

An Overview: Community Policing on Past and Present

Graduate School of Human and Socio-Environmental Studies
Intan Fitri Meutia

Abstract

Police is part of the state government with several functions; they are including maintaining security and public order, law enforcement, and giving services to the community. Community policing has been evolving slowly since the civil rights movement in the 1960s, exposing the weaknesses of the traditional policing model. It has been developed over the past three decades and continues into the 21st. Community policing is used widely as a term of police philosophies, strategies, and tactics well known as problem oriented policing, neighborhood oriented policing, or community oriented policing. Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police services that includes aspects of traditional law enforcement, crime prevention, and making partnerships through problem solving. Establishing and maintaining mutual trust is the central goal of the first core component of community policing-community partnership. However, the effectiveness should be achieved at minimal costs, which mean the efficiency concerns. Community policing is affected most by the decentralization and the permanent assignments.

Keywords

Community Policing, Police, Community, History

概説: コミュニティ・ポリシングの由来と現状

人間社会環境研究科 人間社会環境学専攻
インタン フィトリ メウティア

要旨

警察は、国家政府の一部である。その機能は、セキュリティの維持と公共の秩序、法執行機関を含み、コミュニティにサービスを供与している。コミュニティポリシングは、伝統的な警察モデルの弱点が露になった1960年代アメリカの公民権運動以降徐々に進化してきた。それは過去30年間にわたって開発・発展され、その動向は21世紀に入ってからも続いている。コミュニティポリシングは、警察の哲学、戦略の用語として広く使用されている。その戦術は問題指向の警察、近所指向の警察、またコミュニティ指向の警察として知られている。コミュニティポリシングは、地域の伝統的な法執行、犯罪防止、および問題解決のやり方を取り込んだ警察サービスの提供を通じて、犯罪や社会秩序の混乱に焦点を当てる。コミュニティとのパートナーシップ確立と相互信頼を維持することは、コミュニティポリシングの第一の中心的な目標である。しかし、その有効性を実現するためには、コストを最小限に抑える必要がある。コミュニティポリシング

は、このような観点から地方分権化の度合いによって最も影響を受けている。

キーワード

コミュニティポリシング, 警察, 地域社会, 歴史

INTRODUCTION

This paper tries to survey the historical background of the arising of the idea of community policing through the documentary analyses of the published books, journal, and some reading material from online source. First section examines the historical context of police from terminology and modern law enforcement. Section 2 discusses about the nature of community policing as an important reform for Police. In particular, it examines the role of police in the prevention and detection of crime and sustaining local social order peacekeeping. Section 3 describes the implementation of community policing on several states. Finally, the conclusion shows the role of the police in public society until nowadays. This survey will offer the foundation for the further research analyzing the relation between police and community demands for the community policing implementation.

I. History of Police in The Western

The term *police* (Roth, 2000: 273) can be mark out from the Greek *politeia*, which refers to all the affairs affecting the survival and the order of the state. Until the eighteenth century, military and paramilitary police forces were the rule of the government. By the 1700s, European states started to use the term '*gendarmerie*', that is military police force units, and then '*la police*' in French, and '*die Polizei*' in German. These refer to the internal

administration of government managing safety, protection, and surveillance of a territory. At the beginning the English eschewed the term "police" because of the meaning, it gained increasing currency in France during the Napoleonic era. The term was probably imported into English from French at the beginning of the eighteenth century and referred to good government concerning sanitation, street safety and lighting, and so on.

In 1285 (Roth, 2000: 381) England's Statute of Winchester prescribed a variety of time-tested notions about the beginning of early law enforcement. These kinds of law enforcement had been developing for decades but had not been formally introduced by any statute yet. This policing was the system of watch and ward activity, which introduced the town watchman, a fixture in urban life until six centuries later as the birth of modern policing. According to the Statute of Winchester, most of towns in England were required to maintain a watch consist of up to sixteen men. They were to be stationed at the walled gates of town between the hours from sunset until sunrise and all strangers coming inside within their jurisdiction (city limits) were to be confined during the hours of darkness. Watchmen involving the unpaid, unprofessional position and all ambulatory men were required to participate as volunteers.

In 1829, Sir Robert Peel¹ (Home Secretary of England) introduced the Bill for Improving the Police in and Near the Metropolis (Metropolitan Police Act) to Parliament with the goal of

creating a police force to manage the social conflict resulting from rapid urbanization and industrialization taking place in the city of London. Peel's efforts resulted in the creation of the London Metropolitan Police on September 29, 1829. Historians and scholars alike identify the London Metropolitan Police as the first modern police department. Sir Robert Peel is often referred to as the father of modern policing, as he played an integral role in the creation of London Metropolitan department. Several basic principles envisioned in it are well known as those which guided the formation of police departments in the United States and many other countries. In establishing the principles upon which most modern police forces operate in the western world, Peel created a police force along military lines. The Metropolitan Police were better trained and disciplined than any previous police organization and were expected to maintain a good rapport with their constituents. Prior to Peel, peacekeeping was carried out responding to a certain crime after it had been committed. The new force introduced preventive policing to the peacekeeping of the streets of London, as uniformed officers patrolled streets rather than lounging around the police station waiting for a crime to be committed. According to Wright (2002: 6) the modern police developed in the 19th century as the specific response of the state to the problems of crime and security.

Past and current police officers working in the London Metropolitan Police Department are often dubbed as *bobbies* or *peelers* to honor the efforts of Sir Robert Peel. Peel believed that the function of the London Metropolitan Police should have focused primarily on the prevention of any crime—how to preventing crime from occurring instead of detecting after

it had already occurred and triggered victims. To do this, the police had to work in a coordinated and centralized manner, by providing large coverage designated for beat areas, and also to be available to the public at day and night. During this time the preventive patrol first emerged as a way to potentially deter criminality to happen. The idea was that citizens would think twice about committing crimes if they noticed a strong police presence in their community. This approach to policing would be vastly different from the early watch groups that patrolled the streets in an erratic manner and unorganized. The watchmen prior to the creation of the London Metropolitan Police were not viewed as an effective or legitimate source of protection by the public. It was important to Sir Robert Peel that the newly created London Metropolitan Police Department would be viewed as a legitimate organization in the eyes of the public, unlike the earlier watch groups. To realize it, he identified several principles that were believed to obtain credibility among citizens. The principles stressed that the police must be under government territory and have a military-like organizational structure. They also include the use of crime rates to determine the effectiveness of the police, the establishment of police headquarters accessible for the public, and the necessity of proper recruitment, selection, and training. Peel also thought that the quality of men that were chosen to be police officers would further contribute to the legitimacy of organization. In other words, he believed that men who could show the appropriate discipline to citizens would become the best police officers. It was also important to Peel that his men wear appropriate uniforms, and display numbers (badge numbers) so they could

easily identified, not carry firearms, and receive appropriate training in order to be effective at their work as police officers. Recently, people debate on whether Peel really espoused the previously mentioned ideologies and principles, or they were the result of historical reconstruction of English policing.

However, perhaps “beats” is the most enduring and influential innovation introduced as regular patrol areas. In 1829, the police—whether military or civilian—only responded to the committed crime after it had been reported. Any crime deterrence or apprehension of criminals in the act of committing crimes happened almost by accident because apparently patrols occurred on a sporadic basis. Peel assigned his *bobbies* to specific geographic zones and held them responsible for preventing and suppressing crime within the boundaries of theirs. This strategy was based on his belief that the constables would:

- a. Become known to the public, and citizens with information about criminal activity would be more likely to tell a familiar figure than a stranger
- b. Become familiar with people and places and thus better be able to recognize suspicious persons or criminal activity, and
- c. Be highly visible on their posts, deter criminals from committing crimes in the immediate vicinity.

To implement fully the beat concept, Peel initiated his second most enduring innovation: The paramilitary command structure². Not only he believed that the overall civilian control should be essential, but also that only military discipline would ensure that constables of beats and enforced the law on London’s, something their nonmilitary predecessors, such

as the watchmen, had failed to do before.

According to Reiner (2010: 15), police is identified primarily as a body of people patrolling public places in uniforms, with a broad mandate for the crime actions control, the maintenance of the order and some negotiable social service functions. Policing implies a set of processes with specific social functions. A state-organized specialist ‘police’ organization of the modern kind is only one example of policing. Policing is aimed at securing social order, but its effectiveness is always debatable. The example of policing is regular uniform patrol (police) of public space coupled with post hoc investigation of reported or discovered crime or disorder. Policing may be done by a variety of agents. Police in the sense of a specialized armed force used partially or wholly for norm enforcement was found in only twenty of the fifty-one societies in the sample. Police is usually preceded by other elements of a developed legal system like mediation and damages. The development of specialized police is linked to economic specialization and differential access to resources that occur in the transition from a kinship to a class dominated society. Communal policing forms are converted in incremental stages to state dominating ones during this transition, which begin to function as agents of class control in addition to more general social control. A new international body of technocratic police experts responsible for the diffusion of police thinking is emerging, as the community policing strategies is spreading over the world. It is problematic to define contemporary police mainly in terms of their supposed functions. The police staffs are called upon routinely to perform a bewildering miscellany of task, from controlling traffic to controlling terrorism. This

does not imply that all policing uses force. On the contrary, good policing has often been seen as the craft of handling trouble without resort to coercion, usually by skillful verbal tactics.

II. Community Policing

When Sir Robert Peel established the London Metropolitan Police, he set forth a number of principles, one of which could be considered as the seed of community policing: (point 7) "... the police are the public and the public are the police" (Braiden, 1992: 108). As time went on, however, for a number of reasons, the police lost sight of this relationship with the public as the central organizing concept for police service.

The reform era in government began in the early 1900's, coupled with a nationwide move toward professionalization, including the police (Kelling, 1988: 5). Police managers assigned officers to rotating shifts and moved them frequently from one geographical location to another to eliminate corruption. Management for police also instituted a policy of centralized control in headquarters, designed to ensure compliance with standard operating procedures

and to encourage a professional aura of police officers impartiality. There were a lot of protests and arguments during the 1960's and 1970's, which mushroomed into a full-scale social movement. Antiwar protestors, civil rights activists, and other society groups began to demonstrate in order to be heard. Overburdened and poorly prepared police came to symbolize what these groups sought to change in their government and community. Focusing attention on police policies and practices became an effective way to draw attention to the need for wider reform. The institutions became the targets of hostility, which ultimately led police leaders to concerned reflection and analysis.

Community policing has been evolving slowly since the civil rights movement in the 1960s exposed the weaknesses of the traditional policing model (Rosebaum, 1994: 5). It has been developed over the past three decades and continues into the 21st. Community policing is used widely as a term of police philosophies, strategies, and tactics, and is also known as problem-oriented policing, neighborhood-oriented policing, or community-oriented policing. Community policing promises to change

Table 1. The Three Eras of Policing

	Political Era (1840s to 1930s)	Reform Era (1930s to 1980s)	Community Era (1980s to Present)
Authorization	Politics and law	Law and professionalism	Community support (political), law and professionalism
Function	Broad social service	Crime control	Broad provision of service
Organizational Design	Decentralized	Centralized, classical	Decentralized, task forces, matrices
Relationship to community	Intimate	Professional, remote	Intimate
Tactics and technology	Foot patrol	Preventive patrol and rapid response to calls	Foot patrol, problem solving, public relations
Outcome	Citizen, political satisfaction	Crime control	Quality of life and citizen satisfaction

Source: Based on George L Kelling and Mark H. Moore, 1998

radically the relationship between the police and the public, to handle the community problems, and to improve the living conditions in neighborhoods. Its origin can be traced to the crisis in police-community relations, which has been influenced by a wide variety of factors over the past forty years. Actually, community policing is a plastic concept, meaning different things to different people. Many perspectives on community policing are made only by assumptions and partially supported by empirical evidence.

The community policing era is characterized by close working relationships between the police and community, giving attention to problem solving and creating quality of life in the community. Policing is generally viewed to have become far more attentive to community concerns during this period and police organizations has become more decentralized (Kelling, 1988: 23). Community policing is rooted in the belief that the traditional officer on the beat will bring the police and public closer. Instead of merely responding to emergency calls and arresting criminals, community-policing officers are considered to perform social work creatively toward the problem solution on their beats. The following task is how they make personal contacts to individual, both inside and outside their agencies. This is the face of a police culture that values crime fighting and a paramilitary chain of command as the standard operating procedures.

Community policing is emerging as a democracy in action. Active participation from community, i.e., participation of local government, public and private agencies, civic and business leaders, is required. The parties who share a concern for the welfare of the neighborhood should bear responsibility for safeguarding its own

welfare. In addition, it has been suggested that community policing play a primary role in changing the way of all government services provided at the community level. The implementation of community policing requires fundamental changes in the structure and management of police organizations. Community policing transforms traditional policing in how the community perceived and in its expanded policing goals. These strategies use a wide variety of methods to control the crime actions and prevention of it as central goals. The police and the community become partners in addressing problems of disorder (e.g., gang activity, abandoned cars, and broken windows) and in preventing it before eventually leading to serious crime. Links between the police and the community are strengthened over time, so that the partnership will better be able to mitigate the main causes of crime. Police finds that crime-control tactics need to be augmented with strategies that prevent crime, reduce the fear, and improve the quality of life in neighborhoods. Fear of crime has become a significant problem in itself. A highly visible police presence helps reduce fear within the community, fear which has been found to be "...more closely correlated with disorder than with crime" (Kelling, 1988: 8). However, because fear of crime can limit activity, it pushes residents to keep in their homes, and contribute to empty streets. This climate of decline can result in even greater numbers of crimes which can be predicted previously. Getting the community involved will make police have more resources available for crime-prevention activities, instead of being forced into response to a crime.

Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police

Table 2. Principles Between Problem-Oriented Policing and Community Policing

Principle	Problem-Oriented Policing	Community-Oriented Policing
Primary emphasis	Substantive social problems within police mandate	Engaging the community in the policing process
When police and community collaborate	Determined on a problem by problem basis	Always or nearly always
Emphasis on problem analysis	Highest priority given to thorough analysis	Encouraged, but less important than community collaboration
Preference for responses	Strong preference that alternatives to criminal law enforcement be explored	Preference for collaborative responses with community
Role for police in organizing and mobilizing community	Advocated only if warranted within the context of the specific problem being addressed	Emphasizes strong role for police
Importance of geographic decentralization of police and continuity of officer assignment to community	Preferred, but not essential	Essential
Degree to which police share decision-making authority with community	Strongly encourages input from community while preserving ultimate decision-making authority to police	Emphasizes sharing decision-making authority with community
Emphasis on officer skills	Emphasizes intellectual and analytical skills	Emphasizes interpersonal skills
View of the role or mandate of police	Encourages broad, but not unlimited role for police, stresses limited capacities of police and guards against creating unrealistic expectations of police	Encourages expansive role for police to achieve ambitious social objectives

Source: Intan, research analysis, 2015.

services that includes aspects of traditional law enforcement, crime prevention, and partnership through problem solving. These policing model take balance between responses to call for service with proactive problem solving centered on the causes of crime and disorder. Community policing requires an active movement from police and citizens to work together as partners in creating safety in the neighborhood.

There are several internal factors (Rosenbaum, 1994: 250–253) which become serious challenges for the police in their attempt to implement community policing. Those are such as the variety of size, structure, and quality of personnel and also paramilitary in structure with bureaucratic managerial orientations. Successful implementation of community policing will depend on how well mid-level police managers, most of whom have based their

careers on traditional policing as he change agents directly connected to the community.

III. Acceptance of Community Policing in Society

Those as follows are some examples of what is going on in many different places around the world under the rubric of community policing³:

USA

New York City has a program called C-POP, Community Police Officer Program, involving 900 officers out of a patrol force of approximately 16,000. In each of New York's seventy-five precincts, there are about ten C-POP officers, each of whom has been given a territory in which they are responsible for policing, supported by an overlay of rapid

response patrol vehicles. C-POP officers do more or less what they want. Their injunction is to get to know the community and to find out how police resources might be used in order to meet policing requirements, not as generated by the Police Department, but as suggested by local communities. This is a very popular program, began in 1986, which shows no sign of flagging.

JAPAN

Japan created modern community policing but did not call it so until very recently. The Japanese system, reformulated after World War II but resting on older traditional elements, is based on 15,500 *Koban*, or mini police stations, scattered all over Japan. There are 6,500 of them in cities and towns and 10,000 in rural areas. There is a neighborhood police station of this sort within six or seven blocks of every urban resident in Japan. It is still the case that just fewer than 50 per cent of all people requiring police service to come to the police in person rather than calling over the telephone. Personnel in these *Koban* and *Chuzaiso* do several things. They regularly patrol on foot and respond to citizen requests for service. They also make twice-yearly visits to every home and business in their area, knocking on doors and asking what problems people have. They use these occasions to promote crime prevention and to offer security inspections. Although this appears to be the most wall-to-wall community policing system in the world, the Japanese are not complacent about it. They are now involved in fine-tuning their system-two aspects in particular. The Japanese police have never developed programs of systematic liaison with the community. As a consequence, they are now asking all of their

Koban to create formal community advisory boards in order to obtain feedback. Furthermore, they are now adopting a more problem-oriented approach. Previously, although the police were deployed pervasively, their emphasis was on discretionary law enforcement-impounding improperly equipped bicycles, enforcing laws against speeding motor vehicles, catching drunk drivers, and generally keeping the streets orderly. Now they are changing their priorities to emphasize matters the public is concerned with, as opposed to the matters of concern to police.

AUSTRALIA

Community policing in Australia is primarily an add-on crime prevention program. Hardly any attempts have been made to have community policing penetrate into general duties patrol work, with one major and exciting exception. At the same time the crime prevention programs of Australian police forces are very rich, varied, and show improvements in some instances over similar program in other countries. For example, the Victorian Police sent officers to the United States to study Neighborhood Watch, who liked what they saw but found ways for maintaining the activity and enthusiasm of members, a problem that had been devilled and undermined American efforts. It seems that the only instance in Australia of a serious attempt to change the delivery of police services by general duties officers, could be found in New South Wales. There, Commissioner John Avery and his staff created community policing 'beats', starting in Surry Hills, Sydney. There are now over 200 community police officers assigned to such beats in many larger towns in New South Wales. Each officer is responsible for his own

area in which they establish community liaison, discover persistent order problems troubling to the community, and construct solutions to those problems. In effect they are to become the 'village bobby' for their areas.

INDONESIA

In 21st country, the concept of humanist police has began to be socialized since autonomy (non-combat) of Indonesian Police took place in April 1999. Having initiated by the separation of the Indonesian National Police (INP) with the Armed Forces, the reformation process conducted by The INP could be considered and addressed as a considerable phase to actualize the Police force as professional civilian servants which is close to the community, to change the livelihood of civil society towards national democratic, secure, orderly, fair and prosperous. Changes in the cultural aspect encouraged police to made Grand Strategy 2005 – 2025. The first five years 2005 – 2010 is known as the phase of trust building, in 2011 – 2015 as partnership building, then in 2016 – 2025 as strict for excellent. Police in the structure of the police organization is spearheading. The strongest spearhead of service is *Polsek* (Sector Police), which implements community policing directly to the community. In service position, strong police station is divided into 3 categories, namely Urban Police Commissioner consisted of 50 personnel, and then 40 personnel of Rural Police led by the *AKP* (Captain), Pre-rural police personnel consist 25 officer led by the *Iptu* (Lieutenant). Sector Police is the gateway community service, that receives reports from the public and keeps public security order at the district level, builds the security system at the level of spontaneous communities sub district, district patrol, cases

investigation/Intel, handles and traffics reports, gives counselling, fosters associations and youth organizations and associations.

INDIA

A movement for community policing called "Friends of Police Movement" – FOPs was started in 1993 in Ramnad District of Tamilnadu, India. The FOP is a holistic and pro-active concept that lends a psychological approach to policing. It is a true example of police-public partnership in which citizens have been empowered with the help of the police. It provides opportunities for ordinary citizens to effectively contribute to the prevention and detection of crime. Any member of the public, male or female who is not involved in civil or criminal case can become a member of FOP. The members of FOP can provide useful information leading to solving of crimes. FOP members can also prevent any abuse of Police power because of easy accessibility to the station house officer and other senior personnel. The movement has been well received not only among FOPs but also in the wider public and voluntary associations. Within a few months of its inception, nearly 1000 members of the public from all walks of life volunteered to become FOPs in Ramnad district.

IV. Conclusion

Police as part of the state government acquires several functions. They are including maintaining security and public order, law enforcement, and giving services to the community. Indeed, the presence of civilian police has become a progressing demand. This means that if the police institutions still hold on to the old values of violence, they might be left

behind and run over time. Having these as facts, the presence of civilian police is considered to be one of the ideal models for the Police's new paradigm. This might be happening since the new paradigm is taken the moral values, belief, and behaviour into account, which are hoped to stimulate a more caring and concern police personality. Hence, this new paradigm could reflect the characteristics of the Civilian Police, which are more humanist with minimum use of force.

The discussing points of community policing can be summarized as follows:

1. Two of the key elements of community policing are police and community-partnership relation. Establishing and maintaining mutual trust is the central goal of the first core component of community policing.
2. Public put several hopes to police nowadays. They ask if the police is effective at carrying out their function. This is also primarily concerned with the effectiveness of police services, instead of whether these services can be equitably distributed. Furthermore, the effectiveness should be achieved at minimal costs, which mean the efficiency concerns.
3. Community policing is affected mostly by decentralization and permanent assignments. Solving problems or reducing crime rate is done at the place where it happen and still on the task of law enforcement. Police administrators should acknowledge that crime is a natural condition of community. They must recognize that changes in their operations and their organizations are inevitable, but that few, if any, of these changes will be completely unprecedented

journeys into uncharted territory.

[Notes]

- ¹ Peel, Sir Robert (1788–1850) born into a wealthy manufacturing family, Peel served in Parliament in 1809 and then as chief secretary for Ireland from 1812 to 1818. While serving as home secretary in the 1820s, Peel championed the reform of the English judicial system. However, Peel is best remembered in the criminal justice realm for the police reforms that culminated in Parliaments passage of the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829 (Roth, 259: 2000).
- ² (<http://www.lectlaw.com/files/cjs07.htm> by Jeffrey Patterson, access on 7 February 2015).
- ³ David Bayley on The Police and The Community in The 1990s (http://www.aic.gov.au/media_library/publications/proceedings/05/bayley.pdf)

[REFERENCES]

- Berlin, Michael M. *Encyclopedia of Community Policing. "Community Policing, Evolution of"*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publication, Ltd. 2013.
- Braiden, Chris. *Enriching Traditional Police Roles. "Police and Solving Management: Issues and Perspectives"*. Washington, D.C. Police Executive Research Forum. 1992.
- Kelling, George L., and Mark H. Moore. *The Evolving Strategy of Policing. Perspectives on Policing*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. 1988.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis P. *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Sage Publication. 1994.
- Roth, Michael P. *Historical Dictionary of Law Enforcement*. Greenwood Pub Group. 2000.
- Reiner, Robert. *The Politics of the Police (4th Edition)*. St. Martin Press. 2010.

Wright, Alan. Policing: An Introduction to Concepts and Practice. Willan Publishing, 2002.

Online source :

<http://www.lectlaw.com/files/cjs07.htm>

http://www.sagepub.com/peak/study/materials/reference/07350_5.1ref.pdf

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/commp.pdf>
(Understanding Community Policing,
Monograph, August 1994)

<http://police.pondicherry.gov.in/Community%20Policing.htm>

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/policing/fril49.htm>

http://www.aic.gov.au/media_library/publications/proceedings/05/bayley.pdf