

The Need for a Comparative Criminology of Policing in India and Pakistan^{*}

Fasihuddin

Abstract

This paper, originally written for presentation in the 30th All India Conference on Criminology at Calcutta (India) and the South Asian Conference at Islamabad (Pakistan), emphasizes the need for a comparative study of criminology and policing in the context of India and Pakistan, which offers a vast opportunity for intellectual input by our scholars, criminologists and practitioners. It is not an exhaustive comparison between the two countries. However, it identifies some fundamental issues and responses, common on both sides, from where the future researcher can take on a more vigorous academic exercise. This will definitely and understandably add to the mutual trust and confidence building measures between the two intrinsically similar but commonly known rival countries. This will undoubtedly, pave the way for the redressal of their common problems, enabling them to redress their social evils with the best practices available at next door neighborhood, and of course, a valuable contribution to the present, though relatively scanty literature on comparative criminology and policing.

Keywords

Pakistan, India, Criminology, Police, Policing, Crime

Despite their separation in 1947, India and Pakistan have much in common than diversity. History, culture, art, literature, languages, struggle for independence, social and legal institutions inherited from colonial era, are a few common features of their societies __ the list is not finite. Both have more or less the same level of socio-economic indicators. The structure, role and organizations of the police are nearly identical, with an amazingly similar spectrum of crime incidents, trends and patterns. They have an unprecedentedly similar police image, public expectations and police problems, and a simultaneous movement of police reforms to repeal the 'notorious' legacy of colonialism __ the Police Act of 1861. Both can learn more from each other than to look for a panacea to their perennial ills at a remotest part of the globe, and that too in a completely different system and environment. Pakistan and India are now nuclear powers, but their 'crime bombs' are more dangerous for their own safety and the community at large.

^{*}Fasihuddin (2007). The Need of Comparative Criminology and Policing in the Context of India and Pakistan. In, the *Canadian Journal of Police and Security Services*. Spring / Summer 2007. Vol.5 Issue 1/2, pp. 59 -69.

1. **Comparative Studies of Criminology and Policing: Basic Idea and Approach**

Comparative criminology is gaining greater popularity amongst practitioners and researchers for a number of reasons. By means of documenting, analyzing and contextualising criminal justice processes and institutions elsewhere and comparing them to more familiar settings a broader understanding can be gained. The theoretical and practical incentives to such comparative studies are generally academic curiosity; acquiring knowledge of preventing ethnocentrism; securing basic levels of cooperation; harmonization of laws and procedures; learning from experiences of others as to how some similar problems are tackled by others; and carrying out a self-analysis that where do we stand? (Pakes, 2005). Comparative criminological research is essential in order to understand similarities and differences within and between different jurisdictions, and to gain a deeper understanding of social reality in different national contexts. In particular, key current debates within criminology about international convergence and divergence in criminal justice and penal policy highlight the need for more detailed international comparison (Jones & Newburn, 2006).

These comparisons are often more or less centred around criminal justice structures or criminal justice processes. Although it may be argued that an examination of substantive and procedural laws is another possible avenue for investigation. Comparative crime statistics is still another interesting activity. Though the potential benefits of comparative research are numerous, however, a distinction can be made between the aims of seeking to understand and of seeking to change (Pakes, 2005). Although in some fields of study the basic tools of comparative research are relatively advanced (for example in economic analyses of growth, unemployment and labour markets) in criminology these tools remain relatively underdeveloped. This relates to a number of daunting problems that are being faced by the comparative researchers in the field of criminology (Jones & Newburn, 2006). Within the social sciences, for example, some argue that all sociological research is inherently comparative but due to the technical, conceptual and linguistic problems in the task, others claim that for these and other reasons comparative work is nearly impossible (Nelken, 2002).

The difficulties of different interpretation (like that of statistics and its mode of acquisition) are always there in such academic endeavours. An exhaustive and all-embracing study is next to impossible. The limitations of singular research exercise examining smaller aggregates such as states, cities or single locations and groups have encouraged and compelled social scientists to turn to comparisons among many geographical entities.

Comparative research methods allow for a broader vision about social relations than is possible with cross-sectional research to one country or one location (Bachman and Schutt, 2003). The *Sage Dictionary of Criminology* has equated, in a way, 'comparative criminology' with 'comparative method'. It defines comparative method as, 'the selection and analysis of cases which are similar in known ways and which differ in other ways, with a view to formulating or testing hypotheses' (Victor Jupp, 2006).

Zedner (1995), as quoted by Francis Pakes, has noted the risks of 'criminological tourism'¹, the possibility of misreading or oversimplification, the linguistic difficulties and most often overlooking the problem of 'touching base'.² Cain, who prefers a form of active collaboration with the subjects of her research, insists that comparison faces the allegedly unavoidable dangers of 'occidentalism' __ thinking that other societies are necessarily like ours __ or 'orientalism'__ assuming that they are inherently different from us (Nelken, 2002). Though most comparative work provides summary descriptions of a large variety of national systems, which are often out of data, and are usually less well-informed about the 'law in action' than about the 'law in books'. There is never only one ideal research method, and choice method is inseparably linked to the objectives being pursued. The questions posed in comparative work seem to be more ambitious than the methodologies adopted (Nelken, 2002). One of the largest comparative research projects undertaken in criminology was the development of the Comparative Crime Data File (CCDF), which was undertaken by Dane Archer and Rosemary Gartner (1984). The CCDF continues to be updated, but originally contained crime and violence data from 110 nations and 44 major internationalities covering the period from approximately 1900 to 1970. Archer and Gartner (1984) identified five major problems of comparative criminological research as, generalization,³ controlled comparison,⁴ casual inference⁵ mediation and intervening variables,⁶ and methodological uncertainty⁷ (Bachman and Schutt, 2003). Amongst the various approaches of comparative research such as case studies or statistical analysis, the focused comparison approach is the most used and beneficial method involving neighboring countries in which the same language is spoken; so most similar design tend to be easier to achieve in such cases. Hague et al., (1998) define this approach as,

“A most similar design takes similar countries for comparison on the assumption that the more similar the units being compared, the more possible it should be to isolate the factors responsible for differences between them. By contrast, the most different design seeks to show the robustness of a relationship by demonstrating its validity in a range of contrasting settings”.

(Hague et al., 1998)

In all the components of the criminal justice system, police is the first and foremost component. So, both for practical as well as academic interest, the comparative studies are woven around comparative policing. However, at the outset of any study it is important to distinguish between police (which refers to the institution) and policing (which implies a set of processes with specific social functions). Police is a modern specialized and organized body of people but policing is a relatively broader concept, which encompasses a wide range of activities and personnel. It is said that policing must fit those 'to-be-policed' Therefore, a comparative analysis of policing requires a great deal of knowledge regarding the context in which it operates, which makes case-studies and focused comparisons appropriate methods of analysis. This academic endeavour requires a certain degree of understanding of not just criminal justice systems and processes but also the actors involved in it, and the society in which the system is set. (Pakes, 2005). Basically, the problems of comparative research, as noted above, can be compounded by a lack of common understanding of central concepts, and differing societal context within which the objects of study are located (Hantrais and Letablier 1996, quoted in Trevor Jones and Tim Newburn, 2006).

In comparative policing, the major areas of research are the evolution of the police, its history, style, structure, administration, duties, services, organizational behaviour, achievements, shortcomings, internal problems, expectations, challenges and its rapidly transforming role and shape in the continuously progressing political systems of the modern world, especially in the new democracies like India and Pakistan. For a better understanding and achieving a better model after sifting out the dissimilarities, we have to look briefly into the societies where these systems are operated, as rightly pointed out by Francis Pakes, Trevor Jones, Tim Newburn, Smith and others.

2. Societies Come First

James Sheptycki and others have observed that students of criminology are quite often unaware of the broad facts of geography and history that make the task of comparative criminology so interesting. In order to undertake comparative criminology in a global context, it is necessary to devote time to understanding how the cultural and political histories of different countries of the world serve to establish distinctive points of view about criminology and its object. But criminologists are not necessarily aware of Latin American political and economic history, or the anthropology of Muslim customary law, or how the geography of 'Eastern' Europe affects its place in global illicit markets, despite the fact much of the comparative literature is limited to OECD countries (the economically developed countries), and this begs questions

about crime in places that are more peripheral to the circuits of transnational global capital (Sheptycki & Wardak, 2005). This paper emphasizes that the researchers and intellectuals of the Southeast Asian countries should look for their own perspectives in the field of criminology and policing, especially when they have more similar models for their study work.

How, then are we to acquire sufficient knowledge of another culture (and of societies) for such purpose. Either we can rely mainly on cooperation with foreign experts, or we can go abroad to interview legal officials and others, or we can draw on our direct experience of living and working in the country concerned. All these strategies have their own academic merits and demerits but are beautifully dubbed by David Nelken as 'virtually there', 'researching there', or 'living there' (Nelken, 2002).

We all know about the common culture, common histories, common independence struggle, common languages, common art and literature, common organizations, and common historical personalities of both the countries. Today's borderless 'global village' has brought the two nations more closer to each other than they were before. Without going into the details of politico-economic problems and cooperation between the two countries, we would like to quote the socio-economic indicators of the two. Table I shows that despite the geographical and economic superiority of India over Pakistan, the basic human sufferings and deprivations are mostly similar across the length and breadth of the two countries. Both the nations are suffering equally from low-socio economic indicators, religious intolerance and law and order problems.

Both the societies (like many other developing societies) are rapidly changing and modernizing societies in which the individual lives an institutional life in a traditional set-up, transmitted to him by his culture and under various affiliations of blood-ties, family-roles, kinship behaviour, age-old conventions, ethos, tribal tendencies and valued ideals of religious and sectarian nature. The contradictions and frictions at various levels of both the societies have generated more or less the same problems of identity-crisis, anxiety, frustration, confusion, system dysfunction, and anomie (normlessness), etc, though with a different extent and severity. Similarly, the crime pattern and seriousness of criminal activities are also more or less similar. Actually, it is the similarity of our societal set-up, our culture and our common inherited values that are reflected in our day to day life and actions. Police is evolved from within the society as its first line of defence for combating crime. Police work is mostly affected by the underlying problems of the society, its stratification and anomalies. What Sunita Singh Sengupta observes in the context of India is also true in the context of Pakistan: -

“In India the problem [of policing] has been aggravated because of increase in population, scarcity of basic requirements (food stuffs, water, and dwellings), growing unemployment, conflicting claims of society, fluctuation in political order, rampant corruption, inefficient and insufficient resources, etc, etc, etc,”

(Singh-Sengupta, 1995)

All this above discussion clearly depicts that before carrying out a comparative study of police or policing in any given societies, the researchers have to carefully study the societies themselves, their culture, values, norms, history, ideals and other social institutions. Making sense of such theoretical underpinnings will make the job of the researcher quite easier than in a situation where a blind describes the various parts of an elephant. Police and Policing are the first reflection of a society that how much rule of law and respect for human dignity prevail in that society and how rational a response to an abnormal behaviour is presented and accepted by such a society.

3. Comparing the Police Image in India and Pakistan

Most citizens form their opinion of the police through personal contact either as a victim, witness, or suspect. These encounters often involve less than pleasant circumstances. Media and news broadcasts, movies, and television add a further impact to it. If a police officer himself is apathetic, engaged in unethical or unprofessional conduct, prejudiced, unwilling to handle public calls, selective in applying different standards of enforcement to different people or uses inappropriate body language, a negative police public image is likely to develop. However, the image of the police, as studies reveal, can be improved through implementation of community policing, by promoting better relationship between the police and minority communities, engaging in greater informal contact with citizens, and through events of greater collaborative and effective efforts (Ortmeier, 2006). This image formation is not a single day outcome. It takes a shape in an environment of trust or distrust after a lengthy period of successive interaction and encounters. The vast majority of police officers in the United States is hardworking, conscientious, ethical, and dedicated public servants (Ortmeier, 2006). I don't think that such an image is possible without the effective visibility and performance and cooperative attitude of the police in the United States. On the contrary, the police public image in India and Pakistan, though might be exaggerated negatively, is not that much encouraging and pleasant.

Leaving aside other factors, we would like to say a few words about policing in the two countries. Police in both the countries don't enjoy greater public respect or community support. Old and outdated police models with old weapons and techniques are still intact. Its colonial role of fighting crime, subjugating the miscreants and maintaining the order has not been replaced by service-orientation and community satisfaction. Media carries a bad image of the police everywhere in India and Pakistan and the judiciary and public are critical of their performance. The crime patterns and crime scenario is the same on both sides of the dividing line. We can look into a picture of police handling a person who was agitating over missing of some of his relatives in Pakistan. This man was beaten and got unstripped during police highhandedness. Many writers and columnists bitterly criticized the police for this violation of human dignity and outraging an innocent person (*Dawn*, December 29, 2006).

Not only the public is complaining, and dissatisfied with the police performance, but the higher judiciary is also not happy with the outcome of police efforts. On January 12, 2007, the Punjab (Pakistan) additional advocate-general Arif Bhinder and another advocate Niaz Sindhu were shot by some unknown assailants. The father of the deceased additional advocate-general sought the High Court's intervention on police failure to arrest the killers of his son. A full bench of the Lahore High Court heard the petition on Jan 18, 2007 and called the Chief Secretary and the Inspector General of Police (IGP) of the Punjab Province to submit the progress in police investigation in the said cases. During the proceedings, the Court asked them as:

“to why not billion budget for provincial police be freed owing to its inability to improve the law and order.” The Court observed, “We all are very much concerned about the law and order. The IGP should explain as to why the police had failed to bring the law and order situation under control. The increase in the police budget from Rs. six billion to Rs. 21 billion had made no difference as far as the performance of the force was concerned.”

(*Dawn*, January 20, 2007)

The Honourable Chief Justice of Pakistan while directing the ex-IGP Punjab Mr. Ziaul Hassan to appear before the apex court and submit a report in person in another case observed,

“Criminal gangs are playing with people's life and property in Punjab and police have allowed them to ravage the society. In

case of any political pressure, the police should let us know and we will direct for facilitating their task without fear and favour. The law and order situation has become a serious concern for all Pakistanis. The President of Pakistan has also expressed his dissatisfaction over this deterioration.”

(Dawn, January 13, 2007)

“The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pakistan while giving two-month deadline to eliminate criminal gangs operating in the province, directed the present Inspector General of Police Punjab Ahmed Nasim to bust criminal gangs and their hide-outs in the province by March 16 without taking into consideration any political or external pressure.”

(Dawn, January 13, 2007)

In Pakistan such remarks by the higher judiciary are seen in the local and national press even on daily/routine basis. Editorials and columns are also very common against police inactions. These are incessantly written against the police performance and the unfulfillment of public expectations of the police, in addition to the criticism by the general public and opposition parties. Almost all of these articles are written in a castigating way and very rarely some positive suggestions are given for bringing improvement to the current situation.

Similar is the case in India. For example, in Noida (Uttar Pradesh) where some families were protesting against the missing bodies of about 17 people, the police action against the demonstrators was severely criticized by the general public. The *Time Magazine* in its issue of January 22, 2007 gave a detailed coverage to the said unpleasant happening.

“The uncle of Aladi Halder, 25, another victim, says police looked at the missing woman's photo and told him she was so beautiful that she must have eloped. Why do you keep coming to us with your problems?”

(Time, January 22, 2007)

Swati Mehta, a consultant for the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, an NGO in New Delhi was quoted as remarked,

“The most important aspect of these murders is not why the victims were killed or by whom, but the failure of the police to

protect the powerless.’ ‘This case is indicative of how the police function in India, and how the system needs to be changed”.

(*Time*, January 22, 2007)

These two latest issues about police performance in Pakistan and India are somewhat identical and indicative of the government and public dissatisfaction and uneasiness with the police behaviour and efficiency. In addition, we would like to reproduce the observation of Sharma (1973) and David Bayley (1969) about the image of police in the Indian society of more than thirty years ago, which even holds good for today and which tells that nothing has changed so far despite the public concern and reforms.

“The image of police is not positive in any section of the society. The students consider them power drunk, businessmen as corrupt, intelligentsia as illiterate and unfortunate, political leaders as agents of the ruling cliques, civil servants as lacking in professional ethics and religious leaders as immoral.”

(as cited in Singh-Sengupta, 1995)

“The survey results demonstrate forcefully what many close observers of police-public relations in India have long thought, namely, that the Indian public is deeply suspicious of the activities of the police. A considerable proportion expect the police to be rude, brutal, corrupt, sometimes in collusion with criminals, and very frequently dealing unevenly with their clients.”

(Quoted in Frankel, Hasan, Bhargava & Arora, 2000)

The remarks of the Honourable Chief Justice of Pakistan as quoted above remind us the concluding remarks of a committee, headed by N.N. Vohra and appointed by the central government, to explore the growing politician-criminal nexus in India. The Committee's 1993 report was placed before the parliament on 1st August 1995 and it concluded:

“It is apparent that crime syndicates and mafia organizations have established themselves in various parts of the country [and] have developed significant muscle and money power and established linkages with governmental functionaries,

political leaders and others to be able to operate with impunity.”

(Quoted in Frankel, Hasan, Bhargava & Arora, 2000)

Not only the 'image of police' in a heterogeneous society, like India and Pakistan is indicative of the police itself, but also a true reflection of the society in which it is supposed to deliver. It is this image which seriously helps or hinders the broader goals of national policy. The criminalization of politics and the politicization of crimes are equally agitated in our transitional societies. We can use this police-effectiveness as a yardstick to our social ideals in India and Pakistan. For an academic interest, we would reproduce the following passage from 'The Work Culture in Police Administration':

“It is but natural that the powers and limitations of the parent society will reflect itself in the power and limitations of the police.....It is the police which enforces the law and combats the breakers of it. The type of society thus protected will also be a measure of police effectiveness. The work of a society will be reckoned not in proportion to the number of criminals it burns, hangs or imprisons, but rather by the degree of liberty experienced by the great body of its citizenry.”

(Singh-Sengupta, 1995)

I think we have a number of commissions in both the countries who in their reports have remarked against the existing police and policing with a very disappointing mode. There is no dearth of such references in both the countries. More quotations from such reports will over burden this small paper, however a frank and thought-provoking conclusion by Dr. Arvind Verma in the chapter of 'The Police in India' is exactly like a honest commentary on the police in Pakistan:

“Institutions are important in the life of a nation. In India, where a nascent democracy is shaping the lives of millions of diverse people, in a land ravaged by centuries of colonialism and exploitation by the ruling classes, the need for a well functioning institution is undisputed. The police institution is obviously one that is important in the democratic system of the country. The security and well being of the citizens is dependent upon the police. Yet, the police institution in India is in a dire state: disorganized, inefficient, corrupt, and partisan in its operations. It is unable to perform in accordance with the

expectations of a democratic society. The fault lies in the design and inability to adapt to the changing circumstances that have emerged after Independence. It has failed to deal with social conflicts and prevent growing violence. The force has become heavily politicized and its leadership has been reduced to a rubber stamp.”

(as cited in Kapur & Mehta, 2005, Chapter 6, P.249)

In view of the above facts and stark observations about the similar situation in India and Pakistan, a comparison of 'police image' with its causes, extent, intensity and historical prevalence is necessary in the present day of comparative criminological research. It will guide us about the level of human consciousness and development in our thinking and desire for democratic ideals and moral values. The researcher should focus on any individual or institutional efforts in improving this unpleasant police image in both the countries. Both the countries can learn a lot from each other's success or failure stories in this regard.

4. Comparing the Crime-Statistics

Comparative analysis of crime statistics is fraught with serious difficulties and controversies, e.g; the difference in crime definition, the method of registration of certain crime under different sections of law, the mode of acquisition and compilation of criminal figures, and of course the authenticity and veracity of crime statistics is a major problem all over the world. Mere statistics may not convey the seriousness of a particular crime. The trends and levels are two different things. Moreover, no one can claim with authority that the compiled record of crime/statistics is the complete picture of our national crimes. The official data may be counter checked by alternative statistics like victim surveys, self-report surveys, hospital admissions and cause of death data, etc. We all know that most of the crime is either not reported due to one or other reason or the report is not taken or the games of statistics are played in the compilation process. In relation to the analysis of crime trends, Estrada and Westfelt identify two other problems:

the continuity problem, that is, the difficulties associated with comparing statistical series over time. Since categories of official crime (and the way they are counted and measured) change from time to time, analysis of statistical series may lack continuity; and the *congruity problem*, that is, the differences in legal, statistical and cultural definition of crime, which result in lack of

how crime is counted and measured. (Sheptycki & Wardak, 2005). Such problems can partly be controlled during the process of interpretation and may not be a greater problem in the 'most similar approach' (like India and Pakistan) than we observe in the 'most different approach' of comparative methodologies.

Anyhow, the following comparative figures of crimes, keeping in view the above difficulties of interpretation and compilation, are presented for a brief idea of the prevalence, seriousness and similar nature of crimes in Pakistan and India alike. We can learn from each other why certain crimes are dealt effectively by one country and why the police are facing problem in combating the crime in the other. Pakistani police can consult their Indian counterpart in improving their crime rate and process of investigation. The comparison of our national crime data will be more beneficial for us than comparing our crime rates with the NYPD or Japanese police performance where both of us share little in common vis-à-vis police or policing in that part of the world.

It is pertinent to note that Table: II and III represent very commonly known crimes/offences and which are generally dealt with by the ordinary police in both the countries. As far as some serious or invisible crimes are concerned like drugs/narco business, money-laundering, white-collar crimes, cyber crimes, children abuses, human trafficking, terrorism or any other organized or global crimes, both the countries have some sort of specialized agencies for these crimes, and perhaps very little data or authentic statistics or studies are available in this respect. It is high time that a comparison and a meaningful research into such heinous crimes should be carried out in both the countries in their particular geopolitical, economic and social situations. If organized and global crimes can be studied in the context of Europe and America, then why not in the context of Southeast Asian countries. It is encouraging that the Federal Investigation Agency (FIA) of Pakistan and Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) of India, decided on February 8, 2007 to sign an agreement on launching joint efforts for bringing an end to the crimes related to money laundering, illegal immigration and fake currency. The heads of both the agencies are expected to take final decision towards the end of this month (The *News International*, February 9, 2007).

5. Some Common Grievances Against The Police in India and Pakistan

The legacy of colonialism in many fields is the same for both the countries of India and Pakistan. Many government organizations and the laws governing them are still the same in both the countries despite many new

departments, new laws, amendments and reforms in the last 59 years since their independence in 1947. Police is also one of these old institutions which was established and administered under the Indian Police Act of 1861. The basic structure has not seen any tangible change in these years, though many a reform were advocated, documented and implemented from time to time. The basic characteristics of post-colonial police are summarized by Mike Brogden and Preeti Nijhar and which are equally true in most parts of the two countries. These are:-

- Centralised or regional policing systems.
- Policing traditionally bound up with the maintenance of central political rule.
- Policing concerned with imposing central notions of social order on locality.
- Strangers policing strangers.
- Co-existence of informal policing structure based on locality, communal or tribal tradition.
- State policing often badly paid, corrupt and badly resourced with resort to weaponry as primary feature of control.
- Confusion over legal powers of police due to colonial inheritance and local tradition.
- Minimal local accountability.

Despite the above academic discussion we would simply narrate some common grievances against the police which we commonly hear and receive from the general public. The police in both the countries are attacked for inefficiency, poor performance, misconduct, corruption, political interference, racial biases, favouritism, nepotism, violation of human rights, low level of professionalism, poor response in emergencies and crises, low quality of training, bossism, non-registration of reports and complaints, extra judicial killing, poor public contact, illegal detention, poor knowledge of law, tampering with case properties and investigative processes, excesses and torture in police custody, registration of fake cases, implicating of innocent people in criminal cases, reducing the seriousness of crime, misuse of case properties, and so many other harsh and moderate allegations. Some may be exaggerated but others may be underestimated in some cases. In one country some of these allegations may be over-sensationalized due to greater awareness and media reporting or film-making but the same may be less alarming in the other country. A police encounter is generally highly praised in

both the countries especially when a hardened criminal or a 'chief of the underworld', as most movies portray, is killed or arrested in the encounter. This shows that the 'societal mindset' of both the nations is identical in 'coming tough on crime' and which is truly traced back to a common Indian origin.

6. Western Policing and Transitional Societies of India and Pakistan

The import of technologies and ideas from the west or developed societies is not a new phenomenon. Similar is the case of policing, especially in the former British colonies where the new police concepts are rapidly becoming the alternative to the existing paramilitary and order- maintaining forces. We would like to show what kinds of police practices, police concepts, role and expectations are in current debate in the western literature of criminology and policing. The reader are invited to look at the comprehensive table given by Frank Schmalleger in his book, *Criminal Justice Today: An Introduction Text for the 21st Century* and another by Colin Goff in his book, *Criminal Justice In Canada*. These succinctly summarized accounts provide us an idea of how to evaluate our police, where do we stand and are our expectations from our police really fit to our societies and have we made a rational analysis of our systems? A thorough, meticulous, incisive and profoundly analytical evaluation for our police and policing is strongly recommended on the pattern of these comprehensive analysis. Our policy-makers and policy analysts should work out our performance and expectations in the light of our police organizations and administrative provisions.

Since the time of Sir Robert Peel, where 'the absence of crime and disorder' was the key goal of the London Metropolitan Police (1829), the prevention of crime and disorder is still the major area of concern for any police in the world. The police effectiveness and performance is generally evaluated in terms of crime control, crime management or declining crime rate, despite the complexity between the relation of crime reduction and policing. The comparative researchers should not ignore the fact that some things work in some places, under some conditions, particularly when social and economic factors are favourable and some may not work at other situations and places. The difficulty is in disentangling the effect of 'good police work' from changes in the economic and social context (Bowling & Foster, 2002). For a detailed outcome of research into this point, one may consult 'The *Oxford Handbook of Criminology*', 3rd edition, page 997-8.

The choices of the transitional societies are said to be limited. However, the burgeoning problems of socio-economic inequalities and worsening situations of law and order have compelled the developing societies to seek

help from other modern systems and where not only ideas are borrowed but the technical and financial assistance is also demanded by these transitional or underdeveloped societies. The voices of change or demand for a new system have been heard since long in India and Pakistan. Pakistani police officers and policy-makers launched an academic-cum-political campaign to get rid of the old magistracy system, repeal the old Police Act 1861 and bring in the Japanese Police Model. The movement for police reforms and support for community policing in India is also not unknown to the academics. For example, the *Times of India*, January 12, 2001 is quoted as:

“The police system is based upon antiquated systems and ideas of crime control, and has neglected the opportunities of systematic methods and technologies of crime analysis, of scientific investigation and documentation, of information processing, and of law and order mapping, projection and prediction. The sheer gap between contemporary policing practices in the West, and those that prevail in India is astonishing. Primitive policing practices are reflected in poor rates of conviction, in deteriorating efficiency and effectiveness, and consequently in a declining respect for the law.”

(as cited in Brogden & Nijhar, 2005)

In contrast to the existing system which is accused of being disorganized, ill-equipped, demoralized, highly politicized, coercive, colonial and public-unfriendly, the general population want a new and democratic policing. In India, The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI), an international NGO, based in New Delhi, has produced copious literature and has arranged quite a good deal of conferences and seminars in promoting and articulating such demands by the general public and academia. A roundtable conference by the CHRI in December 2005 on the topic of *'The Police That We Want,'* reiterates and emphasises the demand for a democratic policing which is based on strong public-police cooperation and trust. The basic arguments come from David H. Bayley, who has enumerated the following characteristics of a democratic police organization, which:

- is accountable to law, and not a law unto itself
- is accountable to democratic government structures and the community is transparent in its activities
- gives top operational priority to protecting the safety and rights of individuals and private groups protects human rights

- provides society with professional services
- is representative of the communities (Mehta, 2005)

Basically these are the concepts and ideals which have been agitating the minds of the pro-reform individuals and groups in India since independence. In addition to the numerous Commissions and Committees to suggest reforms, the National Police Commission (NPC) in 1979 - 81, set out a road map for the desired reforms.⁸ The spirit of the NPC is seen in the later developments of Civil Writ Petition No. 310 of 1996 in the Supreme Court of India, the Central Government Committee on Police Reforms in 1998, headed by Mr. J. F. Ribbeiro, a former IPS officer⁹ the Padmanabhaiah Committee on Police Reforms in 2000,¹⁰ the Committee headed by Mr. Kamal Kumar in December, 2004, the initiatives of the National Conference of Superintendents of Police with the Prime Minister of India, in September 2005 and the Police Act Drafting Committee of 2005.¹¹ The Supreme Court of India has passed a landmark judgment on police reforms in September 2006, directing all state and union government to implement its directives by the end of 2006, but this deadline is now extended to 31 March 2007. The judgment may be seen on the website.¹²

Some of the familiar recommendations of the National Police Commission (NPC) of India, which are also reproduced by the subsequent committees, are given as:

- A State Security Commission should be established statutorily in each State to help the government discharge its responsibility to exercise superintendence over the police in an open manner under the framework of law. The State Security Commission should:
 - i. Lay down broad policy guidelines for the functioning of the police.
 - ii. Function as a forum of appeal for promotions.
 - iii. Review the functioning of the police.
 - iv. Conduct yearly evaluation of the police.
- The Chief of the Police should be assured of a fixed tenure of office. The removal of the Chief of Police from his post before the expiry of the tenure should require approval of the State Security Commission. The Chief of the State Police Force should be selected by an expert panel.
- The Police Act of 1861 should be replaced by a new Police Act, which will not only change the system of administration and control over the police but also promote the rule of law in the country.

The Police Act Drafting Committee of 2005 submitted its draft Police Bill, entitled as, 'The Model Police Act, 2006' to the Ministry of Home in October, 2006. The Act is available on the website. Though this Model Police Act, 2006 (Draft) has not been implemented in India, yet many changes are expected after its implementation, both qualitatively and quantitatively. An academic analysis and comparison of the Model Police Act, 2006 of India with the Police Order 2002 will be of immense interest to researchers, practitioners and policy makers. However, it will be too early to look for the extensive results of these reforms.

The case for Pakistan is almost the same in terms of various commissions, committees and reports. Leaving the details of the voluminous documents of a number of these reports, the most important is the Report of Mr. Abbas Khan, the ex-Inspector General of Police, Punjab whose report contains the recommendations of the Japanese Police Mission of 1996. The three major fundamental recommendations of Abbas Khan's report were the replacement of Police Act 1861 by a New Police Act formulation of Public Safety Commission and establishment of National Police Agency. Mr. Abbas Khan was the pioneer of the movement of police reforms while he was in office at various positions, both in provincial and federal government and during his tenure as the Commandant National Police Academy. It was he and the officers of his group who influenced the Report of the Focal Group on Police Reforms in 2000. The Group after giving a bleak picture of the existing law and order situation, criticizing the obsolete Police Act of 1861 and outdated Police Rules of 1934, complaining about the absence of any meaningful research in police and criticizing the protection of criminals by influential politicians, underlined the following major concerns, (not dissimilar to the concerns expressed by the CHRI conferences and academics in India): -

- To restore security, justice and establish rule of law.
- To safeguard the citizens against abuse of authority by police and other vested power groups.
- To minimize extraneous interference, mainly political.
- To enhance operational capabilities along-with improving the credibility of police through the use of due process.
- To institutionalise community participation.
- To strengthen prosecution thereby ensuring speedy justice.

The re-organization of the police system in light of these major concerns was proposed by the focal group as:

- Democratically controlled and politically neutral.
- Non-authoritative.
- People-friendly and responsive to their needs.
- Honest and having respect for rule of law.
- Professionally efficient.

After a great deal of debate across every nook and corner of the country, a final draft was promulgated by the government of Gen. Pervaiz Musharaf as Police Order 2002. It has now completely changed the structure of the police in Pakistan though it is subject to day to day changes and amendments due to one or other reasons. The new Police Order 2002 provides for: -

- Description of Responsibilities and Duties of the Police.
- Reconstitution and Re-organization of the Existing Police Force.
- Formation of Public Safety Commission at District, Provincial and National levels.
- Establishment of Police Complaints Authorities at District, Provincial and Federal levels.
- Establishment of Criminal Justice Coordination Committee at District Level.
- Establishment of National Police Management Board.
- Establishment of National Police Bureau.

So many others qualitative and quantitative changes. Whether it was a step forward or a jump backward is not yet clear and only time will tell whether such reforms were truly needed or were mere a wastage of time and resources due to a clumsy grafting of the Japanese Police Model into a semi-democratic, semi-tribal, semi-religious and transitional society of a country which is already suffering from extremely poor socio-economic development. The new Police Order, 2002 is highly comprehensive in rhetoric and details. It is a part of the Access to Justice Programme (www.ajp.gov.pk), mainly funded by the Asian Development Bank. In reality, the provision of the required human and material resources for its proper implementation is yet to be made honestly and correctly. The former highly senior police officers who once advocated the new system with full vehemence and commitment while they were in office, are now desperately expressing their disappointment over the lacking of true spirit of reforms in their articles in the print media after they have left their offices. I will quote one example of another pioneer advocate of police reforms in Pakistan, who is also an ex-commandant of National

Academy, and an ex-Inspector-General of Police. He worked closely with the National Reconstruction Bureau (NRB) of Pakistan and remained deeply involved in the reforms agenda and its implementation processes. But soon after the reforms were introduced in the country, he started writing columns and critical essays in national dailies, especially Daily *The News*, Islamabad. Commenting on the successive amendments to the original draft, in one of his article under the topic of “Dismantling the Police Command Structure”, Mr. Afzal Shigri writes:

“The Police Order 2002 was a genuine attempt to address inter alia the problem of strengthening the internal organization of police so that it could grow into a cohesive and effective force.....Unfortunately this law was never implemented... The Government, instead of moving towards a progressive and modern law, has embarked on revising the provisions that depoliticize police. Its amendments are even worse than 1861 Police Act, harking back to the Subadari System by Sher Shah Suri in the sixteenth century that was meant to protect and enhance the power of the ruler. The destruction of command structure of a modern police force and its total subservience to the political bosses will have dreadful results for the country.”

(Daily *The News*, December 3, 2005)

In another article on the topic “Aimless Amendments to Criminal Laws” he says that:

“In the rare cases where a government was able to bring about any meaningful change in the basic structure, vested interests have ganged up to sabotage such laws, like the Local Government Ordinance and the Police Order 2002. These laws, even being fully implemented, are being subjected to fundamental changes that negate their very purpose.....We need to address the fundamental issue instead of these cosmetic changes that will only distract the courts from their judicial functions and provide no relief to the common man.....Legislation is serious business and needs consultations with all stakeholders and experts. Enacting lots of legislation is meaningless if it does not improve governance or provide relief to the public.”

(Daily *The News*, July 14, 2005)

The above comments of Mr. Afzal Ali Shigri are no more than the fact that the students of comparative criminal justice are not only concerned with the growth of transnational crimes, but also with the implications of transnational policing. (Nelken, 2002) But this is also a very tricky issue. The most important issue for policy (and of course for policing in my view) in many societies involves deciding when and how to borrow foreign ideas and practices in criminal justice, and which ones are likely to be most appropriate. It is tempting to judge the likely success of such legal 'transplants' or transfers in terms of their 'fit' to existing features of society and culture. (Nelken, 2002) This question of being 'fit' and 'appropriate' seems to be ignored in the transplantation process of developed police models into the given societal context and legal framework of Pakistan.

The political parties keep on criticizing these reforms due to their own political reasons. Moreover, no attention was paid to the fact that what consequences it will bring if a highly modernized police system is grafted to a poor third world country. The points of comparison were overlooked and the societies were not fully analysed on sharing values and concepts. The level of development in both the countries, i.e; Japan and Pakistan were ignored out rightly. Even the Japanese Police Mission who visited Pakistan in mid 1990s and who advised and recommended certain changes in Pakistan Police on the pattern of Japanese system were misled and misguided by their Pakistani counterparts in order to look for some plausible reasons for their failure in crime control and bringing order to the society. A Japanese police officer told me confidentially that “the way our system is implemented in Pakistan has annoyed our senior brass in Japan as it has put questions to our system's credibility and to your incompetence of incorporating our basic themes of politically-neutral, professionally-competent and democratically-controlled police system.”

In fact none of the above themes is truly realized. The non-formation of Public Safety Commission and the increasing influence of local politicians in police departmental issues in most parts of the country are severely agitated by the donors and the anti-reform elements. As far as the benefits of the police reforms are concerned, it is sufficient to say that the image of the police has not improved as we saw in the remarks of the higher judiciary in the above passages. Moreover, the recorded crimes have increased from 3, 88414 (2000), 3, 80659(2001) to 4, 41907 (2004) and 4, 53264 (2005). Even the President and the Prime Minister of Pakistan have expressed their concern and

disappointment over the deteriorating law and order situation in the country and have asked the concerned departments, policy-analysts and intelligence agencies to look for the causes of this situation, despite the much trumpeted police reforms and provision of extra funds and allocations to the law-enforcement agencies. This is a classic example of introducing reforms to a developing society. Both India and Pakistan can learn a lot from this scenario.

As far as a few individual efforts and new experiments by our police are concerned, we have noted that initially such efforts are supported by general public and admired by civil organizations like NGOs but with the passage of time, due to lack of proper legal framework or increased public distrust or donor fatigue, they are rendered ineffective in many cases.

In Delhi, the senior police officer once welcomed the development of COP to replace the old para-military style and said, "it is time to police by consent rather than police by coercion" (The *Times of India*, February 14, 2002 as quoted in Brogden and Nijhar, 2005). The UNDP supported such programmes. In some parts of India the scheme proved successful and in others failed badly and received serious criticism. In fact, all such Neighborhood Watch Schemes, Friends of the Police, Village Defence Parties and Community Liaison Groups (CLGs), etc may not be made a success story without community support and public participation (e.g. in Kerala and Chennai) which in turn are possible due to the high rate of literacy, greater social mobility, greater respect for law, urbanization, effective transportation and communication, and a generalized social consciousness for the rule of law. It is pertinent to note that despite the vociferous demands of police reforms in India, certain quarters have expressed their resentment over the blind imitation, mere copying or unwise transplantation of foreign models into the transitional society of India. In some areas the community policing didn't generate enough public support for its continuity. Many analysts have regarded these programmes as alien and incompatible.

"A retired senior officer dryly noted that there was little purpose in the international contact, given the disparities in literacy levels and disciplinary structures.Other schemes launched by the Delhi police in the past years have failed miserably.....Delhiites have never been benefited (from these community schemes).Hardly unique to India, many such senior police officers have been skeptical about the importation of community policing. In Uttar Pradesh, senior officers regarded COP as irrelevant to the Indian context. The criticisms of COP proposals in Pakistan were identical to

those by informed observers and police officers in India, although often for more conservative reasons”

(Brogden & Nijhar, 2005)

The failure and non-establishment of Citizen Police Liaison Committee (CPLC) in the cities of Pakistan, except in the mega city of Karachi, is basically due to the same reasons as we noted in the case of India. Despite the fact that establishing the CPLC is a legal requirement under the new Police Order 2002 but still we don't see any visible, functional and viable body in any big city. The CPLC in Karachi has rendered many services in terms of recoveries of stolen vehicles and investigation of cases of kidnapping but generally the police officials and other analysts in other parts of the country criticize the CPLC in Karachi on the score of its being funded by the big businessmen for their own security in the metropolitan city of Karachi. They think why the same CPLC doesn't extend its branches to any other city as the crimes in other cities are also rampant and deserve to be addressed with the same level of sophistication and facilities of CPLC. But to my mind, the example of CPLC in Karachi shall be followed by the rest of the cities for themselves.

7. Comparing Police Organization and Police Perspective

The total State Police Forces (by January 2001) was 1,449,761 with a total expenditure of Rs.15,538.47 crores coming from the taxpayers of India. Pakistan has a total of 317019 police with Rs. 48047.65 million of budget. The ratio worked out to be 14.12 policemen per 10,000 population and 45.79 per 100 sq. km in India as compared to 18.75 per 10,000 population and 39.82 per 100 sq. km in Pakistan. One police person serves 746 people in India and 505.78 people in Pakistan. Though we don't have a detailed and authentic comparative data for the existing police departments in the two countries, however, it is of interest that most of the police problems in one country are the chronic issues of the police force in the other.

Police complain against their early and immature posting/transfer, absence of fixed tenure, political interference, media blackmailing, undue propaganda of police excesses by NGOs, distrust by the judiciary and especially during the current judicial activism, unwarranted allegations from opposition parties, low public respect and recognition of police services, work overload, lack of proper training facilities, absence of provisions in remote areas, considerations in recruitment process, unfriendly attitude by the senior officers, unachievable, fixed and time bound targets, lack of legal power or authority (e.g. under the law of the two countries the police recorded statement under Section 161 of Criminal Procedure Code is not admissible in the court),

meagre support for family such as health, education or insurance, mental stress, strain and poor working conditions, and duality of command, etc, etc. Police in both the countries are said to be under-staffed, under-paid, mostly raw handed, under-trained, ill-trained and even don't enjoy the required legal authority. In India, each investigating officer handles more than 45 Indian Penal Code (IPS) cases at a time whereas only 37% of the forces are provided with family accommodation and the majority have to live either in slum like conditions or are away from their families for most part of their careers. The story for Pakistan police may be even more pitiable and deplorable in this context.

The police think that the society as a whole is corrupt and involved in malpractices. Their experience with the 'outwardly nice' but 'inwardly corrupt' big politicians, businessmen, religious leaders, high government officials, or mediamen make them skeptical and confused as how to uphold the integrity of a disciplined force and what to do in such a state of affairs. This mental ambivalence causes severe confusion, stress, and paradoxes in them, particularly in a young police officer. Most of the 'effective police officers' who yield to the dictates of the ruling parties or high offices, strangles and lives in a state of 'captive of conscience' afterwards in their life. Even in ordinary conditions, most of the active policemen lead a life of excessive stress, family maladjustment or even face the consequences of broken families. In case of non-compliance or unyielding attitude, they face departmental enquiries, stoppage of promotion, bad annual reports of 'unbecoming behaviour' and often transfer to an unsuitable station. This is a common phenomenon in India and Pakistan. Moreover, the police is mostly critical of the society for not recognizing their services in shape of their life sacrifice. During a nine year period i.e. 1991-92 to 1999-2000, as many as 9389 police personnel died in the line of duty, which is an average of more than 1043 lives per year. This is a very high toll. No police force anywhere else in the world has paid such a heavy price. Though figures for Pakistan for the same period are not available at the time of writing, however, the situation is not very different from India. From 2001 to 2005, a total of 369 police officers were killed and a total of 929 received injuries during police encounters with outlaws, dacoits and proclaimed offenders.

Both the police derive their authority from and work in the context of similar legal apparatus. The Penal Codes, the Evidence Act, the Local and Special Laws, and the Codes of Criminal Procedure are more or less the same with minor changes and amendment. The Indian Police Act of 1861 has recently been repealed by the Police Order 2002 in Pakistan. It is the similarity of this criminal justice system and legal provisions that the process of criminal justice has greater resemblance in its achievements and shortcomings, and of

course, the two greatly resemble in police malpractices and fault-lines within the system. It is this similarity that is reflected in the establishment, structure and organization of the police forces in the two countries. The researchers will definitely look for similar organizational behaviours in the two countries.

About the research in police and policing, as a last note of this paper, I would like to emphasise, as Arvind Verma observes, that despite 59 years of independence (democracy), our public institutions are still beyond the scrutiny of social scientists and other external reviewers. Dissociation of the social scientists has prevented the development of an appropriate research methodology and reliable data sources. There is no tradition for the police and other criminal justice organizations to open their records, activities, and deliberations for public scrutiny. The police world is thus insulated whereas 'the police need research about the community problems to determine its tasks' (Reiss, 1985:65), and further that 'research should be the core of policing' (Goldstein, 1979), as 'focusing upon quality of life issues also helps combat crime and disorder (Wilson & Kelling, 1982) [as cited in Kapur & Mehta, 2005]. There is greater inspection of police organization in Britain, US and other developed countries which creates an environment of openness, responsibility and accountability. Arvind Verma hopes such an openness and broad based research agenda for India and I hope the same for India as well as Pakistan.

Conclusion

The debate on convergence and divergence is a lengthy but fruitful academic exercise. Common enemies (like cyber-crime and terrorism), constitute a factor that binds criminal justice systems and hence a driving force for convergence. Common threats will invite common responses and promote similarities. Foreign invasion, process of imitation, simultaneous development and international regulations are the other mechanisms for convergence. On the contrary, the opposing force of diversification or divergence arise from 'cultural persistence and indigenisation i.e; to resist the import of foreign programmes or structures and to change structures and processes so that they more closely resemble the original arrangement of the past. Though increased requirements for communication and harmonization provide rewards for convergence and the globalization of crime and criminal justice is likely to increase the pressure on becoming similar, yet the criminal justice system will in each country, after all, be judged on their individual effectiveness. (Pakes, 2005).

The opportunities of increasing convergence and reducing divergence are numerous in case of India and Pakistan. Instead of becoming each other common enemies, both the countries should rather address the common enemies of

transnational and international crimes of money laundering, drug-trafficking, human smuggling, terrorism, religious sectarianism, cyber-crimes, organized crimes, white collar crimes, and many more. The responses to such common threats in one country should be a guiding lesson for the other. We hope that greater accommodation and absorption capabilities are hidden in our systems. A comparative study of criminology and policing will definitely lead us to a broader scope of harmonization, stability, understanding and convergence.

End Notes

¹Going abroad is a fun and enjoyment and feeling free of the worries and commitment of every day life, behaving positively and friendly and spending money__ all bring a positive change in our attitude, which is reflected in our research-orientation also. In such a situation our findings are susceptible to a certain degree of misreading, simplification, superficiality and become uncritical rosy accounts of foreigners` observers. In the field of criminology, a problem like this is generally described as 'Criminological tourism'.

²Most of the discussions, theories and practices in social sciences in general but in criminology in particular are controversial. Not a single theory of crime has become universal and unanimous, so what to speak of a police model or approach like the Community-Oriented-Policing (COP) which has failed to receive a universal applause and acceptance. A multitude of variables are to be taken into account, and both sides of the arguments are to be assessed. 'Touching base' describes such a difficulty of concomitant opposition to a presented view on a certain issue. To overcome the problem of over-identification of participant observers and their intellectual idiosyncrasy, this synthesis approach is called a meaningful access by some criminologists.

³It has been impossible to test the generality of a finding based on single-society research by means of replication in a sample of several societies.

⁴The absence of a sufficient number of cases (e.g., nations or cities has hindered rigorous comparisons between those cases affected by some social change and control cases unaffected by the same change.

⁵With longitudinal data unavailable, researchers have not been able to satisfy one of the classic requirements for making causal inferences the correct temporal relationship among the variables under study.

⁶Without a reasonably large sample of nations, it is impossible to discover whether certain variables may mediate the effects of a social change. Without a large sample of societies, a general pattern that explains or orders these different outcomes will never be seen.

⁷Without an archive of broadly comparative and longitudinal crime data, some key methodological issues have been largely uninvestigable. For example, it would not be possible to assess the reliability of different crime indicators like the number of offenses known or the number of arrests using data from a number of societies.

⁸http://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/publications/police/npc_recommendations.pdf

⁹http://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/publications/police/recommendations_ribeiro.pdf

¹⁰http://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/programs/aj/police/india/initiatives/summary_padmanabhaiah.pdf

¹¹<http://mha.nic.in/padc/npolice-act.pdf>.

¹²http://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/programs/aj/police/india/initiatives/writ_petition.htm

References

- Bachman, R. and Schutt, R. K. (2003). *The Practice of Research in Criminology and Criminal Justice*. (2 ed). London: Pine Forge Press.
- Bowling, B. & Foster, J. (2002). Policing and the Police. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (3 ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Brogden, M. & Nijhar, P. (2005). *Community Policing: National and International Models and Approaches*. Cullompton, UK: Willian Publishing.
- Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI): Sarvodaya Enclave, New Delhi, India (E-mail: chriall@nda.vsnl.net.in,
- Daily *Dawn*, (International Newspaper), Published from Islamabad, Pakistan, December 29, 2006 (www.DAWN.com)
- Daily *Dawn*, Islamabad Pakistan dated January 20, 2007
- Daily *The News* (International Newspaper), Published from Islamabad, Pakistan, February 9, 2007 (www.thenews.com.pk)
- Dr. Arvind Verma. (2005). The Police in India , Design, Performance, and Adaptability, in Devesh Kapur and Pratab Bhanu Mehta (Eds): *Public Institutions in India, Performance and Design*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
- Foreign Policy*. (November/December 2006). Published by Carneige Endowment, USA (www.foreignpolicy.com)

- Frankel, F. R., Hasan, Z., Bhargava, R., & Arora, B. (Eds.). (2005). *Transforming India: Social and Political Dynamics of Democracy*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
- Goff, C. (2004). *Criminal Justice in Canada*. (3ed.). Toronto: Thomson and Nelson.
- Hague, R., Harrop, M., & Breslin, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Jones, T., & Newburn, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Plural Policing: A Comparative Perspective* (1st ed.). New York: Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Mian Habibur_Rehman. (2007). *The Police Order, 2002 with Police Rules 1934*. Lahore: Law Times Publications.
- Ministry of Home; Government of India: Website:
<http://mha.nic.in/padc/The%20Model%20Act,%202006%2030%20Oct.pdf>
- Muhammad Abbas Khan (Ex-Inspector General of Police, Punjab) (1996). *Problems of Law and Order and Police Reforms*. Lahore, Pakistan: Vanguard.
- Nazirul Hasan (Research Officer): Resource Person for Crime Statistics, National Police Bureau (NAB), Govt: of Pakistan, Islamabad.
(nazirul.hassan@npb.gov.pk)
- Nelken, D. (2002). Comparing Criminal Justice. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ortmeier, P.J. (2006). *Introduction to Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Pakes, F. (2005). *Comparative Criminal Justice*. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Schmallegger, F. (2006). *Criminal Justice Today: An Introductory Text for the 21st Century* (9th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Sheptycki, J. & Wardak, A.(Eds.). (2005). *Transnational and Comparative Criminology*. London, UK: Glass House Press.
- Shigri, A. (January 3, 2005). Dismantling the Police Command Structure. In *Daily The News International*, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Shigri, A. (July 14, 2005). Aimless Amendments to Criminal Laws. In *Daily The News International*, Islamabad, Pakistan
- Singh-Sengupta, S. (1995). *Work Culture in Police Administration*. New Dehli, India: Ashish Publishing House.
- Swati Mehta (Resource Person on Indian Police Reforms). Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, New Delhi, India:
(Email:swati@humanrightsinitiative.org)

The Police that We Want: Roundtable on Police Reforms. (Dec 2005), New Delhi, India

The *Time*: January 22, 2007 (www.time.com)

UNDP: *Human Development Report 2005*

Victor Jupp, *Comparative Method* in Eugene McLaughlin and John Muncie (2006). *The Sage Dictionary of Criminology*, (2ed). London: Sage Publications.

Some other useful reading sources

Police Organization in India

National Workshop on Media on Police Reforms, March 2005

Police Malpractices, 2006

Police Public Interface: Making it Happen, Proceedings of Seminar at Mumbai, November 2004

Police Authority: Three-Year Strategic Plan for Northamptonshire Police, 2004-2007

Maintenance of Public Order and Police Preparedness, Sept 2006, New Delhi, India

Web: <http://www.jang.com.pk/thenews/jan2005-daily/03-01-2005/oped/opinion.htm>

Web: www.humanrightsinitiative.org)

Website: <http://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/>)

Table I: Country Profile and Socio-Economic Indicators

S. No.			
1.	Total Area	796,095 Sq Km	3,166,414 Sq Km
2.	Total Population	160 Million (206 estimated)	1.02 Billion (2005 Estimated)
3.	Form of Government	Federation (problems of federation & religious intolerance)	Quasi - Federalism {(problems of seculars), multi-ethnic, multi-cultural democracy}
4.	Population of Density	187 per Sq Km	331 per Sq Km
5.	Annual Population Growth Rate	1.9%	1.55%
6.	GDP Growth Rate	6.6%	9.2% (current)
7.	Per Capita Income	US \$ 600	US \$ 620
8.	Life Expectancy (years)	M 64 - F 63.8	M 60.3 - F 64.6
9.	Population Under 5 (2004)	20,922,000	120,155,000
10.	Population Under 18 (2004)	71,297,000	419,442,000
11.	Maternal Mortality Ratio (per 100,000)	500	540
12.	Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live birth, 2004)	80 / 1000	62 / 1000
13.	Under 5 Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live birth, 2004)	101 / 1000	85 / 1000
14.	Estimated Child Labour (at farms)	3.6 Millions {official (40% Boys & 25% Girls) 10 Millions (non-officials)}	12.6 Million (official)
15.	Unemployment Rate (2005)	6.6%	8.9%
16.	% of Population Using Improved Drinking Water Source (2002)	90	86
17.	% of Population with Access to Sanitation (2002)	54	30

S. No.			
18.	Adult Literacy Rate Male / Female (2000 - 04)	62 / 35	73 / 48
19.	Primary School Enrolment Ratio Male / Female (2000 - 04)	68 / 50	90 / 85
20.	% of Primary School Entrants Reaching Grade 5 (2000 - 04)	55	61
21.	% of Populations Below National Poverty Line (1990 - 2002)	32.6	28.6
22.	% of Central Government Expenditure Allocated to: (1993 - 2001)	2	2
	i — Health ii — Education iii — Defence 	1	2
23.	Globalization Index (Foreign Policy, Now Dec.2006, Carnegie Endowment,(USA)	56	61
24.	UNDP - Human Development Index (2006 HDI ranking)	134	126

Foreign Policy (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), in collaboration with A.T. Kearney, has identified the losers and winners of globalization. Some countries have come on the top and others have gone down. It's a small world, and globalization is making it smaller, even in the face of conflict and chaos. This index is the culmination of various aspects of globalization, namely, Political Engagement (including participation in treaties, organizations, and peacekeeping), Technological Connectivity (including number of internet users, hosts, and secure servers), Personal Contact (including telephone, travel and remittances) and Economic Integration (including international trade and foreign direct investment). Out of the 62 countries in the ranking table, the top ten are shaded red, and the bottom ten are shaded blue. India and Pakistan both are in the blue shaded countries.

Source: UNICEF (World Children Reports), Foreign Policy, UNDP (Human Development Reports) etc

Table II: Crime Head-Wise Incidence in India and Pakistan (2005)

S. No.		Crimes		Crimes Rate		
		India	Pakistan	India	Pakistan	Difference
1.	Murder	32719	9731	3.028797	5.991257	-2.96246
2.	Attempt to Murder	28931	12863	2.678142	7.919591	-5.24145
3.	Kidnapping	22832	9212	2.113557	5.671715	-3.55816
4.	Dacoity	5141	2395	0.475902	1.474572	-0.99867
5.	Robbery	17673	12199	1.635989	7.510775	-5.87479
6.	Burglary	90108	12067	8.341294	7.429504	0.911791
7.	Theft	273111	50707	25.28188	31.21968	-5.9378
8.	Rape	18359	2148	1.699492	1.322497	0.376995
9.	Riots	56235	3139	5.205672	1.932644	3.273028
10.	Hurt	270861	29874	25.07359	18.39306	6.680538
Total Cognizable Crime Under PPC*/IPC**		815970	144335	75.53431	88.86529	-13.331

*Pakistan Penal Code

**Indian Penal Code

Source: National Police Record of Bureau of India www.indiastat.com & National Police Bureau of Pakistan www.npb.gov.pk/

Table III: Comparative Recorded Crime and Crime Rate in India and Pakistan

S. No.	Total Cognizable Crimes under Indian Penal Code (IPC)	Crime Rate (Crime per Lakh of Population)	Total Recorded Crime under Pakistan Penal Code (PPC)	Crime Rate (Crime per Lakh of Population)
1996	1709576	183.4	329305	269.68
1997	1719820	180.0	369161	295.16
1998	1778815	183.2	428549	334.13
1999	1764629	178.9	409167	310.80
2000	1771084	176.7	388414	287.61
2001	1769308	172.3	380659	264.14
2002	1780330	169.5	399006	269.58
2003	1716120	160.7	400680	220.17
2004	1832015	168.8	441907	238.48
2005	1822602	165.3	453264	282.68
Average of 10 years	1766429.9	173.88	400011.2	277.25

Source: National Police Record of Bureau of India www.indiastat.com & National Police Bureau of Pakistan www.npb.gov.pk/

The author Fasihuddin (PSP) is Director Human Rights, Quetta, Baluchistan - Pakistan and he can be reached at fasih68@yahoo.com