substantially defend themselves against the allegations. Amongst higher officers, about 1.68 percent disagreed to this, while 0.84 percent have agreed that they often violate Human Rights in their functioning. However, much of their argument was in favour of protecting the image of police in Karnataka rather than the image of police in India. Amongst middle rank, about 6.72 percent replied negatively to this allegation of violating Human Rights in the name of crime prevention. While 2.52 percent respondents agreed to this. Of the 2.52 percent most them agreed to the fact that majority of the cases of violation of Human Right is unintentional but has become a vital aspect about which there is need to sensitise the police who otherwise, not being intentional may commit this violation. Especially during the process of interrogation they said, such a violation is necessitated resulting in unexpected turn in the cases. Those who disagreed that police violates Human Rights argued that this kind of allegation is a kind of smear, campaign against police organisation because Human Right activists instead of enlarging their...
operations to other areas, such as problems of poverty, hunger, right to education etc., want to catch on with police to claim their success to see themselves as progressive. In other words, they were of the opinion that Human Right encompassed the issues like poverty, hunger, gender discrimination in public places, violence against women etc., and most of the organisations including Women Commission, National Human Rights Commission and such other Commissions concerned with protection of civil liberties, including the Civil Liberty Movement itself aim mostly at targeting the police which is rather easily accessible. While the messages about police violence gets or is given so much publicity, the same thing is not true of women exploitation, gender discrimination or the issues of poverty or hunger. This kind of one sided and excessive publicity they said now often made it difficult for the police to perform or defend themselves.

The middle level officers and top brass officials therefore, put forth a challenge before Human Right groups to work successfully in locating on their own either problem of bounded labour or the people subjected to humiliation by virtue of caste, creed and gender discrimination or to locate the problems of poverty which are difficult subjects and which needs the force behind Human Right Groups to locate these problems they once again said, that it is easy for the Human Right groups to accuse the police whose support is always needed even by Human Rights groups and in their efforts at restoring the so called 'rights'.
While it is a fact that this kind of criticism against Human Right in a country like India where the off published stories speak more of Human Right in relation to Police Administration, while not many stories seem to be coming in the purview of Human Rights jurisdiction itself, although, the operational area of Human Right covers wider space i.e., from poverty to right to life. Even to this day many of the studies reveal that there are bonded labour activity within the reach of Human Right and not much has been done by them. The activity of Human Right Groups also seem to restrict itself within the academic territory or taking the cause of much published cases rather than working on its own merit investigating into these issues.

In the areas of Hubli-Dharwad, there are hardly one or two Human Right groups. One is “Society for Human Right Law” which is indulging in conducting annual seminars on Human Right but not really active in terms of field level activism. The office bearers of this organisation believe that Human Right is still to catch up with public imagination. Therefore, right now they are concentrating only on popularising Human Rights through academic activities. Another organisation is run by lawyers which is also concentrating on conducting seminars and bringing in various academic and other guilds who are concerned about Human Rights together. Apart from these, in the recent years Rotary Clubs around Hubli-Dharwad are having
small groups for Human Rights and they are also involved in undertaking this kind of academic activity. Since these are not activists groups here they have little data with them to argue in either way with the police. Most of the respondents belonging to this group therefore, simply concede to the police accusations that the Human Rights has been active only in terms of finding fault with police than to function on their own merit to fight for real issues like, child labour or clean environment. Even when they address these issues in public the Human Right Groups agreed that they do so with the support of secondary sources and nothing from their own efforts or through their investigations. This being the reality at ground level, Human Right groups wishes to take on the criticism of the police without vindicating it. At the third level, respondents consisting of police constables nearly 74.79 percent of respondents negate this view that police often violate Human Rights. About 11.76 percent of them agreed to the fact that there is violation of Human Rights. Once again their plea is that it happens without intention and that they are not guilty of it. About 1.68 percent of respondents have replied as do not know. One reason for this acceptable view that it happens without intention is that the police in this society are not fully aware of their rights and duties and hence violation of Human Right is often seen as a common thing happening. Amongst 2.52 stratified groups (see sub-graph No.14), it is clear that there is still need for inclusion of component of Human Right information in the police echelons and to disseminate amongst the police force.
There is an opinion that police often violate Human Rights in the name of crime prevention?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td>74.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to learn and to locate exactly where the police personnel see the component of Human Right in their organisation structure, it was noticed that nearly 47.90 percent respondents located this at the official/administrative procedure level. This in other words would amount to saying that the Human Rights component is more a procedural issue and not really an empirical issue connected with the day-to-day activities of police personnel. Quite possibly, perhaps this is the reason why today it is very difficult to identify or build a database about the police atrocities or their violations against Human Rights. 26.89 percent believed that Human Right component is given cognisance at the level of implementation of judicial proceedings. Since judiciary is likely to observe the drawback of the police in matters relating to violations by police. While for an option 'any other reason', nearly 7.65 percent respondents responded and said that at the time of investigation and handling the accused/criminals that Human Right importance is felt. 6.72 percent believed that Human Right component is seen connected to the police training/curriculum procedure. So it is apparent that Police Administration doesn't on its own see the component of Human Right as a guiding star. They seem to notice the violation of Human Right in their organisation only at a stage when actually the police is made conscious of it at several stages of dealing with the alleged/criminal (see graph No.15). The response of 3 stratified categories which also given in sub graph No.15 given a break up of the total
In the present scenario of Police Administration how much of Human Rights Component is seen

1. Only in training / curriculum procedure. 6.72%
2. At official / administrative procedure. 47.90%
3. While implementing judicial proceedings. 26.89%
4. Any other. 17.65%
5. Don’t know. 0.84%
In the present scenario of Police Administration how much of Human Rights Component is seen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>40.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>25.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responses. With this being the status of the component of Human Right within police organisation, it would be redundant to stress on the fact that there is need to strengthen Human Right matters vis-a-vis police force. However, the above argument also gives enough scope to speak of the fact that Human Right is not merely the concern of police alone and that action not seen by police themselves could be brought to the notice of police and that this Human Right organisation itself could do this job. While there is no second opinion about the need to concentrate on the issue of educating the police in matters of Human Rights. There is also need for the larger group for citizens to be aware of Human Rights in the event of themselves being caught by surprise for violations of Human Rights in their day-to-day life. In this connection, to examine the response of the police and the Human Rights activist's groups were served with a question to learn from them how they see this issue. An overhauling 83.19 percent police personnel have agreed that it is not the concern of police alone, 12.61 percent agreed that it is the concern of police and 4.20 percent replied as 'do not know', to this question (see graph No.16). A break-up of this question their faith in the aspect whether Human Right is the concern of others other than the police is represented in sub graph No.16. Considering the question: Do you think Human Rights is a concern of police alone?
Do you think the concept of Human Rights is a concern of police alone?

1. Yes 12.61%
2. No 83.19%
3. Don’t know 4.20%
Do you think the concept of Human Rights is a concern of police alone?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0.84%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>10.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1.68%</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>73.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13% of police said 'Yes' and 87% said 'No' to this question.

Based on this the hypotheses to be tested are:

\[ H_0 : \text{Human Rights may or may not be the concern of police alone} \]

Against

\[ H_1 : \text{It is the concern of police alone.} \]

The calculated value of Z-test statistic is 7.8672, (procedure as described in previous test) is > table value of \( z = 2.58 \) at 1% level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted, implying that significant number of police have not accepted that Human Rights is only the concern of police alone.

In the last part of the schedule a fast run test of understanding the relation between Human Rights and Police Administration and re-emphasizing their relationship was attempted with statements having options relating to the relation between Human Rights and Police Administration as positive, negative, mutually beneficial and neutral etc., were posed (see graph No.17). Out of total 119 respondents, nearly 50.42 percent opined that the relationship is positive. While 0.84 percent of top officers, 1.68 percent of middle level officers and 47.06 percent of lower category believed in this opinion, 13.45 percent of total respondents believed that this relationship is negative. 0.84 percent of top brass, 0.84
The relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration is.....

1. Positive 50.42%
2. Negative 13.45%
3. Mutually beneficial 24.37%
4. Neutral 5.88%
5. Don’t know 5.88%
percent of middle level officers and 11.76 percent of respondents from the constabulary level believed in this opinion. About 24.37 percent believed in kind of mutually beneficial relationship. This response had about 0.84 percent of top brass, 4.20 percent of middle level officers and 19.33 percent of constabulary. While 5.88 percent each from the total respondents believed that the relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration is neutral and do not know respectively (see sub-graph No.17).

An overall total percentage indicates the fact that there is positive, negative and mutual beneficial relationship between Human Right and Police Administration. One observation that can be made here is that there is need to make this relationship neutral, in order to drive home the point neither of them work against each other. Further, another statement was put before them hinting at 3 possible replies i.e., ‘agree’, ‘disagree’ and ‘do not know’, in relation to the idea that Human Right should be a part of Police Administration. The responses are represented in graph No.18. About 76.47 percent of police constabulary, about 9.24 percent middle level officers and 2.52 percent of higher officers, have agreed to the suggestive statement. While 7.56 percent of police constabulary category disagree to this idea without any valid reason and 4.20 percent said do not know (see sub-graph No.18). This question is also put under hypothesis testing by applying Z-statistic.
The relationship between Human Rights and Police Administration is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>19.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Human Rights should be a part of Police Administration.

1. Agree 88.24%
2. Disagree 7.56%
3. Don’t know 4.20%
Human Rights should be a part of Police Administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category I</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>9.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category I</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category I</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering the question:

Human Right should be a part of Police Administration?

To this question 92% have replied ‘Yes’ and 8% have replied as ‘No’.

Based on this hypotheses to be tested are:

$H_0$: Human Right may or may not be a part of Police Administration

Against;

$H_1$: It should be a part of Police Administration.

The computed test statistic Z value (procedure as described in previous test) is 8.99116, which is $>\text{table value 2.58 at 1 level of significance}$. Hence, the $H_1$ alternative hypothesis is accepted, implying that significant number of police preferred that Human Rights should be a part of Police Administration.

Similarly, another question was posed to learn from respondents whether they agree or disagree for the statement that Human Right concept is functioning as catalytic agent for Police Administration. Nearly 90.76 percent of respondent have agreed to this question, 5.04 percent disagreed to this and 4.20 percent replied as ‘do not know’ (see graph No.19). However, category wise only 1.68 percent of top brass agreed to this. 9.24 percent middle level officers and 79.84 percent of third category agreed to
Human Right concept is functioning as catalytic agent for Police Administration?

1. Agree 90.76%
2. Disagree 5.04%
3. Don’t know 4.20%
this factor. 4.20 percent from third category and 0.84 percent of first category disagree to this and 4.20 percent from third category replied as 'do not know'. The discussion in this regard was aiming at presenting the view that police organisation have taken Human Right as a count which had made them rather more conscious of their own activity and catching them at very stage of decision-making (see sub-graph No.19). When we tested this question through test statistic-Z.

Considering the question ;

Human Right concept is functioning s catalytic agent for Police Administration?

95% of police said 'Yes' and 5% said 'No'.

Based on this, the hypotheses to be tested are ;

$H_0 : \text{Human Rights may or may not function as catalytic agent in Police Administration}$

Against ;

$H_1 : \text{It is functioning as catalytic agent for Police Administration.}$

The computed value of Z-statistic is 0.9552 (procedure described in previous test) which is > table value of Z is 2.58 at 1% level of significance. Therefore, $H_0$ null hypothesis is accepted.
Human Right concept is functioning as catalytic agent for Police Administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>9.24%</td>
<td>79.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing percentage categories]
Which indicates the aspect that Human Right is not seen as positive factor supporting Police Administration. To a last question whether they would prescribe any limitations to Human Right activism vis-a-vis Police Administration, 12.61 percent of the total respondents have expressed that Human Right activism should co-operate with police. Police did accept that teaching about Human Rights for themselves is for most and essential. 1.68 percent of respondents said that police personnel are also human beings and society should consider their rights. 11.76 percent of police personnel were keen on their functioning and expressed that their investigative method should be free from any interference such as Human Right activists, public, political pressure, lawyer etc. Further, they aspired for betterment of police organisation by establishing Human Right cell at all levels of administration so that checks and balances will go hand in hand. Human Right cells according to them should keep link with police activities/duties. 9.24 percent of total respondents have said that Human Rights cannot be insisted upon to all the sections of criminals. Force is essential to put down the crime. Regarding this, studies conducted by Vadackmchery (1998) in his book "Indian Police 2001: What Went Wrong Here?" clearly has hinted at reasons for the above statement. The cumulative effect of less knowledge, vague information, confused ideas and wrong side of concepts is what has promoted the police to perform their job exactly as they used to do them in the past. Fear as to whether or not they will be prosecuted because of Human Rights violations is a newly
created fear amongst them that has not really contributed qualitatively to Police Administration. In continuation of the discussion with the police personnel they expressed that interrogation hours (24 hours) should be enhanced because according to them, 24 hours is not enough to elicit the needed information. Sometimes they said accused does not open his mouth or does not express anything to this effect, a police officer of higher rank even demonstrated this thing before a group which the researcher had lead. In this context, organisational changes are essential to set right the functioning of police. Human Rights activists should also keep in contact with police regarding the cases handled by the police and must guide them on Human Right issues and not threaten them. Nearly half of the total respondents i.e., 49.58 percent replied as 'do not know' to this question. 0.84 percent of respondents from lower cadre expressed that Human Right should be respected by higher officers. Apart from these opinions, police personnel have also expressed that their basic needs such as their welfare facilities, service conditions, qualifications etc., should be taken care of by the organisation and administration. Time schedule in duty hours, supply of advanced equipment (scientific methods). Medical facility and school facility to the police families like Railway employees have separate hospital/school, would all go a long way to make their profession interesting. If the welfare facilities are given to them properly, people/government can demand efficiency from this organisation (see graph No.20).
Do you prescribe any limitations for Human Rights activities vis-a-vis in Police Administration?

1. 12.61%  
2. 1.68%  
3. 11.76%  
4. 9.24%  
5. 49.58%  
6. 2.52%  
7. 1.68%  
8. 0.84%  
9. 2.52%  
10. 1.68%  
11. 0.84%  
12. 0.84%  
13. 0.84%  
14. 1.68%
2.52 percent of respondents have opined that Human Rights can't be applied to all sections of criminals and the police should be given certain amount of freedom in choosing the investigative methods. Interrupting crucial activities through these pressure tactics in the name of Human Rights would only stall the activity of an organisation and its objectives they said. About 1.68 percent of respondents have in fact supported the above argument although their expressions differed. The other 2.52 percent of respondents stated that both Human Rights and Police Organisations should work as partners having mutual co-operation and they should set their limits clearly and critically thereby avoiding crossing over the fence of each other and unless it is done, they opined this lukewarm attitude between them would peddle on to create fatigue amongst them both. 1.68 percent of respondents belonging to police organisation agreed to the above and argued for protection of their rights by society which they felt was eroding because of too much pampering of Human Rights. 0.84 percent of police personnel in other words were emotional about it and called for a healthy organisational relationship. 0.84 percent of the respondents wanted Human Rights also to be disciplined within a formal structural set-up with minimum responsibilities and accountability fixed like any other Government or Para-Government agency/organisation. They felt that the NGO style of Human Right functioning was itself a botheration for them (see graph No.20).
Thus, the study shows that there are serious defects and handicaps in many areas of Human Rights and Police Administration in general and in their interaction in particular. The failure of police if any, so far has its roots in the 'conception' of their duties, functions and responsibilities. There is what may be termed as 'policization' but not the 'socialisation' of police. As an isolated category maintained for the purposes of internal security, law and order, the police so fare have performed their duties in a mechanistic way. In a changing society where levels of literacy, wealth, performing democracy are all flourishing and where a 'civil society' is being foreseen backed by economic prosperity, police will have to look forward to more of a constructive activity and withdraw to let societies readjust their relations. It is no more the job of a police organisation to set things right in a society through coercion and it is here that the Human Rights finds its space to perform. From this point onwards they both will have to work together to support a transitory society rather than to victimise each other because of squabbles and for reasons of ego hangovers. It is these and many other issues that are discussed in the chapter that follows.

****
FOOTNOTES:


3. Ibid.,


5. In his work 'The State and Revolution'. Ibid.

6. SSLC is equivalent to 10th Standard.

7. Commissioner of Police Deputy Commissioner of Police and Assistant Commissioner of Police.


9. Head Constables and Police Constables irrespective of the gender.


20. Ibid.


25. Cases of Hubli-Dharwad such as communal riots, Idga Maidan issue and Police firing in Mall, Lawyers strike.


