A Philosophical Exploration of Community Policing in Gujarat

Vandana Ramashray Yadav[1], Dr. Anumeet kaur[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Karnavati University, Uvarsad, Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India

Email ID : 202303006@karnavatiuniversity.edu.in, ORCID iD: 0009-0009-2203-984X

[2]Assistant Professor, UWSLKarnavati University, Email ID- anumeet@karnavatiuniversity.edu.in

ORCID iD: 0009-0003-9337-7682

ABSTRACT:

Community policing represents a transformative philosophy of law enforcement that emphasizes collaboration, proactive engagement, and shared responsibility between the police and the community. Rooted in early collective security practices dating back to 17th-century England, the concept has evolved into a structured and progressive model aimed at addressing the underlying causes of crime rather than merely responding to incidents after they occur. Drawing on scholarly contributions such as those of Greene (2000), Dempsey and Forst (2015), Skogan and Hartnett (1997), and Bayley, this paper examines the theoretical foundations, historical development, and practical implementation of community policing. It highlights how the model reshapes both the organizational framework and social orientation of law enforcement agencies by promoting service-oriented values, enhancing public trust, and reducing fear of victimization.

Particular attention is given to the Indian context, where community policing assumes special significance within a welfare state committed to public order and citizen well-being. Despite various initiatives aimed at strengthening police–community relations—including outreach programs, neighborhood councils, and youth engagement activities—persistent mistrust and historical tensions continue to challenge effective collaboration. The paper further underscores the need for rigorous empirical research to evaluate the causal impact of police–citizen interactions on public perceptions and legitimacy. Ultimately, the study argues that sustainable reform requires not only institutional adjustments but also a deeper transformation in everyday police practices, ensuring consistent, respectful, and participatory engagement with communities.

Keywords: *Community Policing; Community-Oriented Policing (COP); Police–Community Relations; Public Trust; Crime Prevention; Police Legitimacy.*

I. INTRODUCTION:

Community policing originally developed when members of a community came together voluntarily to safeguard their neighborhoods and oversee local security. Over time, this concept evolved into a more structured and progressive approach that emphasizes active engagement, sensitivity to community needs, and targeted law enforcement strategies. Rather than relying solely on traditional, rigid methods of policing, the contemporary model seeks to transform existing practices and ideologies by prioritizing collaboration and responsiveness. It encourages citizens to participate directly in identifying and resolving crime-related issues, thereby fostering shared responsibility. In doing so, community policing reshapes both the formal organizational framework and the social orientation of law enforcement agencies. The model has been widely discussed for its effectiveness in maintaining order and promoting peace. Historically, it has succeeded in reducing the divide between the public and professional police officers, nurturing service-oriented values among officers and increasing their awareness of community expectations (Greene, 2000). Furthermore, patrol-based strategies have demonstrated success in crime detection and peacekeeping (Dempsey & Forst, 2015). The philosophy itself is not new; its origins can be traced back to 17th-century England during the reign of King Alfred, reflecting a long-standing tradition of collective responsibility for public safety.

In the Indian context, the significance of community policing becomes even more pronounced. As a welfare state, India prioritizes the well-being and security of its citizens, and the police play a central role in maintaining public order. Despite this, many individuals remain reluctant to establish close relationships with law enforcement due to persistent mistrust. Community policing serves as an important mechanism to reduce such apprehensions by promoting dialogue and cooperation. Although crime rates may have declined over time, historical tensions between the police and the public continue to hinder the formation of strong collaborative

partnerships necessary for effective governance and public security. Consequently, policymakers consistently advocate for Community-Oriented Policing (COP), which emphasizes constructive, non-enforcement interactions as a means of enhancing public trust and legitimacy. However, existing research has not sufficiently utilized rigorous experimental methods—such as the random assignment of police-citizen contacts—to accurately determine the causal impact of these interactions on individual perceptions of the police.

II. COMMUNITY POLICING

Community policing seeks to address the root causes of crime, reduce fear of victimization, and respond to local concerns through collaborative partnerships among the police, government, and the community. As societies have evolved, policing systems across nations have undergone significant reforms to adapt to changing social norms, increasing diversity, individual expectations, and emerging threats such as terrorism. In this context, community policing has become a central theme in law enforcement discourse worldwide. The underlying principle is clear: public safety and effective problem-solving cannot be achieved without the voluntary cooperation and active participation of the community. Consequently, police agencies increasingly promote community-based approaches. However, the implementation of community policing varies across countries such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Singapore, and India. In many cases, greater emphasis is placed on responding to crime after it occurs rather than preventing it proactively.

This reactive tendency often stems from limited awareness, inadequate analysis of crime patterns, and insufficient leadership among key stakeholders, including police authorities. For example, in Bangladesh, efforts to address the underlying causes of crime have been relatively modest. The absence of clear policies and systematic crime analysis restricts the ability of police to guide citizens on preventive measures. Additionally, many officers lack specialized training in crime prevention and community engagement. As noted by McCarthy of the Braintree Police Department, community policing represents a cooperative process in which police and citizens jointly identify problems of crime and disorder and work toward shared solutions. Skogan and Hartnett (1997) similarly emphasize that the success of this model depends on strong, mutually beneficial relationships between law enforcement and the public.

In the Indian context, several initiatives have been introduced to strengthen police–community relations. These include organizing parades, sporting events, and community competitions; forming neighborhood councils comprising respected local residents; and conducting outreach programs such as "courtesy weeks" and "safety weeks," particularly for schoolchildren. Activities like boys' clubs and *shramdan* (voluntary community service) further encourage civic participation. Some states and cities have also established information centers and special assistance units for tourists and new residents. According to Bayley, such efforts have led to the appointment of press officers to maintain regular communication with the media and improve public relations. However, skepticism remains among many police personnel regarding the long-term effectiveness of these programs. Bayley argues that meaningful reform requires a deeper transformation in everyday police behavior, emphasizing consistent, respectful engagement rather than isolated public relations initiatives.

III. MODIFICATIONS TO POLICE PROCEDURES

As India moves further into the twenty-first century, its policing system stands at a critical juncture. The country faces complex and evolving challenges in the areas of crime, law and order, social unrest, and internal security, all of which pose risks to national unity, stability, public peace, and democratic governance. At the same time, over the past two to three decades, the strength of the police force has remained largely inadequate and stagnant in proportion to population growth and emerging threats. This imbalance has significantly constrained the ability of the Indian police to deliver services efficiently and respond proactively to contemporary challenges. In light of these pressing circumstances, there is an urgent need to adopt a forward-looking and participatory model of policing—one that is proactive, community-oriented, and supported by voluntary organizations and responsible citizens—to effectively meet future demands.

In this context, Malcolm K. Sparrow (1988) raised several thought-provoking questions about the nature and effectiveness of policing strategies. These questions were subsequently examined through the contrasting lenses of traditional policing and community-oriented policing. The analytical framework derived from this comparison highlights the structural and functional limitations of conventional policing models while demonstrating the relevance, advantages, and democratic compatibility of community policing in a republic like India.

IV. POLICE AND POLICING IN INDIA – A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Peace and stability are essential for the progress of any society. When disorder and unrest prevail, social and economic resources are diverted toward managing crises rather than promoting development. In contrast, a secure and orderly environment enables individuals—especially children—to grow and thrive. This underlines the vital role of the police in maintaining safety and public order. Throughout history, systems of policing have existed in different forms, adapting their roles and responsibilities according to the needs of the time.

The term "police" is derived from the Latin word *politica*, referring to the governance or organization of the state. Broadly, it denotes the mechanisms and institutions responsible for maintaining law and order, protecting people and property, and preventing and detecting crime. In a diverse, populous, and multicultural country like India, these responsibilities are particularly complex and demanding.

Policing, therefore, is a dynamic process that must evolve alongside societal changes. Its philosophy, methods, and institutional attitudes need continuous adaptation to meet emerging challenges. To understand its present structure and functions, it is important to examine both its historical development and the social and political conditions that shaped its current form.

V. HISTORY OF THE INDIAN POLICE SERVICES

Modern policing in India began in the early nineteenth century. Prior to British rule—and even during the initial years of British administration—the concept of a distinct, permanent police force was not systematically developed. In 1774, Warren Hastings, under the East India Company, initiated important reforms that later culminated in the enactment of the Police Act of 1861, which laid the foundation of the present policing structure. Around the same period, Sir Charles Napier reorganized the police system in Sind (now in Pakistan), introducing administrative changes to strengthen law enforcement in a region marked by instability and crime.

The term "Indian Police Service" was formally used in 1917 in the Islington Commission Report. After independence, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, India's first Union Home Minister, strongly advocated for a unified and independent All India Service to preserve national integration. Emphasizing its importance in the Constituent Assembly in 1949, he argued that a strong and autonomous service was essential for maintaining unity. Consequently, the Indian Police Service (IPS) was established as an All India Service built on the principles of integrity, professionalism, and national cohesion.

VI. ANCIENT INDIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Rig and the Atharva Veda detail some of the crimes that the Vedic people were aware of, so police can be traced back to this period. Even in the Harappan era, there is evidence of security personnel. It is impossible to know how the criminal justice system operated during the Vedic period, but evidence from the Mauryan period suggests some similarities. On criminal justice, Kautilya's Arthashastra (310 BC) is a treatise. It's written as if it were a handbook for modern-day police officers. On the other hand, there is mention of Danvarika and Antevansika and Pradesika. Dandpal, Durgapal, and Antpal were the three categories of police.

For more information on the Gupta regime and its leaders, consult Magasthenese, the Greek Ambassador to India, and Fa Hein, a Chinese tourist. Those in charge were known as Dandikas. Nagar Shreshthi and Rabasika are two more names that come up. The criminal justice system that was established during this period was in place for at least 500 years. The only distinction between the Mauryan and Gupta eras was the centralization of

power under the former and the decentralization under the latter. It was, however, based on the same basic organization as the village, city, and palace police, which were adapted by various rulers.

VII. INDIA'S MEDIEVAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

During the medieval period, there was no clearly defined or unified police organization in India, largely due to the absence of a structured civil administrative system. With the arrival of Muslim rulers, efforts were made to align governance with the policing practices familiar to them. Islamic law and the Holy Quran formed the foundation of justice administration, punishment, and law enforcement. During the Sultanate period, Pandits were appointed to interpret Hindu law where necessary, reflecting a dual legal influence. Administrative responsibilities were carried out by officials such as the Muhtasib and Muqaddam. Punishments under Islamic law were often harsh, including corporal and public penalties, which likely contributed to public resentment toward law enforcement authorities.

At the provincial level, the Faujdar was responsible for maintaining peace and overseeing criminal justice, while the Kotwal performed multiple roles as magistrate, police chief, and municipal officer. In villages, the Chaukidar handled local security. Under the Mughal administration, which was largely autocratic and military-oriented, both policing institutions and the judicial system were relatively weak and lacked systematic efficiency.

VIII. THE FUNCTION OF THE POLICE: A HISTORICAL VIEW

The creation of the London Metropolitan Police was guided by the principle that "the police are the public and the public are the police," an idea that later became the foundation of modern community policing. However, over time, this close relationship weakened. Scholars argue that early twentieth-century reforms and the broader movement toward professionalization distanced the police from the communities they served. In an effort to reduce corruption and promote objectivity, administrators introduced rotating shifts, frequent transfers, and centralized control systems to ensure strict adherence to standard procedures.

Technological advancements further widened this gap. The introduction of patrol cars replaced foot patrols, reducing everyday contact between officers and residents. The emergence of 911 systems in the 1970s enabled rapid response to emergencies, but the high volume of calls left officers with little opportunity for preventive or community-oriented work. Police became increasingly reactive, responding to incidents rather than building relationships. The use of computers reinforced this trend, as performance began to be measured through statistics, response times, and crime data analysis rather than community engagement. Random patrol strategies also limited predictable interactions with residents. As noted by Kelling and others, this era of intense professionalization fostered the belief that experts alone were responsible for crime control, minimizing the perceived need for public involvement.

Amid rising crime rates and significant social change, the emphasis on formalization, discipline, and technology contributed to growing isolation between the police and diverse communities. In some areas, mistrust deepened to the point where a "we versus them" mentality emerged. As Harrington (1981) observed, particularly among the urban poor, the police were increasingly seen not as protectors but as agents of arrest and authority.

British India Phase

After the British victory at the Battle of Plassey in 1757 and the subsequent decline of the Mughal Empire, the existing policing structures in the region further deteriorated. The British gradually introduced a codified legal framework, with the Criminal Procedure Code and the Indian Penal Code coming into force in 1862, followed by the Evidence Act in 1872. These enactments replaced the earlier reliance on Islamic and Hindu legal authorities such as Qazis, Muftis, and Pandits.

Although the British restructured the administrative system, they initially retained several features of the Mughal law enforcement hierarchy, including positions such as Kotwal, Thanedar, Pargana officials, and Darogah. Over time, however, the Perso-Arabic administrative model was progressively replaced by a British-style policing system, which laid the foundation for modern police organization in India.

Pre Independence-Era

The Mughal Empire began to fall apart by the early 19th century, and up until the middle of the century, there was no effective police force, largely due to British ignorance of the region and lack of experience there. Before Cornwallis arrived in India as Governor-General in 1792, zamindars continued to maintain law and order. They did away with the zamindari system and gave control of law and order to Thanedars. There were also made some other reforms. The Indian Police Act of 1861, which also served as the foundation for the existing police system, was the culmination of a model of policing established later by Napier.

The 1860 Indian Police Act

Following the Revolt of 1857, the British administration recognized the threat to its authority and sought to strengthen its control over India. In 1860, a Police Commission was established to reorganize the police so that it could function as an effective instrument for preventing dissent and detecting crime. Unlike the democratic policing model later associated with Britain, the colonial police system in India was primarily designed to protect imperial interests—safeguarding trade routes, ensuring resource extraction, and maintaining political dominance. Although it drew upon elements of the earlier Mughal framework, retaining titles such as Daroga, Faujdar, and Kotwal, it introduced a uniform and centralized structure under the Police Act of 1861. This Act professionalized and disciplined the force, reduced the supervisory role of the District Magistrate, and created a standardized system that largely continues today.

Despite administrative uniformity, crime control remained weak, partly due to widespread poverty, famine, and inadequate manpower. The second Indian Police Commission of 1902–03 reviewed the system and recommended reforms, but significant changes were delayed until independence. Although Indians were gradually allowed to join the higher services after 1920, the process of Indianization was slow. After independence, India largely retained the 1861 colonial policing framework, with minimal structural transformation.

The Indian Police System's Current Era

After 1860, there were two methods used to select top police officers: first, officers from the British Army were appointed, and second, younger sons of British landed gentry were nominated. In 1893, these two practices were outlawed. Officers were now hired through a combined competitive exam that was exclusively open to Europeans and was held in London. Later, Indians were allowed access as well. The Union Public Service Commission now conducts the Combined Civil Services Examination annually to hire new employees. All India Services are mentioned in Article 312 of the Indian Constitution. Hired probationers undergo extremely rigorous initial training in physical education, weapons, and other activities.

The Constitution declares that the police force is a state subject. In the state police manual, states outline rules, regulations, and recommendations for the police. All of India's states have a very uniform organizational structure for their police forces. The Director-General of Police is the title given to the state's top law enforcement official (DGP). Zones, ranges, and districts are further separated into different parts of a state. An officer holding the rank of "Superintendent of Police" is in charge of the district force (SP). A range comprises several districts and is led by a "deputy inspector general of police" (DIG). Zones consist of two or more ranges and are led by a police officer with the rank of "Inspector General" (IG). Districts are further divided into circles and police stations, each of which is led by a different rank of officer. The district police are further separated into the civil police and the armed police, the former of which primarily deals with crime control, the latter of which deals with peace and order issues, and district's reserve police held in case of an emergency.

IX. THE IMPACT OF THE PREVIOUS POLICE SYSTEM ON THE CURRENT

The structure of the Indian police system continues to rest largely on the Police Act of 1861, a colonial-era legislation that shaped its basic organization and functioning. Over the years, only two major nationwide reviews have examined police administration in depth: the Indian Police Commission of 1902–03 during British rule, and the

National Police Commission established in 1977 after independence. Both assessments highlighted similar concerns, noting deficiencies in organization, inadequate training, weak grievance redressal mechanisms, limited community engagement, and a public perception of corruption and authoritarianism within the force.

Despite independence, substantial structural reform has remained limited, and the colonial framework has largely persisted. Consequently, there is still a pressing need for a transformation not only in institutional arrangements but also in the mindset and operational approach of the police to make them more responsive, accountable, and community-oriented.

X. POLICE REFORMS IN INDIA

Under the Constitution of 1950, "police" and "public order" fall within the jurisdiction of the states, resulting in each of the 29 states maintaining its own police force. At the same time, the Union Government is empowered to maintain central police forces to assist states in preserving law and order. Accordingly, the Centre administers several core police and specialized agencies responsible for intelligence gathering, investigation, research, record maintenance, and training.

The primary functions of police forces include enforcing the law, investigating crimes, and safeguarding national security. In a vast and diverse country like India, effective policing requires adequate personnel, modern equipment, forensic and communication support, and reliable transportation. Equally important are operational autonomy, fair working conditions, and opportunities for professional growth, balanced with accountability mechanisms to address misconduct or inefficiency. This report outlines the structure of the Indian police system and examines key challenges affecting it. Additionally, the Standing Committee on Home Affairs has reviewed related subjects, including the "Roadmap for Implementing Police Reforms" and matters concerning the Central Armed Police Forces and organizations.

XI. REPORT OF THE NITI AAYOG (2016)

On 1 January 2015, the Union Cabinet established the National Institution for Transforming India (NITI Aayog) as the Government of India's premier public policy think tank, replacing the Planning Commission. Designed to promote cooperative federalism, it involves state governments in economic policymaking and provides strategic and technical policy inputs to both the Centre and the States. Its major initiatives include long-term vision and strategy documents, reform agendas in sectors such as health, education, agriculture, urban development, and digital governance, and the promotion of best practices across states. NITI Aayog also supports consultative processes through task forces and sub-groups of Chief Ministers on key national programs.

Headed by the Prime Minister of India, NITI Aayog functions as a knowledge and innovation hub. It formulates policy frameworks, develops model laws, publishes research, organizes seminars and conferences, and serves as a repository of governance best practices. Its structure includes the Team India Hub, which strengthens Centre–State coordination, and the Knowledge and Innovation Hub, which promotes research-based policymaking and collaboration with universities, think tanks, and civil society organizations worldwide.

To enhance its capacity, NITI Aayog has introduced recruitment frameworks for consultants, research staff, and domain experts, along with internship and fellowship programs such as the NITI Non-Resident Fellows initiative. These programs aim to integrate academic and professional expertise into policymaking. Additionally, evaluation and monitoring functions are carried out through the Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), formed by merging earlier evaluation bodies. Institutions such as the National Institute of Labour Economics Research and Development (NILERD) function under NITI Aayog to conduct research, training, and data analysis in areas related to human resource development and labour economics.

XII. EPRS 2017 (EUROPEAN PARLIAMEN - TARY RESEARCH SERVICE)

The European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS) provides independent, objective, and authoritative research support to Members of the European Parliament and its committees. Its primary aim is to strengthen parliamentary effectiveness by supplying reliable policy analysis, institutional

expertise, and knowledge resources across diverse sectors. In addition to assisting legislative work, EPRS also promotes public outreach and enhances transparency in parliamentary functioning.

With regard to India's broader policy challenges, several structural constraints may affect its long-term development. Domestic dynamics such as rising regionalism and identity-based political movements can influence national cohesion. While India's cultural and regional diversity is a source of strength, it also presents governance challenges, particularly in balancing the differing economic and social aspirations of the less-developed northern states and the more prosperous southern states. Despite agricultural progress and food self-sufficiency, issues such as hunger and malnutrition persist, highlighting weaknesses in food distribution systems. Moreover, regional disparities in health, education, and living standards continue to affect India's position on the Human Development Index. Growing concerns over migration and perceived cultural imbalance between northern and southern regions further underscore the need for cooperative federalism and inclusive development strategies.

XIII. MUSHARI COMMITTEE

Background

After Independence, both the Central and State Governments established several Commissions and Committees to examine weaknesses in the Indian police system. Although these bodies made detailed and far-reaching recommendations, their implementation has remained fragmented and inconsistent. Sporadic reforms have addressed urgent concerns, but they have not produced substantial or systemic improvement in policing standards. What is needed is a consolidated review of all major reform recommendations and the formulation of a clear, time-bound action plan to enhance the overall quality, accountability, and effectiveness of police services, particularly in safeguarding citizens and addressing internal security challenges.

Need for Police Reforms

The urgency of reform has been repeatedly emphasized by the National Police Commission and other national committees. These reports highlight declining public trust in the police, frequent criticism of their efficiency and integrity, and concerns over misuse of authority. Simultaneously, police morale—especially at the constabulary level—has been reported as alarmingly low. Many constables feel alienated, undervalued, and disconnected from both the public and the higher administration, contributing to dissatisfaction within the force and weakening institutional performance.

Committee's Approach

The Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel National Police Academy (SVP National Police Academy) was tasked with reviewing the recommendations of various Police Reform Commissions, in consultation with management experts. The key proposals from national-level committees were carefully analyzed, while state-level reports were also examined, though many of them focused primarily on local concerns. The recommendations were then classified into six implementation categories: those requiring legislation; those needing central government action; those to be implemented by state governments; those requiring initiative from police organizations themselves; those with financial implications; and those without financial impact. This structured approach aimed to facilitate more practical and coordinated reform implementation.

XIV. PROGRAMME 'UMMEED'

UMMEED: A Community Policing Initiative in Delhi

Rakesh Asthana, Commissioner of the Delhi Police, launched the *Ummeed* initiative as part of a broader push toward strengthening community policing in the North-East district of Delhi.

What is Community Policing?

Community policing is a philosophy of law enforcement in which officers regularly serve the same locality to build strong, trust-based relationships with residents. Rather than merely responding to incidents, it focuses on preventing crime through collaboration with the community. It is guided by the principle that "a citizen is a policeman without a uniform, and a policeman is a citizen in uniform," emphasizing shared responsibility for public safety.

Launch and Objectives of *UMMEED*

The *Ummeed* initiative was introduced to promote social harmony, mutual trust, and cooperation between communities and the police. During the launch, the Commissioner highlighted that maintaining peace cannot rely solely on police presence in every area; instead, it requires a disciplined and service-oriented society working in partnership with law enforcement. He stressed that crime is not linked to any religion and that only a small number of antisocial elements disturb social harmony.

Organized by the North-East District Police at Shyam Lal College, *Ummeed*—meaning "hope"—aims to strengthen community bonds and encourage peaceful coexistence. The program seeks to foster unity, trust, and collective responsibility, reinforcing the idea that sustainable peace and development depend on cooperation between citizens and the police.

XV. POLICE REFORM IN THE PRESENT CONTEXT

India's police system is still largely governed by the Police Act of 1861, drafted by the British after the 1860 Police Commission to maintain law and order. Although intended for colonial control, the Act continued even after independence. Other laws such as the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act (UAPA) and the now-repealed Prevention of Terrorism Act (POTA) also guide police functioning.

Some states like Mumbai, Hyderabad, and Delhi have separate police laws, but these are still based on the 1861 framework. Colonial provisions such as sedition—once used against leaders like Mahatma Gandhi—remained in force even after independence, reflecting the slow pace of reform.

XVI. IMPACT OF POLICE REFORMS ON THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

The police form a crucial pillar of the criminal justice system. After independence, concerns arose about political interference and corruption affecting fair investigations. Various committees were set up to recommend reforms.

In Madheshwardhari Singh v. State of Bihar, the Supreme Court emphasized speedy investigation and trial. Reforms aimed to reduce political control by establishing oversight boards to ensure accountability and impartial functioning.

XVII. POLICE ACT OF 1861 VS. MODEL POLICE ACT OF 2006

Policing is a State subject under the Constitution, but most states still follow the 1861 Act or laws based on it. The central government manages the Indian Police Service and coordinates with states. At the district level, the Superintendent of Police functions under the District Magistrate, reflecting colonial-era executive control.

The 1861 Act gives police defined powers but lacks strong provisions for civilian oversight. To modernize the system, several committees—including the Ribeiro Committee and Padmanabhaiah Committee—recommended reforms. In 2006, following the landmark Prakash Singh v. Union of India, the Supreme Court issued seven binding directives to states to initiate long-pending police reforms.

XVIII. RESULT

In conclusion, the evolution of the Gujarat Police and the implementation of community policing strategies have marked a significant paradigm shift in the state's approach to law enforcement. The journey from traditional policing models to a more community-centric philosophy reflects a nuanced understanding of the complex dynamics between law enforcement agencies and the society they serve. Gujarat's commitment to fostering a symbiotic relationship between the police and the community underscores a philosophical realization that effective policing transcends mere enforcement; it necessitates collaboration, trust, and shared responsibility.

The strides made in Gujarat's police development reveal a holistic commitment to enhancing not only the security apparatus but also the overall well-being of the communities. The adoption of community policing as a central tenet acknowledges the intrinsic interdependence between law enforcement and the populace, emphasizing the need for mutual understanding and cooperation. Through proactive engagement, communication, and problem-solving partnerships, the Gujarat Police has endeavored to create a more resilient and secure social fabric.

Furthermore, the philosophical underpinnings of community policing in Gujarat extend beyond conventional law enforcement paradigms. The emphasis on ethical guardianship, inclusivity, and a proactive stance against potential threats showcases a commitment to creating a society where safety is not merely a product of enforcement but a shared responsibility. The Gujarat Police's dedication to fostering positive relationships, understanding community needs, and addressing issues at their roots aligns with the principles of community-oriented policing, contributing to a more harmonious and secure environment.

As Gujarat continues to navigate the complex landscape of law enforcement, the integration of community policing principles stands as a testament to the state's commitment to evolving with the changing needs of its diverse population. The philosophical foundation laid by this approach ensures that the Gujarat Police not only responds effectively to challenges but also actively participates in the collaborative construction of a safer and more cohesive society. Through this transformative journey, Gujarat exemplifies a model that other regions can study and adapt, fostering a vision of policing that is deeply intertwined with the values and aspirations of the communities it serves.

REFERENCES

1. "NITI Ayog update June (2017).", NIC news, June (2017).
2. "Committee on Home Affairs," Subjects selected by Standing Committees, PRS Legislative Research, Last visited August 17, (2016), http://www.prsindia.org/parliamenttrack/parliamentary-committees/subjects-selected-by-standing-committees-3451/.
3. "India braces for religious violence," 28 September (2002), https://edition.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/asiapcf/south/02/27/India. Train/index.html. Accessed 23.02.2021.
4. "India: Gujarat Officials Took Part in Anti-Muslim Violence," Human Rights Watch, 30 April (2002), HTTPS:// www.hrw.org/news/2002/04/30/india-Gujarat-officials-took-part-anti-Muslim-violence. Accessed 19.02.2021
5. "Indian MPs Back Gujarat Motion," 06 May 2002, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1970415.stm. Accessed 22.02.2021.
6. "Intimidation and Harassment of Witnesses, Human Rights Activists, and Lawyers Pursuing Accountability for the (2002) Communal Violence in Gujarat" (Human Right Watch, 24 April 2004), 2, https://www.hrw.org/legacy/backgrounder/asia/india/Gujarat/gujarat0904.pdf. Accessed 21.02.2021.
7. "Public Order," Second Administrative Reforms Commission, (2007), http://arc.gov.in/5th%20REPORT.pdf; "Police Organisation in India," Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, 2015, http://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/download/1456400058Final%20Police%20Org%20in%20India%202016.pdf; Prakash Singh vs. Union of India, Supreme Court, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 310 of 1996, November 8, 2010; "Building SMART Police in India: Background into the needed Police Force Reforms," NITI Aayog, 2016, http://www.niti.gov.in/writereaddata/files/document_publication/Strengthening-Police-Force.pdf.
8. "Scores Killed in India Train Attack", 27 September (2002), http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1843591.stm. Accessed 24.02.2021.
9. "Timeline of the Riots in Modi's Gujarat," The New York Times, 06 April (2014), BLM. World, https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/04/06/world/asia/modi-Gujarat-riots-timeline.html. Accessed 10.02.2021.
10. "We Have No Orders To Save You' State Participation and Complicity in Communal Violence in Gujarat" (Human Right Watch, April 2002), 22. https://www.hrw.org/reports/2002/india/gujarat.pdf. Accessed 23.02.2021.
11. Achyut Yagnik ve Suchitra Sheth, "Whither Gujarat?", Economic and Political Weekly 37, no 11 (16 March 2002): 1010.
12. Christophe Jaffrelot, (2003) "Communal Riots in Gujarat: The State at Risk?", Working paper, c. 17.
13. Dempsey, J. S., & Forst, L. S. (2015). An introduction to policing 8Ed. Boston: Cengage Learning.
14. Entry 2 and 2A, List I, Schedule 7, Constitution of India, (1950).
15. Entry 2, List II, Schedule 7, Constitution of India, (1950).
16. Greene, J. R. (2000). Community policing in America: Changing the nature, structure, and function of the police. Criminal justice, 3(3), 299-378.

17. Harrington, Michael, (1981). The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York: Macmillan:p.16.
18. https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1569253/.
19. Islington Commission Report https://www.upsc.gov.in/sites/default/files/Sl-019-RprtRoyalCmsnSuperiorCivilSerIndiaLeeComsnRprt-1924_0.pdf.
20. Kelling, George L., and Mark H. Moore, (1988). The Evolving Strategy of Policing. Perspectives on Policing. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University:pp.4–5.
21. Philip, Prateep V., (2006). The Friends of Police Movement: A Roadmap for Proactive People Participation, The Icfai University Press, Hyderabad.
22. Raiden, Chris. (1992). "Enriching Traditional Police Roles." Police Management: Issues and Perspectives. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum:p.108.
23. Skogan WG, Hartnett SM (1997) Community policing, Chicago style. New York: Oxford University Press 2: 1.
24. Sparrow, Malcolm K. (1988). Implementing community policing. No. 9. US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.