

Executive Summaries

1999 India Meeting Summary

SIXTH INTERNATIONAL POLICE EXECUTIVE SYMPOSIUM

Hyderabad, India, July 13-16, 1999

Prepared by Peter C. Kratcoski, Ph.D., Official Recorder

The Sixth International Police Executive Symposium was held in Hyderabad, India, from July 13 through July 16, 1999. The theme of the symposium was "Policing of Public Order: A World Perspective." The symposium was hosted by H.J. Dora, Director General and Inspector General of Police of Andhra Pradesh, head-quartered in Hyderabad. A. Madhava Reddy, the Honorable Minister for Home for the Government of Andhra Pradesh, played a vital role in the symposium's development, and he addressed the delegates at the inaugural session. Support was also given by Nara Chandrababu Naidu, Chief Minister, Andhra Pradesh. The Local Organizing Committee included S.C. Dwivedi, Director General of Police Recruitment and Training, A.K. Mohanty, Inspector General of Police, and R.K. Raghavan, Director of the Central Bureau of Investigation. Police officials from other states and from the Central Bureau of Investigation also assisted with the organization of the symposium and participated in the sessions. Plattsburgh State University of New York contributed important support and provided invaluable assistance. Plattsburgh's President, Horace A. Judson, Dean Kathy Lavoie of the College of Arts and Sciences and Chair Stephen Light of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice played key roles in making the symposium a reality. The Symposium Organizer and Chair of the sessions was Dr. Dilip Das, Professor, Plattsburgh State University of New York, Founder/President, International Police Executive Symposium.

Representatives from 20 countries, from Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Europe, North America, South America, and Australia, made presentations at the symposium sessions. Approximately 50 persons were in attendance as participants or observers. Special presentations were made by H.J. Dora, Director General and Inspector General Of Police of Andhra Pradesh, R.K. Raghavan, Director of the Central

Bureau of Investigation, Padmashri Dr. S. Subramanian, IPS Retired, and Dr. Kornel S. Kumar and Dr. Mahesh K. Nalla of India.

The four day symposium was designed to provide many opportunities for the participants to interact with each other and exchange ideas and information in both formal and informal settings. The delegates were housed at a local hotel, and they met together for meals and toured historical and cultural sites of Hyderabad and the surrounding area. They also visited the National Police Academy and heard a presentation about the program offered there. The inaugural session and two lunches were held at Jubilee Hall in Hyderabad, where, during the British rule, the kings (Nizams) of Hyderabad were coronated. Three evening dinners were held at local hotels, hosted by the Director General of Police of Andhra Pradesh, the Commissioner of Policed, Hyderabad, and the Minister of Home Government of Andhra Pradesh, and the farewell lunch, hosted by H.J. Dora, Director General and Inspector General of Police of Andhra Pradesh, was held at the Police Officers' Mess.

In keeping with the theme of the symposium, the presenters were asked to prepare papers that specifically addressed the following matters: (1) the definition of public disorder used in their country's laws and regulations, (2) the reasons (political, social, racial, or economic) for public unrest and discontent, (3) the strengths and weaknesses of police methods used in combating, containing, and dealing with public unrest, (4) the extent of political considerations rather than professional values and skills involved in handling public disorder, and (5) the types of disturbances affecting public order that are anticipated in the near future, and the measures the police are planning to meet the challenges these potential disturbances may pose.

Definitions of Public Order and Disorder

Public disorder, in a broad sense, is a disturbance of public order. The questions of what would constitute a disturbance of public order and what types of circumstances and behavior should be perceived as a disturbance were debated by the symposium participants. It was concluded that the types of behavior perceived as a threat to public order would vary, depending on the political and social conditions of the society. In several of the countries, particularly those that had formerly been controlled by autocratic governments, the earlier laws appeared to have been structured to regulate and control dissent by persons or organizations that might threaten the government. When these countries changed to more democratic forms of government, the laws regulating public order were also changed. For example, the Internal Security Act No. 24 of 1984, Section 26 of Lesotho made it an offense for anyone in a public place to use obscene or threatening words or otherwise conduct himself with intent to provoke a breach of peace. Section 28 of the same Act made it an offense for anyone to incite others to engage in "public disorder, defiance, or disobedience of any law." (Petlane, 1999: 10). The police could and did apply these prohibitions to virtually any form of public gathering and did this at their own discretion. In 1993, the Public Meetings and Processions Act No. 2 relaxed some conditions

imposed by the Internal Security Act. It provided that any person could hold a public meeting or procession as long as written intention was provided to the police twenty-four hours before the event. The police cannot deny such permission unless they believe that the activity will be a real threat to public security or create disorder (Petlane, 1999).

In Tanzania, which also includes Zanzibar, the laws pertaining to public order are to be very specific, and they have their historical origins in English common law. The Tanzania Penal Code, 1945 (Cap 16, Section 62) defines unlawful assembly in the following manner:

. . . if three or more persons assemble together and such assembly causes fear to other persons it is an unlawful assembly and the assembly is called a riot when the persons assembled begin to execute their purpose. (Tibasana,1999:10).

This restrictive law was obviously an attempt by the colonists to prevent the native African people from assembling and organizing to reestablish African rule. Today, this law still exists, but it is not enforced. The Criminal Procedure Act (1986, Section 47), which allows police officers to intervene in an assembly for the purpose of trying to prevent a breach of peace, is now the basis for police action. The officer must use discretion in determining whether there is a reasonable belief that a breach of the peace is imminent (Tibasana, 1999:13).

In Austrian law, the terms public order and public disorder are not specifically defined. Edelbacher (1999:10) stated that public disorder is the opposite of public order, In a legal sense it would cover the “totality of all types of violations of and offenses and crimes against existing laws, on the administrative as well as on the criminal levels. The spectrum comprises minor offenses like aggressive begging or causing undue noise, but also serious crimes like terrorist activities.”

Subramanian (1994:1) of India noted that the human has a “natural instinct to gravitate into groups and he finds assurance of safety, self confidence and comfort with being in them.” Throughout history in all societies people have assembled when common needs, concerns, or interests presented a need for discussion or debate. Subramanian (1994:1) further observed that:

Police operations cannot be blind to the democratic aspirations and impulses of the community at large and the inevitability of the masses participating in public demonstrations. This is notwithstanding the fact that such demonstrations pose a definite threat to “public order,” a term that encompasses something more than law and order, which is often applied loosely to day- to day events that disturb peace but do not pose a threat to civilised society or to constitutionally established governments.

The concept of public disorder was not specifically defined in most countries’ criminal codes, and it is also not likely that one could understand the application of this concept to a specific event without having an understanding of a specific country’s culture, political traditions, and forms of social organization. Disturbance of public order is generally associated with crowd behavior, but, as noted by Dr. Subramanian (1999:1), the formation of a crowd or a large assembly of people who have a common interest and express common ideas and emotions does not constitute public disorder, particularly in a society with a democratic tradition that guarantees the rights of assembly and free expression.

The definitions of public disorder used by the speakers were not uniform. Such acts as interfering with public business, unauthorized gatherings, or committing acts of terrorism and rioting all came under public disorder definitions in various countries, as did a fight in a public park, a strike, or violence at a sporting event. Argentina has a very specific public disorder offense in its criminal code. It is defined as a misdemeanor offense, and pertains to disturbances by various groups that may occur at sporting events, artistic and cultural events, social, political and union meetings, election events, arrival of officials, celebrities or dignitaries, political acts, special transfer of critical materials or people, protection of renowned visitors, or custody of diplomatic representatives, of judicial courts, and other special custodies (Montoya 1999:14).

In any discussion of public disorder, the distinction between public order and disorder may not be readily apparent, and those responsible for maintaining public order may be called upon to make this decision when responding to a specific situation. Smelser, (1962) noted that a crowd, a group of people who are assembled because of a common interest but not creating any disturbance, can quickly become a mob. In addition, within the general context of a mass meeting or public protest there will be various groups with different interests and methods to express their goals. In attendance for this event may be those who wish to express their views in a lawful, peaceful manner and others bent on creating disruption and violence. Those who are responsible for maintaining public order, specifically the police, may interpret the intentions and behavior of the entire group as being unlawful, and respond accordingly. For example, in Swaziland public order is policed according to the provisions of the Public Order Act of 1963, which provides that public meetings, public gatherings and public processions must be licensed and held according to the provisions of a license issued by the police officer in charge of the region where the activity will be held. The Act allows the police to stop or prevent such gatherings if

they are held without a license or if any condition of an issued license is violated. Although certain types of meetings are not required to seek such licenses (events scheduled by the government, trade union gatherings, or events that have a social, cultural, charitable, recreational, religious, professional, commercial or industrial purpose), the police are also empowered to police these gatherings if they believe that they may cause a breach of the peace and the maintenance of law and order (Magagula, 1999).

Public Disorder and Social Control

Nalla and Kumar (1999:5-6) noted that social control has been defined and applied in a variety of ways. Sociologists and social psychologists have indicated that in the past and to some extent even today in small or highly traditional societies social order can be maintained through informal mechanisms used to gain compliance with the norms, values and laws of that society. According to Janowitz (1975), this self-regulation through socialization has gradually been changed to regulation through social repression, with the public police assuming the role of primary social control agent. Nalla and Kumar observed that:

Sociologists harkened back to the concepts of *Gemeinschaft* of Tonnies, or “mechanical solidarity” of Durkheim, but then observed that in modern complex societies, social control was more problematic and resulted from certain kinds of coercion (e.g., Durkheim’s use of authority in establishing discipline, his ideas of exteriority and constraint (Nalla and Kumar, 1999:6).

There is no doubt that, as societies have become more urbanized and commercialized, the coercive functions of public policing have expanded, and informal social controls have become less effective. However, Nalla and Kumar were not convinced that the public police have assumed total responsibility for maintaining public order. In contemporary societies, there are numerous examples of private citizens and organizations performing this function. They observed that the social control “entrepreneurs” exemplified by the private security industry have taken on significant responsibility for maintaining public order, reducing crime, and preventing losses of or damage to property. While they are protecting private interests, they assist in the maintenance of public social order at shopping malls, sporting or entertainment events, or amusement parks. In addition, with the ever increasing popularity of community policing citizens now have opportunities to reestablish some social control functions by becoming partners with the public police working on matters of specific concern to them. The community policing concept implies that the police will become functioning members of the community in spirit and view community problems from this standpoint.

Reasons for Public Disorder or Discontent

Disturbances of public order are often associated with public discontent. Reasons for public unrest and discontent described by the symposium participants included social condition related matters, such as labor disputes, protests of inequalities of treatment given to minority groups that organized to demand their rights, activism for protection of the environment, and territory control issues, and situational matters, such as violence and destruction of property by fans at sporting events. Countries with long traditions of democratic government also have histories of public disorder protests, but such protests have tended to focus on a single issue at a particular point in time (for example, the Vietnam War, civil rights, gay rights, protection of the environment against a specific threat) or involved transitory events (sports riots). In contrast, public protests in more recently formed democracies are more often related to deep-seated quality of life issues (employment, housing, education, representation in government, political power) that cannot be resolved until sweeping social, economic, and political changes occur.

These contrasts were well illustrated by the symposium speakers. For example, The speaker from Canada, which has a long democratic tradition, reported that the incidents during the preceding five to ten years where the police had been required to intervene during large scale public disturbances were related to riots by fans of professional sports teams, aboriginal land claim disputes, religious conflicts over abortion laws, political protests by members of ethnic groups related to political unrest in their homelands, environmental protests, and labor disputes (Mackenzie and Plecas, 1999:12-19). In Zambia, full democratic rights have only been available to the citizens since 1991.

The speaker from Zambia observed that:

In the period between 1991 and 1999 the country has seen a proliferation of civic organisations such as political parties, non-governmental organisations, religious associations, cultural groups, trade unions and student bodies championing various sectoral interests. (Ndhlovu, 1999:5)

Political unrest and fear of crime can result in social upheavals that may lead to public disorder. Representatives of countries that had gone through dramatic changes in government noted that these changes brought about serious adjustment problems for the citizens and altered the relationship

between the people and the police. For example, under earlier forms of government in Guyana, South Africa and Swaziland the police were instruments of the ruling classes and were used to suppress other classes. Marks and Olivier (1999:3) noted that during the time South Africa was an apartheid state almost any collective activity, particularly by black South Africans, was defined as a potential disorder situation, and this resulted in such events being policed ruthlessly by the South African Police. They also observed that the definitions of public disorder changed after apartheid was abolished. The Regulation of Gatherings Act (Act 205, 1993) and the Constitution of South Africa (Act 108, 1996) provided for free expression of views through peaceful demonstrations, and allowed peaceful assemblies, picketing, demonstrations and presentation of petitions to take place.

In general terms, all assemblies, marches, gatherings, meetings, demonstrations are lawful and classified as Crowd Management Peaceful incidents. However, due processes need to be followed (e.g., seven days notice to be given in respect of a march or meeting, and if possible at least 48 hours notification). The focus of the Act moves away from permission to hold a gathering, to a situation where notice of an intended gathering is sufficient. No longer is there a distinction between legal and illegal demonstration and gathering- gatherings are now defined as either “peaceful” or “unrest” incidents, depending on their outcomes (Marks and Oliver, 1999:5).

Even after independence, suppressive actions by the police continued in Guyana, South Africa and Swaziland, and police responses to matters that appeared to threaten public order were heavy handed. The suspicion and mistrust of the police built up during earlier times is hard to erase, even though efforts are being made to change police-citizen relationships. However, several speakers, including those from the United Kingdom and South Africa, noted that the nature of public protest demonstrations and political gatherings tended to become less violent and confrontational once the right to hold such gatherings was established by law. Willis (1999: 1) stated that the policing of public demonstrations and public dissent has become less adversarial and more rights-based in the United Kingdom and that the rights-based approach to protest and the police response to this type of protest movement results in far fewer public-police confrontations in public demonstrations. He stated:

This is further exemplified by the trend away from demonstration which seemingly threaten the fabric of social order towards less damaging protests of a more issue-specific kind. (Willis, 1999:1)

Police Methods Used In Public Order Policing

Nalla (1999) observed that appropriate response strategies must be developed by the police, formulated in the context of the cultural, social, and political conditions of the respective countries. Key factors involve determining when orderly demonstrations become disorderly situations and when private disorder contributes to and creates public disorder. Alexander (1999) of India mentioned that, although demonstrations and processions are regular occurrences, certain aspects of these activities can create public order challenges beyond the demands for policing the original events. Processions involving fasting by members of religious groups, trade union demonstrations, and political protests can tie up transportation services, and a lack of water or sanitation facilities for the demonstrators can create extreme difficulties. Since the causes of demonstrations are not likely to disappear the police must be prepared to provide for the security and safety of the demonstrators and of those who are not involved in the demonstrations but are affected by them.

Subramanian (1999) suggested that the most important factor in maintaining public order and preventing public disorder is to understand the psychology of crowds and mass gatherings. People come together in large gatherings for a number of different reasons. They can be attracted out of curiosity or novelty (a traffic accident or a street performer), or have purposive involvement (to be entertained, to express opinions, to promote or debate a specific issue). Individuals in crowds are highly susceptible to external suggestions and can feel anonymous and invincible. Agitators or certain stimuli can transform a passive, conventional crowd into an angry, aggressive crowd.

Effective crowd control demands a clear understanding of the psychological dimensions of crowd formation, its behavior, mentality and likely reaction. Lack of such understanding will result in innocuous and routine police actions at control and regulation, resulting in a friendly crowd turning hostile. Unimaginative use of force on, and tactless handling of sports fans result in peaceable crowds indulging in vandalism and destruction of properties in the sports arenas. Use of force at the wrong moment has resulted in stampedes among conventional crowds at religious festivals, melas, etc. (Subramanian, 1999:1)

Approaches that were commonly used by police included creation of special units specifically trained for crowd control, protest management, and supervision of any large scale meeting. The use of private police and security units to assist with such control was fairly common, and the training of all units in community oriented policing was seen as having positive effects in such situations. In India, there is a clear distinction between the civil police and the army. The police of each state handle their own

problems, but the army may be called in at times of major disasters or civil disturbances. The Black Cats Unit was created from both army and regular police elements and it is specifically oriented to handle problems of terrorism. Many of these terrorism incidents occur near India's borders with other countries (Alexander, 1999).

According to Willis (1999), policing in the United Kingdom from the mid-nineteenth century to the present primarily focused on public order. This British model was replicated throughout the Empire and had far-reaching effects, even in countries that were not controlled by the United Kingdom. The functions of the police tend to be defined in very broad terms, which are open to discretion. The Final Report of the Royal Commission on the Police set up in the United Kingdom (1962) lists "to maintain law and order; to protect persons and property" as the first main function of the police (Mprah, 1999: 6). In Kenya, the statutory function of the police is briefly stated in the Kenya Police Act as "the Force shall be employed in Kenya for the maintenance of law and order, the preservation of the peace, the protection of life and property, the prevention and detection of crime, the apprehension of offenders, and the enforcement of all laws and regulations with which it is charged" (Mprah, 1999:7). In Ghana, the broad functions of the Ghana Police Service are described in Section I (i) of the Police Service Act, 1970, Act 350::

It shall be the duty of the police service to prevent and detect crime, to apprehend offenders, and to maintain public order and the safety of persons and property.(Mprah, 1999: 7) It was noted by the speaker from Ghana that the police are often expected to only enforce the law, not to legislate or interpret laws. It is, however,

. . . not uncommon for many to think that police personnel empowered to administer the law often fall easily into the delusion that ". . . they are empowered also to interpret and shape it." The consequence of this is usually that of a paradox-that is, the power intended to be judicially used in preventing crime, violence and oppression perpetrated by law breakers, if not constrained and bounded, becomes a tool for oppressing and intimidating the law abiding citizen. In the result, the rights and liberties that are intended to be protected and preserved become imperilled as "casualties" of official coercive power (Mprah, 1999:7)

The vagueness of the laws in specifying how the police are to respond to a public disorder situation creates a potential civil liberties violation problem in all societies. Representatives of every country present at the symposium could present examples of situations that could lead to a violation of citizens' rights. The ability to balance the rights of the demonstrators and protestors with the needs and rights of

the general public is the most difficult aspect of public order policing. This is true even in countries with long democratic traditions and histories of police sensitivity to the protection of rights. For example, in Canada the Charter of Rights provides fundamental freedoms of association, press and religion, but Section 7 allows state authorities to deprive a person of life, liberty or security, as long as the deprivation is in accordance with the principles of justice (Mackenzie and Plecas, 1999: 11). Mackenzie and Plecas (1999) noted that the Supreme Court of Canada established the Oakes Test, a two stage test to determine whether limiting the rights or freedom of citizens is necessary.

The first stage is to determine if the objective of the impugned legislation or state activity is sufficiently important to override the constitutionally guaranteed right or freedom. If the answer to this question is yes, then the second stage consists of evaluating the mechanisms used to achieve the objective to ensure that they are reasonable and proportional. *R. v. Oakes* (1986), 24 C.C.C. (3d) 321. Quoted in Mackenzie and Plecas, 1999: 12).

Other speakers also expressed the concern that the general mandate of maintaining public order given to the police often led to a very aggressive, forceful and suppressive approach to policing, particularly in terms of responses to protests of government policies. Willis (1999:3) alluded to Jefferson's conclusion that:

. . . the use of police by the state is intended primarily to nullify protest, either by making a peacefully-managed demonstration seem politically impotent, or by using militaristic police tactics to overwhelm protestors and make their protests seem both unacceptable and ineffective; [however] . . . overly hostile and aggressive policing can itself generate the very violence it seeks to control (Jefferson, 1993:47)..

The Delhi Police, who are responsible for policing in a New Delhi district that witnesses nearly 4,000 demonstrations each year, have set up standard rules and procedures for the demonstrators to follow. Prior permission is needed, and the demonstration are confined to designated areas. According to Mr. Sanjay Beniwal, Additional DCP, Delhi police, each group:

. . . implicitly binds itself to certain rules. . . . The police find out the socio-economic profile of the demonstrators-an indicator of their likely behaviour . . . and through its “sources” receive continuous feedback on the demonstrators’ orientation and intentions. . . . We decide the route they should be allowed to take, where to guide them, and finally stop them. (Hindu, 1999: 1)

The Netherlands, noted for its tolerant and democratic approach to policing, has developed highly effective methods to maintain public order. This is partially the result of The Police Act of 1993, which gave the mayor of the central municipality of each of the 25 regions primary responsibility for directing police activities, placing police activities under civilian control. The police are part of the society and the public’s response to and acceptance of police practices are very important considerations. All police are trained to deal with disturbances of public order. Such disturbances are categorized as small scale when they predominantly involve safety on the streets for small groups of citizens in a restricted area, and large scale, where special units, such as the riot police, may be deployed. In recent years, large scale disturbances included political demonstrations, the squatter movement, which resulted from a housing shortage, football hooliganism, and anti-nuclear protests. The specific operational tactics used by the police in disturbances of public order are dependent on whether the activity is predictable or unpredictable, its projected length, and whether the issues are relatively simple or complex in nature. Although the Netherlands does not have units specifically designated to combat public order problems, the regional police forces do have access to a “model for large-scale action” that can be used for crisis situations. When this model is activated, clearly defined policy staff members, a command staff, and operational units made up of platoons of arrest teams and fire and tear gas groups become involved. (Visser and Bezuyen, 1999: 12-13).

As a result of their experiences in dealing with public order disturbances, police from The Netherlands have drawn the following lessons:

- . . . potential disturbances of public order-specifically those that are unpredictable-are often minor at the start, but can escalate rapidly.

- We are often familiar with the problem, but not with how it will develop..

- The nature of disturbances of public order can also change quickly and, imperceptibly, develop into new, more complex problems.

- The methods of police (government) action can have a major effect on the way in which the problem develops.

- The problem facing the police is and/or will remain equivocal, with the consequence that the police cannot restrict itself to an unequivocal approach or method of action.
- The rapidity with which a problem (crisis) develops could be so great (even unexpected) that the police might have to perform at maximum capacity from one moment to the next. (Visser and Bezuyen, 1999: 11-12)

Their major conclusion is that the police must evaluate the nature of a disorder quickly and implement action that can easily be modified, as the situation develops.

Citizen Involvement in Maintaining Public Order

A number of the symposium speakers mentioned how important it is for citizens to recognize and accept the legitimacy of their government, the legal system, and consequently the police as enforcers of public order. The specific religious practices, culture, and political traditions of a country will influence the ways the people respond to these institutions. If the ultimate legal authority is vested in a government or an agency outside of the country, the resistance to this authority is likely to be greater than in situations where people feel that they are a part of system. For example, the speaker from

Saudi Arabia maintained that Islamic law has played a strong role in stabilizing the public order of that country. He mentioned that there is a oneness of ideology among the people and that the spiritual and materialistic aspects of life are integrated into this ideology. The Muslim commitment to religion regulates the spiritual and behavioral aspects of life.

This behavioral engagement, depending on faith, would push a Muslim to abide by almost all ethical and moral regulations. A Muslim is told to cooperate with others and abandon any conduct that will lead to riot or disorder. There are many religious texts that state that aspect (Badrani, 1999: 4).

According to Badrani, the security force is not “apart from society; it come from within its people. Therefore, the relationship should be one of integrity, respect, and cooperation” (Banradi, 1999:5). The speaker from Sudan (Yagoub, 1999) also made reference to the influence of Islamic law as a primary factor in the lack of public disorder problems in his country. He noted that the spirit of cooperation among the people is grounded in the traditions of the country.

The history of the police in Bahrain further illustrates this point. In 1926, the government established a police force and in 1932 the government decided to recruit its officers from Punjab, India. The organizational structure, training and administration of the force were based on the English model. However, it was soon realized that the police department should be under local control in this traditionally peace loving country.

[In 1937] the administration had decided that a modern, professional police force must have its roots in the local community and thereby the appointments to control and command of the force were gradually passed into indigenous hands. The present arrangements and facilities provide security for the citizens through law and order. (Al-Khayyat, 1999: 14).

In Zambia, a new Public Order Act (Act No. 1 of 1996, Chapter 113) gave major responsibility for maintaining order at public meetings, processions or demonstrations to those planning the event. They are required to present a standard written form to the police fourteen days before the scheduled date of the event and provide a sufficient number of marshals to regulate the activities of those engaged in the event (Ndhlovu, 1999: 9-10).

In Australia, pluralized policing and community policing compliment the more traditional crime control models. According to Sarre (1999) pluralized policing engages private police and security providers, administrative bodies, community service groups, and educational and welfare agents to assist in the planning and implementation of crime prevention and control activities. The private security industry is the most important in this regard. The police are receptive to working with private security forces to form strategic alliances. Community policing in Australia includes problem oriented policing, which seeks to identify factors that precipitate crime and uses this information to stop or limit crime and disorder problems, and partnership with the community, in which non-police resources (including groups and professionals who work to increase the social and economic stability of an area, such as teachers, social workers, employment personnel, recreation officers and volunteers) are used to work on alleviation of local problems. Another facet of community policing in Australia is inter-agency cooperation, through which the police work with specialized law enforcement bureaus, including the Commonwealth Office of Strategic Crime Assessment, customs, securities and investment and intelligence agencies, and the National Crime Authority. The military also may be called upon for disaster relief or search and rescue missions, but it is not used in public disorder situations. (Sarre, 1999:9-12).

The police in Austria are also embracing the principles of community policing, developing what they term a "citizen-friendly police organization." (Edelbacher, 1999:8). This requires that the police embrace humanitarian principles and safeguard the rights of all citizens, regardless of their social positions.

It has become increasingly important for the police to reflect a human component and to act according to fundamental humanitarian principles. A society which suffers more and more from a variety of symptoms of social deficiency, such as violence in the family, violence against women and children, youth criminality, sexual abuse of women and children, vandalism and drug addiction, but also calls for assistance by the police in word and deed requires a human police. To make it citizen-friendly, any abuse of the police must be avoided. (Edelbacher, 1999: 8)

In the United States, the diversified policing system operates on three levels-federal, state, and local. The local police are the first line of defense for maintaining public order. If they are not able to control public disorder situations, involvement of the state police can be requested. The mayor of the city or municipality contacts the governor of the state, who has the authority to send in the state police. If additional assistance is needed the governor can bring in the National Guard (military units housed in each state) and, as a last resort, request that the President of the United States dispatch troops from the U.S. Army to restore order.

Many cities and municipalities in the U.S. have embraced the concept of community policing, and the police have been quite successful in enlisting the aid and cooperation of citizens in their endeavors. Small police stations (termed "mini-stations") have been established in neighborhoods, and foot and bicycle patrols are widely used. Efforts have been made to improve urban quality of life by encouraging citizens to clean up and take pride in their neighborhoods.

In their book, *Fixing Broken Windows* (1996), George Kelling and Catherine Coles state that "disorder is incivility, boorish and threatening behavior that

disturbs life, especially urban life." (14) . . . Disorder creates public fear. Neighborhoods with the cooperation of the police have to clean their areas of disorderly elements if citizens are to develop a sense of security and safety. (Palmiotto and Geary, 1999:15).

Private Security Policing

Most of the speakers noted that the use of private police or security for public gatherings, sporting or entertainment events, protection of private property, and

political rallies has increased tremendously and will continue to grow. For example, in the U.S. private police personnel far outnumber public police. A private event held in a public owned facility will have security made up of both private and public police. The public police may direct traffic and provide security outside the building, while the private police work inside. Private security may function in residential areas, businesses, public service establishments (hospitals, schools, recreation centers) and at locations that attract large crowds (shopping and entertainment areas). The amount of cooperation and collaboration between private and public police in the maintenance of public order will vary, according to the situation. In the U.S., the police cooperate with a wide variety of outside agencies to assure public order and safety. These include crime watch groups and private police who are employed to patrol and safeguard property. The private police are most likely to be found in wealthier neighborhoods or in low income housing subsidized by the government.

Nalla and Kumar (1999:10-14) described the similarities between private police and public police. Both groups are dedicated to reducing crime and protection of property, both have order maintenance functions. They often use similar types of uniforms, equipment, and vehicles and have received comparable training. A sizeable amount of private policing is carried out by former military personnel or retired public police officers. Since much of private policing is conducted in areas open to the general public, considerable cooperation with public police assigned to the same locations is vital. Nalla and Kumar examined research related to private and public police cooperation, and concluded that the role of private policing will continually increase for order maintenance situations as it becomes more apparent that public policing does not have the resources to adequately provide this service. Also, there may be more contracting of public policing to provide for the security needs of private enterprises or public housing complexes. Examples of cooperative efforts between private and public policing include private organizations paying public policing organizations to conduct investigations, sharing intelligence files, both public and private police physically staffing security posts at large scale sporting or entertainment events.

Laitinen (1999:24) noted that:

In principle, the services of the private security-guard firms cover only such private and strictly defined areas what are mentioned in the agreements between the buyers of the services and the security firms. In practice, however, the activities of the guards cover whole business-blocks in the cities. In this way, the distinction between public policing and private guarding has become more and more indefinite. This trend is emphasized by the special uniform which the guards are required to wear.

The current emphasis on cooperation between public and private security forces is part of an observable trend to make policing of public order as effective, efficient, and humane as possible. Although adequate number of personnel and appropriate technical equipment are important, the key factor in public order policing may be the ability to gain the confidence and cooperation of the people through knowledge and understanding of their needs and rights.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Public Order Policing

When the representatives attending the symposium were asked to describe the strengths of the methods used by their police in effectively dealing with public unrest, the following information emerged:

- Learning from past experience helps the police develop their current policies and approaches.
- Specific mistakes, including unlawful treatment of citizens, have led to legislative or constitutional changes that limit the power of the police,
- If the police are sympathetic to the causes of those creating public disorder by protesting, they will not resort to heavy-handed tactics unless this is absolutely necessary.
- Enlisting the aid and cooperation of the general citizenry helps to isolate the impact and extent of public disorders.
- Having good intelligence information through knowing the people of the community and the types of issues that have a potential to result in public protests and disorders and working with groups who represent these issues reduce the potential for disorder.

- Training is invaluable in preparing police for alternative responses to public disorder situations. "Situational discretion" was described as the ability to have different response patterns available to meet the needs of the moment.
- Responsibility for preventing public disorder can be shared with private police at sporting events, large entertainment events and appearances of controversial speakers.
- Control can be maintained over situations and participants through strength of organization and numbers.

While most of the speakers could describe various public disorder situations in which the outcomes were positive because of effective police intervention, they also mentioned incidents that did not have favorable outcomes. It would appear that the most important reason for a situation deteriorating into violence or loss of police control is related to a lack of understanding of or sensitivity to the values and needs of those involved in the protests. This tends to be true for countries that have long-standing traditions of democracy and guaranteeing civil rights as well as for those countries that have suffered political, social or economic repression in the past. While the police may be expertly trained and have appropriate resources, communications, and personnel, if they do not have a sociological and psychological understanding of collective behavior the end result of a public disorder confrontation can be tragic. Numerous examples were given from various countries that illustrated situations that began as peaceful, legal gatherings or demonstrations but became ugly, violent police-demonstrator confrontations. Failure to have good intelligence information on the nature of a crowd or a group involved in a public disturbance can also lead to a negative outcome. For example, in many crowds the majority of those present may be expressing their concerns in a peaceful, lawful manner, while others who have infiltrated the crowd have a different, violence driven agenda. If the police are not cognizant of the fact that the demonstrators who are directing hostility toward them are really viewing them as a symbol of the government or the organization that is the source of their frustration, the police may feel threatened and react with heavy-handed aggressive tactics that tend to escalate the conflict on both sides.

Visser and Bezuyen (1999:13) described a study of public order incidents in the Netherlands conducted by the Crisis Research Team of the University of Leiden. Among the vulnerabilities recorded were:

- faulty procedures
- too little time and priority

- no attention from the senior police organization
- coordination between the public administration and the public prosecutor
- weak intelligence position
- identification of risks
- not recording agreements

To remedy these problems in the Netherlands, more attention has been focused on preparation for large scale disturbances of public order. The training has included use of scenarios, establishment of separate offices of Public Order and Safety, and conducting practice sessions with staff and operational commanders who would be involved in control of such disturbances (14)

The speaker from Argentina noted that officers who are dealing with public disorder situations must have specific plans of action and display restraint in the face of serious threats to their own safety:

In matters of disturbances the Police acts with a numerical disadvantage compared to the protesters. So, in order to fulfill their task effectively, it must act according to a plan of action and work as a unity, as regards organization and discipline. At the same time the Police must bear in mind that it can never commit any excess. It must be prudent in the middle of a crowd in order not to revert to irresponsible and hard actions, condemned internationally, especially when it surpasses the use of force with which the disorders are suffocated. This type of action must be in accordance with objectives that provide prevention and restoration of order through actions duly planned and according to instructions which are to be followed precisely. (Montoya, 1999:2).

Officer stress was also mentioned by Edelbacher (1999:8-9) as a possible source of overreaction to public disorder situations. He stated:

. . . it is necessary to improve the working conditions to greatly reduce the physical and psychological stress of the police officers. . . . Among the measures to be taken is the elimination of the staff shortage. . . . In fulfillment of its tasks, a citizen-friendly police must be bound to law and justice. It has to protect the citizens against daily dangers and violence. But it should also be understood as a center for handling problems and conflicts.

A good example of such a situation was the confrontation between students, police, and the National Guard at Kent State University that began as a peaceful protest of U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War and culminated in the shooting deaths of four students and the wounding of others. Many of the police and military personnel called upon to control the Kent State protest had spent the previous several weeks working at a site where a union dispute had threatened property and safety. There had been property destruction and occasional sniper fire. They were called from this assignment to go immediately to Kent State to control the anti-war protest at a time when they were tired and suffering from stress. In the opinion of many experts who researched the incident, the shootings occurred in part because the troops and officers, tired and overly concerned about their own personal safety, took action that went far beyond what was needed to control the situation. The speakers regarded the following conditions as weaknesses in police responses or causes of inappropriate police responses to public disorder situations:

- Lack of training or planning,
- Insufficient and stressed police personnel,
- Overreaction to situations,
- Poor intelligence work,
- Failure to enlist the support of the mass media,
- Communication problems,
- Alienation of the citizens by the tactics employed, and
- Not being sensitive to the cultural, religious, or ethnic values, needs, concerns or issues of importance to those participating in public protests or demonstrations.

A common theme of the speakers was a change in orientation on the part of the police in the handling of public order and disorder situations. A great deal more consideration is now given to the civil rights of the citizens. Policy makers must be sensitized to the needs of the people. Politicians and community leaders must be educated on ways that they can help create public order and how they can work with the police. They must also create legal safeguards to compel the police to deal with the people in a completely lawful manner. As Saubramanian (1999:1-2) observed in his valedictory address to the symposium attendees:

We are on the threshold of a new Millennium where management of public order is going to assume greater dimensions and complexities due to many factors which will be beyond the control of the police services. The shrinking global village, information explosion, improvement in the quality and capabilities of people all over the world are going to change the scenario completely. The increasing awareness of human rights and their entitlements among the people will result in people constantly questioning the legality and the social needs of many of the restraints which become necessary in the management of public order. While the cardinal principles of the democracy stress on individual freedoms and rights, law enforcement requires placing restrictions on these in the larger interests of the society. Conflict of perceptions of police services and the public will be an eternal feature in management of public order. This dilemma, being faced by the police services even today, is going to accentuate.

Political Influences on Public Order Policing

It has been well established through research that policing is never totally void of political influences (Bailey and Shearing, 1996). Depending on one's theoretical perspective, a case can be made that all policing has some political foundations. Even if this premise is not accepted, it is not difficult to find examples of politically influenced policing in all countries, particularly in relation to control of political demonstrations and protests against the government's policies. In the United States, civil rights protests and protests against that country's involvement in the Vietnam War often were marked by police brutality and violation of the demonstrators' civil rights. Speakers from several African countries that were formerly under colonial rule described how the police were used as instruments of the government to assure that the interests of the propertied class were maintained. Mars (1999:1-2) illustrated how a change in political control can affect the manner in which policing is undertaken.

Recent developments in Guyana since the last general election (December, 1997) which was won by the incumbent People's Progressive Party, have resulted in a proliferation of public order events requiring police intervention. These events, which are still continuing to unfold, have placed the policing of public order at the forefront of public discourse, and provide classic examples of the pervasive influence of politics in the policing of Guyanese society. We examine the checkered history of public order policing in Guyana during the post- independence period (1966-present) and argue that variations in the strategies adopted by police in response to public order disturbances reflect changes in the influence and control of the police by the state apparatus. The movement from the "rough justice" meted out to participants in public order events during the lengthy period of the Burnham dictatorship, to the "soft" and sometimes comical tolerance currently being displayed by the police, reflects changes in the relationship between the police and the government, rather than institutional policies and practices. Neither of these policing styles engendered the required respect for and adherence to the rule of law that is required for effective policing in a democratic society, and protection of the civil rights and liberties of all citizens.

The symposium speakers agreed that, while all policing has some political connotations, some police are more independent and buffered from political control than others. The cultural, historical, and political background of the country determine this. In Ghana, the Constitution specifically provides that the government can react swiftly and strongly to public disorder occurrences.

The 1992 Constitution of Ghana contains very important provisions on the maintenance of public order. One of such significant provisions is Article 31, clauses (1) and (9) under which the President of Ghana may, acting in accordance with the advice of the Council of State, declare a state of emergency in any part of the country where circumstances exist rendering necessary the taking of such measures as are required for securing the public safety, the defence of Ghana and the maintenance of public order and of supplies and services essential to the life of the community (Mprah, 1999: 11).

Other examples of political leaders' ability to make decisions pertaining to control of public disorder include the authority of the President of the United States to call in the U.S. Army to control a protest situation. This happened after World War I, when the veterans marched to Washington to demand bonuses and were dispersed by the Army under Presidential order, and during the World War II, when the U.S. Army was brought in to handle a strike by coal miners that appeared to threaten the war effort. It was noted by most of the speakers that the more extreme measures of using the external army to handle the affairs that were generally relegated to the internal or civil police were rarely used but were

available and legal. When such measures are used, the motivations of the political leader are often questioned. Was the action necessary to protect the common good, or was it taken for personal political benefit?.

Regardless of the political situation, the police can normally still perform in a very professional manner in public disorder types of situations. Demonstrations, marches, labor unrest, and strikes can have great political importance, particularly if they interfere with the normal functioning of a community by tying up transportation and other services for extended periods of time. Balachandran (1999) of India vividly described how a peaceful religious procession can tie up hundreds of police personnel and resources and has the potential to shut down the city by bringing transportation and other services to a standstill.

Regardless of the degree of political input in a public disorder situation, the police can still perform in a professional manner when carrying out their duties. The police are often asked to provide protection for public demonstrations in which the topic is politically unpopular and also unpopular among the rank and file citizens. In such cases there may be tremendous pressure to forcibly end the demonstration and act in a manner that would not be in conformity to the law. In the face of these pressures, Subramanian (1999) of India declared that order has to be maintained in accordance with law. Today, people have a greater awareness of their human rights and insist that these rights be guaranteed by the government. Legal safeguards must be created. Sensitizing politicians, policy makers, and community leaders to ways that they can help maintain public order and work effectively with the police is of great importance. Wiarda (1999) of the Netherlands stated that police cooperation with politicians is not in opposition to professional values. Police and politicians need to cooperate to get the job done, but the police can remain professional and independent.

It was felt that politics and policing do not have to be confrontational. Political cooperation is not in opposition to professional values. Police administrators must be outside of the political system, but they can never ignore the impact of political decisions. Funding and even the style and primary goals of policing are affected by political decisions. Wiarda (1999) noted that whether to adopt a community policing approach or a very hard line approach in dealing with public order matters is basically a political decision. Police administrators must be politicians in the best sense and a professional police administrator can sensitize politicians, policy makers, and community leaders to ways they can create public order and work effectively with the police.

Anticipated Future Public Order Challenges and Police Responses to These Challenges

Public disorder occurrences in the future are most likely to happen in those countries that are in transitional stages-developing economically, becoming urbanized and mechanized, seeking modern

industrial development-because people in these countries are not satisfied with their quality of life. Some will seek changes that will improve education, health services, transportation, jobs, and housing, but others will protest because they are forced to give up old ways and life styles. The influence of other cultures through the mass media will have an effect on these situations.

The speakers from Canada (Mackenzie and Plecis, 1999:29-30) reported that even in Canada, a country with a stable democracy that has generally been able to resolve its conflicts in a peaceful manner, the widening gap between the rich and the poor could eventually lead to social unrest and civil disorder. Another possible source of future conflict in Canada is treatment of the aboriginal or native people, who are growing increasingly militant because they feel that government has not responded to their grievances. Sarre (1999:16) described the measures to improve relations between indigenous people and the police that are already in place in Australia:.

The success of the “professional partnership policing” in the Australian context (where Aboriginal people are given a key role in the controlling anti-social behavior, minor infractions and serious breaches of the law) has been reported widely. . . . Other indigenous policing schemes involving police aides and newly devised multi-racial recruitment practices, training in non-racist attitudes and cultural awareness programs have received much attention since the 1991 Royal Commission. Sarre (1999: 16) concluded that:

All attitudes will not change overnight, of course, but the desire is apparent amongst senior police policy-makers to root out police racism where it appears. Once distrust and antipathy dissipate, there is some hope for the future of police/Aboriginal relations.

Other speakers (Marks, 1999; Mars, 1999; Ragnavan, 1999; Ndhlovu, 1999, , Mprah, 1999; Tibasana, 1999) mentioned ethnic group conflicts or conflicts based on political or religious differences as current and potential future problems.

In countries with high standards of living and stable political situations, protests related to specific issues (minority rights, environmental issues, hate group confrontations) may trigger disorder situations. Nalla and Kumar (1999) observed that a certain amount of disorder is a sign that a society is healthy, and that those creating disruptions often emerge as the leaders of that society. No country, regardless of how traditional its values and culture are, will remain static. There is constant change, and often protests, demonstration and strikes are the mechanisms used to bring about desired changes more quickly. If the

police approach such disorder events from the perspective that these are opportunities for peaceful solutions to political or social unrest problems, the outcomes are likely to be productive. For example, Tibasana (1999) of Tanzania reported that since the introduction of political pluralism in that country in 1992 the country, where previously one single party controlled the labor unions, cooperatives, the media and the public bureaucracy, now has twelve political parties competing for control and influence.

The net effect of all this is that forces hitherto kept on a leash have now been unleashed in the interest of democratic practice. Diversity of opinion and views is a necessary consequence of the new set up and arrangement.

Far from claiming a return to the old monopoly culture, the present set up should be a lesson and a pointer to a future with more public disorder situations than otherwise. (Tibasana, 1999:49)

Similar sentiments were expressed by speakers from other developing countries that are in a transition from some type of autocratic or military control to a democratic model. The politicians and citizens of these countries are still not completely sensitized to the self control that is demanded in democratic society in regard to exercise of freedoms of assembly and speech. The social and economic problems that bring about discontent will continue to exist for a considerable period of time, and it is expected that this desire for a higher quality of life, expressed by demands by political organizations, labor unions and the general public for improvements, may create public disorder situations. The speaker from Zambia (Ndhlovu, 1999:12) eloquently described this condition.

It is interesting to note that the new procedures for managing crowds and public events generally in Zambia are a reflection of a democratic culture that seeks public participation in [the] decision-making process of such events. However, there is also an acknowledgement of the fundamental essence of peace and order as a precondition to the enjoyment of Human and Constitutional Rights of the people. Zambia Police Service, therefore, is disciplined enough to move into the twenty-first century well aware of the citizens' expectations but, even more important, aware of its obligation to the people Vis a Vis maintenance of public peace and order.

There was common agreement that the police must be more cognizant of the rights of those who are involved in public order situations. People of all countries are more aware of their civil rights, and the mass media is quick to record and report any violations. With increased professional standards of policing, the violations will be handled internally. Thus, the expected response to demonstrations, protests, and public gatherings, except in extreme instances, is likely to be the “soft” approach, and this “soft” approach will be coupled with the enlistment of cooperative assistance from a number of other agencies, including those involved in organizing the events, private police, and interested public service groups. Many examples were presented at the symposium of how the “soft” approach led to positive results. Ndhlova (1999) of Zambia described a situation in which street vendors were blocking the corridors to the shopping centers in the main commercial district of Lusaka. They were disrupting traffic, congesting the sidewalks, and creating unsanitary conditions because of the huge amount of garbage they created. Rather than forcefully removing the street vendors from the site, which could have caused considerable hostility toward the police and the government, negotiations were undertaken between the Deputy Minister, the City fathers, the police, and representatives of the street vendors. The vendors agreed to move from the streets to authorized outlets.

The Lusaka “regaining of the streets operation” was a huge success given the magnitude of the risks it posed to public peace if something had gone wrong. (Ndhlova, 1999:15-16.)

As the world moves more and more toward a global society, we can expect that more public disorder events will be orchestrated by those who object to cooperative economic and political agreements. New opportunities for criminal activity will emerge, and terrorism or other disruptive tactics may become more common. Montoya (1999) of Argentina described the effects of Mercosur, the economic integration that was part of the Treaty of Asuncion, signed in 1991 by Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay. The agreement established free trade of goods, a common foreign tariff, and the coordination of macroeconomic policies and also provided for cooperation between police from these countries. Montoya (1999:20) observed:

Such free traffic also brings about foreign criminality since as regards crime acts, the typical concentration of crowds contributes to any crime against property, carried out by foreigners who join the people in order to take advantage of their distractions as well as to break into properties, The Mercosur action program has considered police co-operation as one of its main items, . . . to pave the way for an agile, dynamic and modern interchange among the police forces of the nations involved. All the methods adopted by the Mercosur lead to preventing and neutralizing complex criminal methods that are materialized through the boundaries. . . . Mercosur can adopt preventive mechanisms for such actions by integrating and interchanging strategies, means and information on common issues on the part of the Police Forces.

Edelbacher (1999:14) also cautioned that public disorder problems in the future may have an international flavor. He described recent public disorder events in Austria that had international political significance. Austria borders several countries that have had and continue to have severe internal political problems. The result is that persons from these countries immigrate to Austria, and particularly to Vienna. The Austrian police must be prepared to respond to the actions of terrorist groups or mass protests on matters that do not have their origins in Austria. For example, in 1999 a Kurdish leader was arrested in Kenya and extradited to Turkey. This resulted in protest activities by Kurdish activists in countries all over Europe. In Vienna, they occupied the Greek embassy and the Kenyan embassy by force. Another potential problem for the future in Austria is the presence of Islamic extremists among the refugees from the former Yugoslavia, Turkey and North Africa and of left-wing extremists who have fled Yugoslavia during its civil war. Since violent future actions by these groups cannot be ruled out,

. . . great efforts are undertaken internally to fight terrorism preventatively. The bilateral and multilateral cooperation with foreign police authorities and other security organizations have been continued and, in sub-areas, intensified (Edelbacher, 1999: 17).

A development that will gain importance in the future is the international relevance of many issues pertaining to social unrest or public disorder. These include environmental preservation, smuggling, immigration, and the havoc created through drug trafficking and terrorism. For example, the speaker from Ecuador (Moreno, 1999) mentioned that this country is located on a well-established drug trafficking route, and many of the problems related to public order are caused by outside influences. Conflicts and violence that erupt in that country often are not perpetrated by the citizens of that country. Through electronic communications, people who are involved in these activities can organize worldwide protest actions. The police response to these social and political activities requires coordinated and cooperative police action among many countries.

The consensus among the speakers was that the police must use a softer approach to handling mass demonstration and public order situations than they did in the past. Raghavan (1999) of India noted even the slightest use of force by the police is likely to lead to greater problems and escalation of the conflict. The police will be criticized by the public and the press. Citizens have become more and more aware that laws now guarantee their rights to assemble for peaceful demonstration or protests and the police

are sure to be challenged if they resort to extreme responses. Throughout the world, the mass media can now document and report incidents that may be construed as uses of excessive force by police and can arouse or shape negative public opinions toward the police. The various countries have instituted internal police review mechanisms whereby police conduct or policies developed by police administrators that are considered too extreme and not necessary to restore public order can result in dismissals or criminal prosecutions. A pluralistic approach to public disorder situations is likely to evolve. This is true because the police realize that there are limitations on the actions they can take to maintain public order and that the enlistment of the local citizens and other interested organizations and groups in social control situations will produce the most positive results. As Sarre (1999:16) observed:

The key element in all of the literature is the emphasis that is to be placed on partnerships with other agencies, national and international, in the fight against crime and social disharmony. Most crime trends vary regardless of police strength and policing resources. That fact is well known, and today's police managers recognize the limitations of law enforcement as an instrument of social control. They also recognize that many of the tasks that confront their agencies could be the responsibilities of other governmental and non-governmental organizations, private and public in the future.

Conclusions

On the final day of the symposium, five participants were asked to present their analyses of the findings related to each of the five questions posed to the attendees. With regard to Issue 1 – the definitions of public disorder - Marks (1999) emphasized that such definitions were particularly important for the new democracies, because quality of life issues are important matters and high levels of crime are likely to be closely related to social disorder in these countries. Crime and social disorder must be regarded as interdependent. Political and social protests should be seen as normal occurrences, and acceptable avenues for citizens to seek redress through social protests must be viewed by the police as acceptable means to express opinions and rights.

For Issue 2 - the political, social, racial, or economic reasons for public unrest and discontent - Nalla (1999) presented a model for dealing with public disorder that involved working within a suitable theoretical framework to develop appropriate response strategies. These must be formulated in the context of the cultural, social, and political conditions of the respective countries, because there are widely different opinions as to when orderly demonstrations become disorder, and situations where private disorder can contribute to public disorder must also be taken into account.

Willis (1999) declared that the the topic of Issue 3 - police methods used to combat, contain, and deal with public unrest - can be analyzed at three distinct levels. At the operational level of police practice, the graduated response of "situational discretion" involves the taking of police action only when needed. The cost of public order policing should be evaluated, keeping in mind that when funds are spend on policing public disorder less money is available for other types of police work. The increasing amount of "vigilante" activity and private justice and its effects on public policy must be examined.. At the macro level, more attention must be given to the conditions that produce normal order in the country. Efforts to promote diversity, acceptance of cultural differences, and social engineering to maintain normal order are important in this regard.. At the political level, there must be a change in the perception of political and social unrest as a crime problem. Political problems must not be ignored by the government.

With regard to Issue 4 - the extent of political consideration rather than professional values and skills involved in handling public disorder - Wiarda (1999) described two approaches to police-political organization. In the first, based on the English system, the Chief of Police is independent from the political system. In the second, grounded in the French model, the police are not independent, but a political instrument. Political cooperation is not in opposition to professional values. The police chief must be a politician, working outside the political system. A police chief can never ignore the political impact of his/her decisions. Single issue protests require police decisions that may be in opposition to the prevailing political views, and policing as a means of maintaining public order is a political decision. Community policing has been quite effective as a means of maintaining social and public order.

In discussing Issue 5 - the types of public order disturbances that are anticipated in the future and police measure to contain them, Ndhlovu (1999) projected that those countries that have had past problems with public disorder will continue to have such problems for a period of time, but the amount and types of public disorder will differ. Poor countries cannot satisfy the needs of the people, and political parties in these countries exploit those situations for their own benefit. Social unrest will continue until quality of life matters such as employment, health, housing, and others are satisfied. The response of the police to social unrest can be the "soft" approach, that is, requiring permits, cooperating with demonstrators, and using force only as a last resort. If a hard policing approach is used, it must be evaluated. Police must be adequately trained in police response to public disorder.

References

Al-Badrani, Abdullah D. (1999). A Paper from Saudi Arabia-Policing Public Disorders: A Local Perspective. Paper prepared for the Sixth Inter- national Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Alexander, A. X. (1999). Presentation at the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Al-Khayyat, M.A.R. (1999). Policing of Public Order in the State of Bahrain. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Bachandran, N. (1999), Policing of Public Order. Presentation at the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Bailey, D. and C. Shearing. (1996). "The Future of Policing." *Law and Society Review*, 30 (3), 585-606.

Chilufya, Alex M. (1999). Policing of Public Order in Zambia: The Challenges and Responses of the Zambia Police Service. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Edelbacher, Maximilian. (1999). Policing of Public Order: An Austrian Perspective. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Hindu, "Mob Control: Not by Lathi Alone," Aug 10, 1999:1. Jefferson, T. (1990). *The Case Against Paramilitary Policing*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Jefferson, T. (1993). "Pondering Paramilitarism: A Question of Viewpoints." *British Journal of Criminology*. 27: 47-53.

Laitinen, Ahti. (1999). Policing of Public Order in Finland. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Magagula, Gilbert. (1999). The Royal Swaziland Police: Policing of Public Order. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Marks, Monique and Johan L. Olivier. (1999). From Green to Blue: Public Order Policing in South Africa. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Marks, Monique. (1999). Summary of Issue I. Presentation at the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Mars, Joan. (1999). From "Rough" to "Soft" Tolerance: The Political Policing of Public Order in Guyana. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Montoya, Mario D. (1999). Policing of Public Order in Argentina. Paper Prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Moreno, Mario R.C. (1999) Policing of Public Order. Presentation at the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Nalla, Mahesh K. and Kornel S. Kumar. (1999). Social Control and Collective Regulation: Law Enforcement and Private Policing in the 21st Century. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Nalla, Mahesh Kr. Summary of Issue 2. Presentation at the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Ndhlovu, Francis K. (1999). Policing of Public Order in Zambia. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Ndhlovu, Francis K. (1999). Summary of Issue 5. Presentation at the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Palmiotto, Michael J. and David Patrick Geary. (1999). Dialectic Organization and Practice of Policing in the United States. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Petlane, Elliot Kahlolo. (1999). A Paper on Policing of Public Order in Lesotho. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Raghavan, R.K. (1999). Address to the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13.

Raghavan, R.K. (1999). Preserving Public Order. *Frontline*, August 13, 1999: 98-99.

Smelser, Neil J. (1962). *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: Free Press.

Sarre, Rick. (1999). The Policing of Public Order in Australia. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Subramanian, S. (1994). Crowd Control in a Democracy. Paper circulated to the delegates of the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16, 1999.

Subramanian, S. (1999) Valedictory Address. Delivered to the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 16.

Tibasana, Laurean M. (1999). Policing Public Order: The Experience of the United Republic of Tanzania. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Visser, B.R. and M.J. Bezuyen. (1999). Preserving Public Order in the Netherlands. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Wiarda, Jan. (1999). Summary of Issue 4. Presentation at the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Willis, Andrew. (1999). Sense and Nonsense in Public Order Policing. Paper prepared for the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Willis, Andres. (1999). Summary of Issue 3. Presentation at the Sixth Inter-National Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India, July 13-16.

Yagoub, Al-Adil-Agib. (1999). Policing of Public Order. Presentation at the Sixth International Police Executive Symposium, Hyderabad, India July 13-16.