INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

"CITIZEN SECURITY IN CENTRAL AMERICA" PROJECT
Sponsored by the Government
of the Republic of China-Taiwan

CITIZEN SECURITY IN CENTRAL AMERICA: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

José María RICO
Regional Coordinator

1998 - 1999

Citizen Security in Central America:
Theoretical and methodological aspects
San José, Costa Rica
First Edition - 1999
© 1999, IIDH
Diagraming and Final Arts: Mars Editores S.A.
English Translation: Orlando García Valverde

CONTENTS

PART FOUR
GENERAL PROFILE

APPENDIX

INTRODUCTION

The sensation of insecurity that the citizens of our societies are experiencing during this final stretch of the century, is one of the main threats against the quality of life in democracy. The fact that our political systems have evolved from military authoritarianism into constitutional rule while, on the other hand, the citizenry perceives itself as being all the more threatened by uncontainable, uncontrolled crime, constitutes, without a doubt, a cruel paradox.

Regardless of whether or not the crime rate actually increases, the *perception* of insecurity is very real and widespread, and this factor of social psychology generates detrimental effects against our democracies. In the first place, they cause public opinion to cry in favour of a search for easy solutions to the problem. And, for their part, large sectors of the constituency become easy prey to demagoguery that offers magical answers. In turn, "iron fist" proposals, the hardening of punishment, the elimination of procedural guarantees for the accused, the limitation of the judges' discretion in the passing of judgement, and the reinstatement of the death penalty, undermine the ethical foundations of our system, and push us back into authoritarianism, although this takes place behind a façade put up by the decisions of the majority.

Citizen insecurity bogs the police down and hinders the transformation of this body into the security force of a democratic State that would report to civilian authority, acting with a spirit of service for the protection of the citizens. Instead,

public opinion is reluctant to advocate the imposition of controls over police bodies, fearing that, when needed to combat crime, this would throw them into the action "with their hands tied." And, incidentally, this trap of logic is expertly exploited by ambitious politicians, sensationalistic journalists and media, and even policepersons who long for the autonomy that they enjoyed during dictatorial times.

To a greater or a lesser extent, the situation described in the preceding paragraphs applies to all our countries and constitutes, in each case, an evident sign of deterioration of the quality of democracy. In extreme cases the police feels so exempt from democratic control, that many of its members aggravate citizen insecurity through their own corruption, violence and criminal behaviour. While this makes the communities feel threatened by crime, they mistrust the police bodies that should protect them. It is easy, from this point, to jump to the decision of becoming armed, taking the law in one's own hands, lynching offenders, and breaking the rule of law.

Such a state of affairs calls for creativity and long-term work. Indeed, the subject fits into our human rights promotion mandate, and even more so into our efforts for the application of the international human rights doctrine and law to the specific reality of Latin America and the Caribbean. We have the obligation to confront these problems, because of our mission of expansion of the deep contents of democracy and the rule of law; our vocation for encouraging the protection of victims from any aggression against their dignity; and our commitment to the progressive development of life's basic guarantees, the physical integrity of the individuals, and the due process.

We tackle these problems with an approach which has been proven in our experience for the past nineteen years. Such an approach consists, in the first place, of encouraging scientific research applied to human rights problems. In this case, we believe it is basic for our societies and States to act upon a base

of rigorous information obtained with scientific means. This will prevent hysterical reactions and desperate solutions. In the second place, our educational approach proposes the study and emulation of the best practices employed in other countries to confront similar human rights problems. Concerning citizen security, there are models for the organisation of efforts, which must be studied without passion and adapted creatively to dissimilar realities.

Our approach favours, in the third place, fruitful dialogue between the society and the State; more precisely, between civilian society organisations, and authorities responsible for compliance with different aspects of human rights. In this sense, we are convinced that it is not possible to tackle insecurity problems without breaking the barriers of mistrust and frustration that hamper cooperation between the police, the attorneys general, the courts, and the population that is attacked by crime. Finally, the contents of our educational message must be consistent with internal constitutional and international human rights doctrine and law. This way the deep objective of our citizen security work tends to seek solutions that will not violate essential obligations of the State with respect to the individuals. Thus, we try to reconcile the legitimate rights and interests of the victims of crime, with the basic guarantees of the due process that must be afforded even the worst offenders.

For several years, the IIHR has been constantly intensifying its activities on this subject. We began in 1996 with programmes aimed at civilian society organisations concerned with the security of their communities. We were then already working in education on human rights for police and correctional personnel. Since January 1998, however, we have been doing integrated study, diagnosis and analysis work on Central American citizen security practices. This project, which is sponsored by the Republic of China (Taiwan), brings together the authorities and police personnel, to discuss these subjects with the active citizens of the community in towns,

neighbourhoods, and selected sectors, in six countries, in order to make possible a more detailed analysis and a more active, continuous and specific dialogue. As part of the Project, we also brought in experiences from other latitudes, and sought to develop a Central American version of the ideas that are usually defined as "community police."

This Project is already bearing fruit in terms of specific products, which we try to present through several publications. This publication is the first one of that series, and it is devoted to theoretical, conceptual and methodological aspects. By placing it at the consideration of the public and colleagues who are devoted to these subjects, it pleases me to express recognition for the contribution made by the Coordinator of our "Citizen Security in Central America" Project, José María Rico; our Programme Officer for the same Project, Gilda Segreda; and our collaborators from the Public Institutions and Civilian Society Areas, Gonzalo Elizondo, and Roberto Cuéllar, respectively.

San José, April 1999.

Juan E. Méndez
Executive Director

FOREWORD

Pursuant to its policy of cooperation with Central America, in July 1997 the Government of the Republic of China-Taiwan, gave the Inter-American Institute on Human Rights (IIHR) an important grant to implement, with the joint and coordinated participation of the official and civilian society organisations directly involved, a pilot project on "Citizen Security in Central America," whose purpose was to encourage actions intended to generate sustainable solutions to the problem of crime and insecurity that prevailed in the countries of the region. The countries that agreed to participate were Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

The Project, whose institutional supervision was entrusted to Mr. Gonzalo Elizondo, Director of the Public Institutions Area at the IIRH, was broken down into two basic stages: the first one for the preparation of a diagnosis of the situation prevailing in the region, and action plans on this subject, and the second one for the implementation and evaluation of such plans.

Its implementation, however, required the preparation in advance of a guide containing the Project's theoretical, conceptual and methodological aspects. This task was performed by the Regional Coordinator, and the results of this effort are presented in this document, which is broken down as follows: the first part contains the background, rationale and frame of reference of the Project; the second part its theoretical-conceptual framework; the third part its objectives and

components, and the methodology employed; and the fourth and final part the Project's general profile, which includes its objectives, the expected results, activities, indicators of success, and the tentative timetable.

This initial document[1], which is in principle applicable to all the participating countries (with the adjustments necessary for each specific context), shall be followed by other documents, where the results obtained during the different stages of the Project shall be gradually reported. The IIRH intends, through this series of publications, to make available to the professional and academic community of the Central American region in particular, and the Latin American region in general, important materials purporting to provide novel and sustainable solutions to the disturbing problem of crime and insecurity.

---

1   The following works as well as their bibliographies were consulted for the preparation of the document: José María Rico and Luis Salas, *Inseguridad ciudadana y policía*, Madrid, Tecnos, 1988, pp. 13-56 and 159-237; José María Rico, *Justicia penal y transición democrática en América Latina*, México, Siglo XXI publishers, 1997, pp. 82-111; and Laura Chinchilla and José María Rico, *La prevención comunitaria del delito: perspectivas para América Latina*, Miami, Center for the Administration of Justice, 1997.

PART ONE

BACKGROUND, RATIONALE, AND FRAME OF REFERENCE

I. THE PROBLEM AS A WHOLE

Several public opinion surveys made in the Central American countries coincide on that, for most of the population, crime has, over the past decade, been one of the main social problems, and one that has been just barely outranked by the economic problem (unemployment, poverty, high cost of living); that the citizens feel insecure fearing to be attacked or robbed even in their own neighbourhoods or homes; and that the citizens feel that the institutional intervention modes applied (by the police, the courts, the correctional system) are inadequate.

In such a situation and within the realm of private action, the population's reaction normally entails the purchase of guns or watchdogs, the installation of security devices (protective bars or grills, alarm systems), the hiring of guards, or the organisation of the neighbours, at the same time that greater severity in the intervention of the public authorities is demanded by the citizens: strengthening of police action, stiffer sentences, intensification of penalties -including the reinstatement of the death penalty (which has been introduced in Guatemala), and in some cases (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras) even the intervention of the armed forces in the struggle against crime.

Far from guaranteeing effective and sustainable solutions in the long run, these eminently repressive trends worsen the situation since, on the one hand, they tend to postpone the structuring of integrated and preventive responses, and, on the other, they help kindle social conflicts, exposing the region's still young processes of democratic consolidation and governability to risk. Thence, the importance of considering other approaches intended, on the one hand, to tackle efficiently

the important problems of crime and the feelings of insecurity that prevail, and, on the other, to strengthen the rule of law and due respect for the rights of individuals.

II. THE REGION'S HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The need to find new approaches in this matter is further justified if certain essential aspects of the region's recent historical context are taken into account, one such aspect being the need to substitute an agenda of "citizen security" for the "national security" doctrine. For more than two decades, the East-West confrontation was characterised by the "national security" doctrine, which caused internal social and political conflicts to be perceived by the governments of the region as threats against the State; these situations were erroneously dealt with as national security problems that could be solved through the intervention of the armed forces, whose ranks increased in number considerably; instead, the new "citizen security" policy, which has been vigorously recommended by the peace agreements signed in some Central American countries between the government and the guerrilla, is based on the struggle against street and organised crime, within the framework of democratic institutions that would seek both, a more efficient administration of criminal justice, and the social and economic development of the countries of the region.

Since 1991 some presidential meetings have been held to discuss these matters, and in December 1995 an agreement of great importance was signed: the Framework Agreement on Democratic Security in Central America. In this Agreement it is established, among other things, that "the Central American democratic security model is erected upon the supremacy and strengthening of civilian power, the reasonable balance of forces, the security of persons and their property,...the eradication of violence, corruption, impunity, terrorism, narco-activity, and the arms trade," and that its justification lies upon "respect for, and the promotion and protection of all human rights..."

Concerning police matters, thus far the following organisations have been created: the Association of Chiefs of Police of Central America (1992); the Central American Security Commission, comprised of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs (1994); the Permanent Central American Commission for the Eradication of the Illicit Production, Traffic and Consumption of Narcotics and Psychotropic Substances (1994); and the Central American Higher Police Studies Institute, with headquarters in San Salvador (1996).

III. MAIN INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED AND BENEFITED

Another important aspect of the general framework within which the problems of crime and citizen security lie, is the intervention of the different institutions involved. In this respect, the role that the Ministries of Security (or the Interior), or the offices of the Attorneys General (or other organisations) of human rights play, is particularly important. In the case of the former, since the police forces that are, by virtue of their functions, charged with the prevention and repression of crime, for which reason they should play an essential role during the second stage of this Project, are within their jurisdiction. In the case of the latter, since one of their main responsibilities consists of seeing to the observance of human rights in general and, specifically, seeing that there be consistency between the actions of the official agencies in charge of the struggle against crime, and the national and international rules that exist on the subject (especially concerning protection of the basic rights and the due process, and abuse of power, among others).

The remaining official institutions (parliaments, Ministries of Justice, Judicial Branches, correctional systems, etc.), as well as those organisations of the civilian society that are related to or interested in the subject, should collaborate in a coordinated fashion, each within the realm of its respective competence,

with the programmes that can be designed to confront the problem of crime and citizen insecurity.

With respect to police intervention, the evolution experienced over the past few years in most of the Central American countries, involving the separation of the police forces from the armed forces to be placed into the jurisdiction of the civilian authorities, as well as the efforts made to ensure their professionalisation, are worthy of special mention.

The main beneficiaries of the Project would be those official institutions that most directly have to cope with the problems of crime and citizen insecurity (particularly the Ministries of Public Security or the Interior, and the offices of the Attorneys General and other human rights protection organisations), as well as civilian society and community organisations in general (provided the Project is implemented in strict observance of the principles that characterise a State under the rule of law, thus strengthening the region's on-going democratisation processes).

THEORETICAL-CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Although in its broader conception the phrase "citizen security" refers to numerous aspects of organised social life, it is generally used in connection with the subject of crime. "Fear of crime" or "citizen insecurity" are the main notions involved in the description of such a phenomenon, that most of the population normally associates with real or assumed increases in crime rates and luckless interventions of the state agencies in charge of crime prevention and repression. This rather widespread belief has, in numerous countries, led to simplistic, scarcely rigorous proposals and conclusions that are usually erroneous and often dangerous, which brings up the problem of human rights in this sector.

Any policy adopted in this sector must take into consideration the complexity of a subject where, among other things, elements of reality (crime, i.e. the totality of crimes actually committed in a given society and the operation of the different components of the criminal system), and of perception (the opinion of the citizens about crime and state intervention) combine together, warranting clearly differentiated but consistent political treatments and actions.

In face of such a situation, some countries (the United States of America, Canada, and almost all European countries) have for some time been successfully testing new crime prevention intervention methods.

Following is a brief analysis of those aspects of the subject that have been cited above, making special reference to the Latin American context.

I.   CRIME

On the subject of crime and notwithstanding the fact that some countries of Central America do not have criminal statistics at all, or that this type of instrument is not very reliable where available, certain data obtained make it possible to observe the following:

- constant crime rate increases, mostly concerning crimes against life and the physical integrity of individuals;

- increasing participation by youths in criminal activities who also are usually organised into gangs;

- an increasingly closer relationship between street crime and the problem of drugs and narcotraffic;

- a "regionalisation" of crime, since certain offences (arms and drug trafficking, smuggling of merchandise and animals, car theft, and smuggling of illegal immigrants) normally ignore geographical or political boundaries.

II. THE FEELING OF INSECURITY

Concerning the feeling of insecurity, public opinion polls reveal the following:

- high victimisation rates that greatly exceed those of officially recorded crime,

- in most countries the criminal phenomenon is usually one of the greatest social problems; so much so that is just barely outranked by the economic problem (unemployment, poverty, high cost of living);

- among all citizen groups and categories it is felt that crime increases non-stop; that the country, the city, the

neighbourhood, the street or the home where they live are insecure, and they expect to be attacked or robbed within the following months (this opinion is much more emphatic among the residents of urban centres, females and the elderly); and

• most of the citizens feel that the main causes for the increase in crime rates are unemployment and drug abuse.

III. THE OFFICIAL SOCIAL REACTION

Lastly, concerning the performance of the criminal system, both, research findings, and public opinion polls, underline the existence of serious limitations as to the form of intervention vis-à-vis crime and citizen insecurity. The following perceptions must be stressed:

• there is no integrated and coherent policy that could be really applied concerning citizen security and crime prevention;

• the population has little knowledge concerning the law and the performance of the criminal system;

• intervention by the police is generally characterised by an ineffective performance in the struggle against crime, and by authoritarian and corrupt practices, as well as –in several countries of the region and in spite of recent reforms in the sector– by the lack of a definition and ambiguousness concerning the police function (national defence vs. citizen defence; military police vs. civilian police, etc.).

• judicial action is perceived negatively by numerous population sectors, above all because of the leniency of the sanctions imposed by the judges, the sluggishness of the trials, and inequality in the treatment afforded the users of

the system (especially depending on their socio-economic status);

- a correctional intervention characterised by little effectiveness in convict rehabilitation programmes, the deficient condition of correctional centres (crowding, inadequate infrastructure, impossibility to separate the inmates) and the scarcely rational use of instruments such as release on bail and parole (often applied without regard for the dangerousness of the persons under custody); and

- generally the feeling that the fundamental philosophy of the reforms made (for adults and juveniles) in the criminal procedural legislation, which is regarded as excessively protective of the rights of the accused, is out of phase with the expectations of the citizens concerning their personal security.

The increase in crime rates and fear of crime, together with an inadequate response by the competent authorities, normally entail consequences of an economic, a social and a political nature.

Worthy of mention among the first type of consequences are the cost of crime and of prevention measures adopted by the individuals and the criminal system; loss of productivity from non performance of activities for fear of crime or from work not done by the offender; and foreseeably negative effects on the country's balance of payments, in that crime scares away investments, technological development and tourism, which are important foreign exchange generation sources.

As regards the social consequences, crime and the real or justified fear of crime normally engender emotional reactions, as well as important changes in behaviour arising from the search for protection from criminal activities; this affects the

population's quality of life because of its consequences at both, the psychological level (feeling of loneliness, abandonment and anguish), and the social level (reluctance to lend an ear to strangers and greater mistrust for peers); in addition, it contributes to the establishment of stereotypes concerning crime and offenders, according to which the latter are perceived to belong to lower-category social classes or to certain countries, which in turn leads to stigmatisation, rejection of the indigent and aliens, despectiveness towards the poor, and so forth, most probably resulting in a feeling of diminished social solidarity.

Lastly, the political consequences normally involve pressure by the population on the public authorities intended to generate changes in the modes of intervention, which normally translate into demands for more repressive measures at the legal level (stiffening of penalties, introduction of the death penalty), as well as at the police level (granting of greater powers to the police bodies), and even at the para-police level (acceptance of armed groups similar to the infamous death squadrons), which would constitute negative and improper elements for a democratic and open society, and which would represent a serious threat against the consolidation of the rule of law.

Independently from the existence of certain paradoxes with respect to the problem of crime and the feeling of insecurity - one such paradox being the image that prevails with respect to crime, which is generally associated with most violent acts such as homicide, rape and assault against individuals, when in fact the actual risk of being the victim of a crime of this nature is greatly lower than that of being the victim of a violation against property- the reality that has prevailed for the past few years is that of an increase in both modes of the phenomenon. The preceding implies the need to design policies for preventing and combating the most important forms of crime, as well as the need to prepare and undertake initiatives that may bring calm to the population.

IV. CRIME, CITIZEN INSECURITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

In different ways, the preceding also lays out the problem of human rights which, in terms of citizen security, has to be approached at least in connection with two of its aspects.

The first one has to do with the fact that security and other legally-protected interests (for instance, life and physical integrity) are recognised as basic rights in numerous international human rights instruments (declarations, agreements, treaties, principles, etc.). In this sense, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Articles 3 and 17), the International Agreement on Civil and Political Rights (Articles 6.1 and 9.1), the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (Articles I and XXIII) and the American Convention on Human Rights (Articles 4.1, 5.1, 7.1 y 21) establish in almost identical terms that all persons have the right to life, physical integrity, freedom, security and ownership. The perpetration of certain offences (homicide, injuries, rape, kidnapping, robbery, petty larceny and others) attempt against such basic rights of the citizens.

The second aspect relates to the modes of operation into which the official social reaction against crime may translate, which must be duly respectful of another series of basic rights that are equally recognised by the previously-cited international rules. These instruments recognise, in favour of the alleged offender, among others, the rights not to be subjected to arbitrarily arrest or imprisonment; not to be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment; to a public and fair trial before an independent and impartial jury; to the presumption of innocence; and to a full-fledged defence. Other international rules complete, in specific areas, the rights that have been mentioned; they are, concerning police work, the Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials (United Nations, 1979); concerning correctional matters, the Minimum

Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (1955); in both cases, the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatments or Punishments (United Nations, 1984); and, concerning the victims of crime, the Declaration on the Basic Principles of Justice for the Victims of Crimes and the Abuse of Power (United Nations, 1985).

V. OUTLOOK

In the criminal realm it is possible to intervene preventively, through the action of bodies or procedures whose essential purpose is to prevent the commission of offences; such is the case of criminal law (through intimidating power associated with the threat of punishment against those who violate certain legally-protected interests), police patrolling (done either solely by policepersons or with the participation of the citizens) and the intervention of certain institutions that favour socialisation (the family, the school, the employer, and others). When these instruments do not function as desired, that is, when a crime is committed, the action undertaken is basically repressive; it translates into police intervention (the arrest of suspects and criminal investigation), and into judicial intervention (prosecution and sanction within the framework of the rules established in criminal procedural legislation), as well as, in the case of a conviction, into the intervention of the correctional system, whose purposes include the rehabilitation of the convicted individual.

The most frequently used solution vis-à-vis the problem of crime has been repression officially represented by the criminal system, although since the end of the nineteenth century it has been also considered that crime prevention could be an important objective of this system. However, in relatively recent times empirical research has been carried out -especially in the countries of the common law legal family- about the real impact of the objectives presumably ideal of criminal intervention, and the findings of such research show how deficient those

objectives are when construed as methods capable of coping usefully with the problem of crime.

It has not been possible thus far to prepare integrated and consensual policies in this field, that may harmonise two apparently contradictory objectives of official action: the protection of the society through the application of rules that may ensure a quick capture, a prosecution, and eventually the punishment of the violators of criminal law, and the protection of the basic rights and liberties of the accused, without which we cannot speak of true justice. The accomplishment of these two objectives constitutes the ideal that the criminal systems of democratic countries aspire to. The apparent contradiction between these two objectives can be solved if we bear in mind that the repression of crime is not the ultimate goal of the criminal system, but only a means for the attainment of another yet more important goal: the protection of individual freedom under the rule of law.

The preceding considerations, together with the problems already mentioned relative to an increase in crime rates, the appearance and development of the feeling of insecurity among the citizens, and the return to criminal policies based on repression, such phenomena having been witnessed over the past few decades in almost all countries, have brought about the appearance of new models and approaches on this subject, whose experimental application and evaluation seem to portray them as being more promising than those in existence. Such is the case, in the police sector, of the community-oriented (or proximity) police model, and on the subject of prevention , of the "situational" approach (applied in the Anglo Saxon and Scandinavian countries) and the social approach (applied in Europe and Canada). These trends further imply the participation of the civilian society in the cited fields, such as it occurs in other political and social sectors.

1. The main characteristics of the new community-oriented police model are:

- broad and active participation by the civilian society and the community in the identification and solving of its main problems (including crime);

- a deep change in police organisation which translates, above all, into the emphasis placed on the beat around the neighbourhood;

- a proactive, rather than a reactive intervention; and

- establishment of association and co-operation mechanisms among the political authorities, the public and private services, the media, and the community in general, in order to tackle the problem of crime and citizen insecurity.

2. Concerning the new approaches of crime prevention, "situational" prevention is construed as the set of non-criminal measures intended to eliminate or reduce the circumstances that in numerous instances encourage the commission of an offence (for instance, through the installation of locks and alarm systems in homes and commercial premises, better street lighting or surveillance of the neighbourhood); the basic argument of this approach is that crime results largely from choices influenced by specific and immediate aspects of the situations in which a potential offender may find her or himself and its effects can be felt in the short term. The social approach (non-criminal interventions on potential offenders aimed at reducing their proneness to crime) is based on the classical etiological theories of crime, according to which criminal action is explained by the existence of diverse factors that precede the commission of the offence (the family, the school, the employer, the company of other offenders, membership in criminal gangs, the media, excessive consumption of alcohol and other drugs, and personality weaknesses); the results of this approach can be obtained only in the medium and long terms.

Because of the novel nature of the models and approaches that have been mentioned above, it is recommended, before

initiating any action in this sector, that they be applied in a city (or even in a zone of the city) as duly designed and evaluated pilot experiences, with the possibility of extending the programme later to other cities and to the rest of the country.

In Central America, the only experience reported that corresponds to these types of models and approaches took place in Costa Rica, where in 1996 the Ministry of Public Security launched as a pilot plan the Community Police Project in the locality of Hatillo, within the greater metropolitan area of the capital; the idea was to incorporate the community into the struggle against the problems of crime and citizen insecurity. Support was provided by the permanent police patrolling services (with motor vehicles and on foot) that covered this community, and the action of an Advisory Committee of the Precinct's Chief, whose membership included representatives of different governmental departments (education, health, sports, etc.), the church, and the community; their mission was to identify jointly security problems and possible solutions thereto, and to follow up their action. After one year, the evaluation of the Project rendered positive consistent results, especially a considerable reduction in the levels of victimisation and insecurity feelings, as well as an important improvement of the image of the police in the area. Such positive results justified the expansion of the Hatillo experience to other communities.

In 1996 the Research and Development Directorate of the Inter-American Institute on Human Rights (IIHR) started efforts to apply this model in the other countries of the region. The first pilot Project -which for several reasons could not be concluded- was initiated in the city of Usulután (El Salvador); a second Project intended to spur local action by the civilian society in search for sustainable solutions to the problems of crime and citizen insecurity, was launched in El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Panama. Worthy of mention among its main achievements are the preparation of

diagnoses on the conditions prevailing in the selected areas, the preparation of action plans, and the joint participation of practically all public institutions and the civilian society in the preparation of the diagnoses and in the discussion of its results, as well as in the preparation of the action plans.

Since Belize belongs to the realm of Anglo-Saxon tradition and legislation, it offers numerous examples of crime prevention programmes based on the participation of the other State institutions and the civilian society; such is the case, in the police sector, of the Police Crime Prevention Educational Programme, the Police First Offenders Programme, the Conscious Youth Development Programme and the Police Youth Service Corps, and, in the correctional sector, of the Youth Enhancement Academy.

Only recently, in almost all the Central American countries initiatives intended to bring the police institution and the civilian society closer together have started to be encouraged. These are certainly valuable experiences; however, they do not correspond to the previously-mentioned approach that this document describes.

VI. TOWARDS AN INTEGRATED CITIZEN SECURITY POLICY

An institutional citizen security strategy must be constructed upon certain principles which are the requirements for its success. Most important among them are the following:

1. Guaranteeing the security of the members of a community is one of the main purposes of the State, and one of its uncontested exclusive duties. Regardless of how important civilian society participation in this area is, it must be conducted within the regulatory and guiding framework that the State will define.

31

2. As it is being done in other countries, the community-orientation police model must be combined with the "situational" and the "social" preventive approaches, in the understanding that the participation of the civilian society plays a key role for success in both realms.

3. The strategies intended to deal with crime and the citizens' feeling of insecurity must be combined as well.

4. Although joint action by the police and the civilian society is of basic importance for citizen security, the complexity of the matter demands the collaboration of several State departments that are involved in the problem (the prosecutorial agency, the Judicial Branch, the correctional system, aid programmes for the victims of crime, ministries of labour, health and culture, etc.), with the unavoidable reference to the legal framework in force. The sector's policies and strategies must be also based on leadership shared by the institutions involved, the determination of responsibilities that each of them must undertake within the framework of their respective competencies and possibilities, and close coordination among said institutions.

5. Under the rule of law it is impossible to conceive a citizen security policy that will not fully observe the basic and human rights of the citizens.

6. Nor can there be a sustainable strategy in this sector within a context of social exclusion and deterioration of the socialisation mechanisms.

7. Citizen security policies and strategies must be prepared and implemented especially at the local level, whereupon they can become the basis for the design of national policies. Only with this approach will it be possible to identify adequately not only the specific problems of a given community, but possible solutions thereto.

8. Because of the novel nature of the approach proposed, said policies and strategies must be launched as duly evaluated pilot experiences, while the necessary measures are taken to ensure their permanence. These experiences could be broadened later and extended to other areas or to the rest of the country.

9. These policies and strategies should pursue, above all, the following objectives: significant reduction of the most serious and disturbing forms of crime and of the feeling of insecurity; improvement of the image of those institutions that are charged with the official control of crime (the police and the criminal system as a whole); promotion and encouragement of active participation by the civilian society in solving the problems of crime and citizen insecurity; and contributing to inter-institutional coordination in citizen security matters. The results expected in the short, medium and long terms should be taken into consideration for this purpose.

10. Human and financial resources are usually scarce, and the costs of certain programmes are relatively high in this field. At a time when constraints of this nature prevail, models of relatively low cost that could be undertaken by the countries on their own should be sought.

11. When facing the application of measures that imply police intervention (for instance, the introduction of the community-oriented police model), civilian society action and that of the other organisations involved must be subject to the orientation that the former shall, on its initiative, determine and apply for joint and coordinated action. Such police leadership is justified not only by the fact that the police is the State institution with the principal powers in this sector, but by the fact that its main crime and public protection-related functions are performed at any time, place and moment.

Such privileged intervention powers imply, however, the requirement of civilian-oriented and professional services. Thence the need to support the recent reforms being implemented in almost all police organisations of the region.

12. Civilian society intervention in citizen security matters must in principle take place within the framework of strategies jointly designed together with the police services and the other State institutions involved in the problem. In this sense, its activities could be essentially oriented towards the identification of the resources it can offer; especially, towards the determination of its intervention modes with respect to those preventive measures that relate to certain factors traditionally associated with crime (education, work, the family, etc.), as well as towards the establishment of certain modes of control of police action.

On the other hand, -not to mention the fact that we still have to define what we understand by "civilian society" (does it include State education, labour, family and other similar agencies? Could other organisations whose essential responsibility does not include the protection and promotion of human rights be included?)- any initiative requiring more direct and short-term intervention (for instance, citizen patrols for preventive purposes) is faced by problems such as the temptation to take the law in its own hands using methods that are unacceptable under the rule of law (for instance, beatings, lynching); the risk of abandoning an activity that must be maintained over time (for instance night patrolling by residents of the neighbourhood, which are usually discontinued because of fatigue); the danger of revenge by criminals arrested or accused as a consequence of a report filed by a civilian; and difficulties in coordinating the different actions that can be carried out in this field.

Part Three

THE PROJECT

I. OBJECTIVES

The Project's overall objective is to initiate, using the problem-solving approach and as pilot experiences, actions intended to provide sustainable solutions to the problems of crime and insecurity in Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, with the joint and coordinated participation of the official organisations involved, and the civilian society; and to strengthen any such actions thus far undertaken in Belize, Costa Rica, and El Salvador.

Its specific objectives are the following:

* to identify the main problems of the community, particularly those related to crime and the feeling of insecurity, as well as possible sustainable solutions thereto;

* to reduce the most serious and frequent forms of crime and the feelings of insecurity that the citizens have with respect thereto;

* to improve the image of the police and of the criminal system;

* to favour and encourage the active participation of the civilian society in the solving of the problems of crime and citizen insecurity;

* to encourage the establishment of a Central American databank on this subject, as a basis for the creation of an information system intended to facilitate investigations and decision making;

- to contribute to inter-institutional coordination in matters of citizen security; and

- to lay the foundations for the adoption of policies on this subject in each one of the countries.

II. DURATION

The Project shall have a duration of two years, beginning in January 1998, and ending in December 1999.

III. COMPONENTS AND ACTIVITIES

The Project includes two essential components and one evaluation, follow-up and publications phase; the first component, with a duration of some eight months, is destined to the preparation and approval of an action plan; the second one, with a similar duration, to the implementation of the plan.

A. Preparation and approval of an action plan

Although this component's main activity consists of the preparation of a diagnosis of the problem, it is important to underline the need for some previous requirements to ensure the success of the Project as a whole.

1. General and preceding aspects

1.1 Meetings at the beginning of the Project with representatives of the official organisations involved and the country's civilian society, to obtain, among other things, the following:

- strengthening of relations among all counterparts or stakeholders involved in the problem of crime and citizen

security, with the purpose of creating or improving conditions for the successful implementation of the Project;

- approval on the basis of its principal guidelines;

- a first approach to the country's social and criminal problem, possible solutions and resources available to reach them;

- determination of a geographical area where the Project is to be implemented; and

- selection of the local team that will participate in it.

1.2 Organisation of the participants, to which effect the following is suggested:

- joint action and the use of a uniform methodology;

- selection, in each participating country, of a restricted team of individuals representing the existing organisations, and appointment one person to take responsibility in each one of them;

- identification of specific responsibilities in each team; and

- determination of a timetable of activities, in accordance with the Project's general timetable.

1.3 Selection of a geographical area, which, taking into account the Project's pilot experience nature, the complexity of the problem, and the methodology employed in other countries, should be done on the basis of the following criteria:

- selection of only one geographical area in each country;

- selection of a neighbourhood (or of one section of a neighbourhood) preferably in an important city, since it is

in such a setting that the problems of crime and citizen insecurity normally occur in a relatively severe form;

- definition of such area, whose population should not exceed 100,000 inhabitants, with the greatest possible accuracy;

- using as criteria for selecting the area the presence in it of a police precinct, civilian society organisations, and problems of crime and insecurity, as well as the availability of instruments to make possible the measurement thereof (statistics, reports, studies, etc.); and

- avoiding the selection of areas without problems of this type or with problems that are too severe, since, in the first case, the actions to be undertaken would not be justified, and, in the second case, the importance of the existing problems and the pilot-experience nature of the Project could affect the success of said actions.

2. Diagnosis

It would be advisable, first of all, to make the following comments previously, in relationship to this activity:

- this is an indispensable phase for the preparation and implementation of action plans in the field of crime and citizen insecurity;

- the limitations that shall be described in chapter IV of this Part Three of the document must be taken into account;

- similarly, and with a few exceptions, the lack of previous work and integrated policies on this subject both locally and nationally, must be taken into consideration.

Following is a list of the main diagnosis stages.

2.1 Compilation and analysis of information

Due to the complexity of the subject, which includes aspects related mainly to crime, its perpetrators and its victims, the modus operandi of the offenders, the factors that determine the origin or crime, the volume and evolution of crime, its surroundings, the perception of insecurity, and the resources available to confront this phenomenon, the information necessary to develop a diagnosis will have to correspond, to the extent possible, to each of these aspects.

The data compiled shall, in addition, be the main indicators that will make it possible to evaluate the application of the actions to be undertaken, in order to cope with the problems of crime and citizen insecurity.

2.1.1. General data on the selected area

The compilation of certain general data (on the selected area and the country), which makes it possible to locate the problems of crime and citizen insecurity in their surroundings, is useful as a basis in the search for possible solutions. The following information must be sought:

- surface area (in km^2);

- demography: population (by sex and age), density (inhabitants per Km^2), birth and mortality rates, characteristics of the family, etc.;

- socio-economic situation: population of age to work, percentage of unemployment, annual per capita income, and other characteristics (number and type of companies and commercial businesses, etc.);

- education: total number of schools, school population (by levels), average schooling rate, percentage of literacy, characteristics of the schools and other educational centres, etc.;

- health: number of bars, taverns and other establishments where alcohol is sold and consumed; number of hospitals and other medical services;

- criminal system: police officers (in the country, in the area), number of policepersons per 10,000 inhabitants, total number of higher and lower courts, total number of lawyers, total number of correctional centres, inmate rehabilitation services, aid services for the victims of crime; mediation and reconciliation services; and

- community organisations by sectors (family, minors, drugs, etc.).

2.1.2. Crime

The classical instrument to measure crime in a country or in an area of a country is criminal statistics. However, the existence of a so-called "dark figure" which stands in place of certain crimes that are not reported, has caused some countries to switch to victimisation surveys; this instrument makes it possible to have a more complete knowledge of the real number of crimes committed.

Concerning criminal statistics, the following is suggested in order to compile data on crimes committed in a country (or in any of its areas), which will have been discovered by the police or reported to any of the criminal system agencies:

- use, above all, police statistics (which are closer to the offence committed) or, in its defect, those of the Prosecutorial Agency or the Judicial Branch;[2]

---

2   It would be advisable to indicate, beforehand, that some Central American countries either lack this type of instrument, or have compiled data that are insufficient and/or not too reliable; also, it may occur that the publication of such data is done after a long delay. Further-

- to the extent possible, use data for the past five years (for the country, for the selected area);

- examine only the 4-5 more frequent and/or serious offences (for the country, for the selected area);

- show how the perpetration of the offences selected has evolved over the past 5 years (in the country, in the selected area); and

- for the last year for which information is available concerning the previously-mentioned offences, indicate, with respect to the selected area, the data that relate to:

  √ the perpetrators of the offences (sex and age);
  √ their victims (personal and social characteristics, risk groups);
  √ modus operandi of the perpetrators (crimes committed single-handedly or as members of gangs, consumption of drugs or alcohol, use and types of weapons, etc.);
  √ areas or localities where the offences selected are most frequently committed;
  √ chronological characteristics of the offences selected (month, day of the week, time of day); and
  √ any other information which may be useful for a more efficient application of the action to be undertaken.

With the purpose of either completing information obtained from statistical sources, or obtaining it if statistical information is not available, the public opinion survey to which the next section refers includes a series of questions intended to obtain data on the real level of victimisation of the area's residents and, consequently, on the offences actually committed in those areas.

---

more, the definitions of the offences are not necessarily similar in all the countries involved in the Project.

2.1.3. The citizens' perception of insecurity

Usually, the actual presence of the crime phenomenon goes together with a feeling of insecurity by the population, which is concerned about its growth and consequences. We are dealing here, as has been already indicated, with two facets of the problem that do not necessarily coincide, and that warrant different responses or actions.

For an analysis of the citizens' perception of insecurity, a public opinion survey to be taken in the areas selected in each participating country has been provided for, in accordance with the following guidelines:

- use of a questionnaire prepared by the technical team of the IIHR on the basis of instruments prepared in other countries with ample experience on the subject, which appears as an Appendix;

- hiring of a specialised firm;

- since the Project constitutes an approach to the subject and, therefore, a first attempt intended to identify the main problems that exist in this field, a significant sample is not required;

- the sample could be comprised of up to 300 homes located in the selected area, and a representation by sex (men-women), age (youths-adults), and socio-economic situation should be sought.

2.1.4. State policies on citizen security

For purposes of identifying and describing the State's policies on citizen security as regards both, the criminal system, and aspects of the life of the society that may have an influence on the phenomena of crime and the citizens' feeling of insecurity

(the economy, health, education, housing, the family, etc.), the non-structured interview technique is expected to be used, since its objective is to complete with qualitative data, some of the aspects of the diagnosis for which only quantitative data will be available (crime, insecurity, victimisation, the criminal system, and civilian society initiatives on citizen security).

Five individuals of different ranks from each of the different institutions or organisations involved in the problem shall be interviewed, that is:

• the criminal system: policepersons, prosecutors, defenders, and judges;

• social aspects: individuals responsible for the economy, health, education, etc.

• the community: private enterprise, universities, NGOs.

The questions to be asked shall be of a general nature, and must correspond to the following subjects:

• on the basis of the questionnaire:

   √ main problems affecting the country
   √ crime
   √ victimisation and insecurity
   √ criminal policy

• concerning State policies related to the criminal system (adults, minors):

   √ on legislation
   √ on police matters
   √ on the judicial branch
   √ on correctional matters
   √ on crime prevention

√ on aid to the victims of crime
√ other aspects;

• on aspects that may have an influence on crime:

√ the economy (poverty, employment, etc.);
√ education (school programmers, the population's schooling rate, drop-out rate, etc.)
√ health (medical services, drugs and alcohol, etc.);
√ housing (policies of aid to construction, types of homes, etc.);
√ the family (childbearing policies, family aid programmes, etc.);
√ leisure or other activities (recreational, cultural, sports, religious and other services);
√ other

2.1.5. Civilian society initiatives on citizen security

The identification and description of these initiatives both, in the country, and in the selected area, will make it possible to keep them in mind for the preparation and implementation of the action plan.

2.1.6. Supplementary information

Some of the aspects dealt with in the preceding sections can be completed through the identification and analysis of treatises, books, articles, reports, and any other pertinent materials available.

2.1.7. Suggestions and alternative solutions

To conclude the diagnosis report, some alternatives for action should be identified; their strengths and weaknesses, as well as the possibility to implement them in the short, medium or long term should be determined.

2.2 Analysis and reporting of results

Once the information to which the preceding sections refer is compiled and analysed, the results of the diagnosis shall be presented in a draft report approximately 50 pages long (single-space), according to the following outline:

Introduction
I.   Methodology
II. General aspects of the country and the selected area
III. Crime
IV. The feeling of insecurity
V.   State policies on citizen security
VI. Civilian society initiatives on citizen security
     Conclusions and recommendations
Appendices (if applicable)
Bibliography consulted

3.   Discussion of the results of the diagnosis and preparation of an action plan

The results of the diagnosis made in each of the areas selected shall be submitted and discussed at a seminar, whose main objective shall be, on that basis, the preparation of an action plan; the plan shall be intended to solve the crime and insecurity problems detected in the diagnosis, and the identification of the human and material resources necessary for its successful implementation.

4.   Dissemination of the diagnosis findings

The findings of the diagnosis and the discussion held on the subject, shall be widely disseminated in the selected area and throughout the country, by means of pamphlets, announcements in the media, lectures, fora, and other similar mechanisms.

5. *Starting the preparation of a databank on crime and citizen insecurity*

Taking advantage of the opportunity offered by the preparation of the diagnosis, the process of creation of a databank on crime and citizen insecurity shall be started; this is of great importance for decision making in these sectors. During an initial phase said databank shall be established at the national level; however, the possibility to establish it at the regional level during an eventual second phase could be examined.

B. Implementation of the action plan

1. *Previous aspects*

The following must be taken into account for the implementation of the established action plan:

- the nature of the Project as a rigorously-evaluated pilot experience;

- recognition of the diagnosis findings as the indispensable basis for the preparation and implementation of rational action plans in the sector;

- use of the community-oriented police model, and the two types ("situational" and "social") of approach mentioned concerning crime prevention;

- the need to refer the actions to be undertaken both, to the Project's general objective, and to its main specific objectives;

- the need to refer such actions only to the selected area and to the offences identified in the diagnosis as being the most frequent and disturbing;

- the opportunity to select actions whose results may be obtained in the short, medium, and long terms; and

- the duration of the action plan, which shall be from six to eight months.

2. Activities

Although this component's modes of implementation shall be largely contingent upon the diagnosis findings, the following activities in each of the participating countries may be already foreseen:

- identification and training of the representatives of the official departments (particularly the police) and the civilian society who will participate in the plan, and determination of their respective responsibilities;

- holding, at the beginning of this phase, of a workshop on similar experiences carried out in other countries;

- organisation of an operational police structure in the selected area, that will be appropriate for the implementation of the action plan prepared;

- analysis and start of integrated actions that the civilian society may undertake with the purpose of intervening on the causes of crime, concerning the family, education, housing, health (which includes the problem of drug distribution and consumption), employment, the media, physical improvements in the area, aid for the victims of crime and released inmates, etc., and determination of priorities;

- start of police intervention (both, preventive and repressive), with activities such as patrolling (on foot and with motor vehicles), establishment of contacts and frequent meetings with businesspersons and community organisations,

information visits to schools and other educational centres, intervention at drug sales and distribution points, and arresting violators;

- discussion on and dissemination of the pilot experience findings, and discussion on the possibility to extend it to other areas of the country, by means of seminars (both, national and regional), and publications (pamphlets, announcements in the media, lectures, fora, etc.); and

- a final publication containing, among other things, the problems that characterise this subject matter, the methodology employed for tackling such problems, the activities carried out, the results of such activities, and the identification of future needs.

3. *Criteria for the determination of the actions to be undertaken*

For purposes of determining the actions to be undertaken during this phase of the Project, which should not be more than 15, if we take into account, as previously mentioned, its pilot-experience nature, its duration, and the need for its rigorous and realistic evaluation, priority should be given to strategies that will:

- correspond to the Project's (general and specific) objectives;

- permit specific, duly identified outcomes;

- show the adopted plan's indicators of success;

- establish the human, material and financial resources that are indispensable for its successful implementation;

- identify the participating institutions, organisations, groups and persons;

- take into account the short, medium and long-term results;

- support or complete activities in progress;

- permit its continuity once the Project is completed;

- self-finance themselves, or use local or national resources;

- focus on crime prevention rather than on crime repression;

- be youth oriented;

- contribute to the development of the current capacity of the civilian organisations involved, or to the creation of such a capacity; and

- determine a timetable for its implementation.

The implementation modes of such strategies may also be different from country to country.

4. Listing of possible actions

Once the criteria mentioned in the preceding section are considered, the identification of possible actions to be undertaken in the selected area should correspond fully to the entrepreneurial and imaginative capabilities of the participants in the seminar held to this effect, and be based on the diagnosis findings. For this reason, any listing of specific actions could inconveniently restrict, or at least reduce, those participants' creative efforts.

However, experience shows that, if no specific examples of actions possible are given, excessively vague actions or actions that are unfeasible in the short and medium term (for instance, legal reform, the eradication of poverty, or the improvement of the administration of justice) are usually proposed.

This is why it is deemed advisable to provide, as an example and only for orientation purposes, a listing of activities that correspond to the models and approaches that have been indicated on several occasions.

Before actually listing these items, an inter-institutional committee should be established that should, taking into account the diversity and number of institutions, associations, stakeholders and other persons involved, unite and coordinate the efforts thereof, respond to any problem that could arise in the course of the action, and evaluate its results.

4.1 The situational approach

- Adoption of individual protection measures (changing hours; avoiding dangerous places; not opening the door to strangers; installation of locks, grills and/or alarm systems; not carrying large amounts of cash; identifying and/or marking valuables, etc.)

- Establishment of collective protection measures (systems for communication and exchange of information among neighbours, patrolling by neighbours, etc.).

- Improvements in the area's lighting and cleanliness.

- Police intervention (both, preventive, and repressive), with the following main activities:

  √ patrolling on foot and at the most appropriate times throughout the most frequented places, residential areas, shopping centres, etc.;
  √ motorised patrols throughout the selected area, especially around the most conflictive or crime-ridden places, to ensure greater police visibility and protection;
  √ establishment of frequent contacts and meetings with residents, tradespersons, and community organisations;

√ information visits to schools and other educational centres;

√ intervention at drug sales and distribution points; and

√ arresting of violators

4.2 Social-preventive approach

- Organisation of the community concerning security.

- Establishment of local citizen co-operation networks or links.

- Dialogue, sensitisation, and legal education programmes, consisting of regular lectures and information to the community through the media, by specialists in subjects related to the problem (crime, insecurity, drugs, domestic violence, community crime prevention, criminal legislation, the criminal system, etc.).

- Inventory of local prevention resources (social groups, schools, churches, etc.).

- Identification and characterisation of local risk groups (potential offenders).

- Identification and characterisation of the main danger zones in the area (streets, parks or squares, bus stops, school surroundings, drug sales and distribution points, etc.).

- Encouragement of activities intended to reinforce self-esteem among risk groups, towards a greater social integration by their members (contests, shows, sports, successful experiences, etc.);

- Encouragement of self-help activities for risk groups to satisfy basic needs (employment agency, shops for learning trades, youth clubs, etc.).

- Establishment of networks of solidarity with the victims, and programmes of care and orientation for victims, which should start with the identification of the organisations that work in different fields (women, minors), and with study on the possibility to expand their mandate so as to cover certain issues that relate to the problem (sexual offences, domestic violence, etc.).

- Programmes intended to prevent the citizens from taking the law in their own hands.

- Initiatives intended to neutralise the risk of criminal action by youths (formal or informal organisations, training, establishment of points for the encounter between the community and youths).

- Programmes of support to social rehabilitation for convicts or individuals under prosecution.

- Programmes of aid to underprivileged families and to families in crisis situations.

- Programmes of family violence prevention.

- Prevention programmes on the use of weapons.

- Programmes to increase the possibilities to complete school studies successfully.

- Labour demand generation programmes in collaboration with the public and private sectors.

- Programmes for the prevention of alcoholism and drug addiction.

- Programmes for the establishment of recreational areas for youths.

- Programmes for the recovery of juvenile gang members.

- Programmes with the media for a better approach to the subjects of crime and citizen security.

- Prevention programmes combined with State institutions.

- Start or strengthening of relations with State institutions involved.

- Regular meetings with the police services.

- Citizen participation in police preventive activities (patrols, registration of weapons, disarmament, lectures at educational centres, etc.).

- Closer contact and coordination between the police, the community and other public institutions.

- Community evaluation of police activities.

- Characterisation of the presence/absence in the area of public authorities in charge of citizen security.

- Establishment of a data bank on crime, perpetrators, victims, risk groups, etc.

- Programmes of training to NGOs in prevention and security.

- Greater collaboration and coordination among NGOs concerning these matters.

- At the end of the programme, organisation of a march for citizen security.

C. Follow-up and evaluation

The implementation of the action plan shall be evaluated every two months, with the purpose of making the adjustments that may become necessary for a complex and novel plan. A final evaluation of said action plan as a whole shall be also made, including the repetition of the opinion survey made at the beginning of the Project.

The Programme's main indicators of impact shall be the results of the opinion surveys made at the beginning and at the end of it, as well as the results of the indications obtained from criminal statistics and the interviews with key persons from official institutions and the community. These data will make it possible, among other things, to verify whether or not the Project's objectives will have been accomplished.

IV. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This Project, whose conception focused on an integrated, *sustainable problem solving approach*, constitutes a *first approach* to the problem of human insecurity, and to civilian society participation in the solving of such a problem. For this reason, as well as for the subject's complex nature, it has been considered necessary to structure it as a *pilot experience*.

There are certain limitations that the Project will have to overcome, which include the following:

• the isolated manner in which the official bodies involved in crime prevention and repression have traditionally acted, since the integrated approach suggested requires, on the one hand, the joint intervention of all such bodies and, on the other, the participation of the civilian society for the same purposes;

- the lack of integrated and long-lasting crime-prevention policies in the countries involved; and

- deficiency and incompleteness, in most countries, of the mechanisms required for planning and information compiling and processing, which are indispensable for rational decision making.

The model proposed does not intend to change substantially crime rates in the short term, although it may accomplish this objective with reference to the feeling of insecurity and trust in the police and in the criminal system; however, its contribution may be considerable in the long term to reduce crime and improve the population's quality of life.

Part Four

GENERAL PROFILE

Objectives, results expected, activities, success indicators, verification means, and necessary inputs

Following is a description of the Project's general objective, its specific objectives (results expected), activities to be implemented, success indicators, verification means, and the inputs necessary for their implementation.

General objective: Initiate, in the form of a pilot experience, actions intended to provide sustainable solutions to the problem of crime and insecurity in Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, with the joint and coordinated participation of the official organisations involved, and the civilian society; and to strengthen any such actions thus far undertaken in Belize, Costa Rica, and El Salvador.

Results expected:

1. Identification, in the area selected of each participating country, of the problems related to crime and citizen insecurity, as well as of possible sustainable solutions to such problems.
2. Reduction, in said area, of the most serious and frequent forms of crime.
3. Reduction, in said area, of the citizens' feelings of insecurity vis-à-vis such forms of crime.
4. Improvement of the image of the police and the criminal system.
5. Encouragement and assurance of the civilian society's participation in the solving of the problems of crime and citizen insecurity.
6. Promotion of inter-institutional coordination on the subject of citizen security.
7. Initiation of the process of creation of a Central American databank on crime and citizen insecurity.
8. Assurance of continuity of the actions undertaken within the framework of this Project.

Result 1 expected: *Identification, in the area selected of each participating country, of the problems related to crime and citizen insecurity, as well as of possible sustainable solutions to such problems.*

Activities	Success indicators	Verification means	Necessary Inputs
1. Design of a methodological guide for the preparation of the diagnosis.	1. Design made and submitted to the Office of the Director of the IIHR, and to the local authorities involved.	1. Design approved by the Office of the Director of the IIHR, and to the local authorities involved.	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 weeks.
2. Training of national team members who will prepare the diagnosis and participate in other Project activities.	1. The national consultants are capable of preparing the diagnosis and carrying out the other activities assigned.	1. Evaluation by the Regional Coordinator and the Office of the Director of the IIHR.	1. Half-day workshop in each country. 2. Regional Coordinator: half a day. 3. One national consultant and one assistant per country: half a day each.

3. Preparation of the diagnosis.	1. Diagnosis prepared.	1. Draft reports of the national consultants. 2. Reports of the Regional Coordinator. 3. Approval of the reports by the Office of the Director of the IIHR, and the local authorities involved.	1. Regional Coordinator: 3 months. 2. One national consultant and one assistant per country: 4 months each. 3. One firm to take the public opinion survey: 6 weeks.
4. Organisation and holding, in each participating country, of two-day seminars to discuss the results of the diagnosis and prepare an action plan.	1. Seminars held (with 40 persons in attendance) and action plan prepared.	1. Reports of the Regional Coordinator.	1. Regional Coordinator: 10 days per country. 2. One national consultant and one assistant per country: 10 days each. 3. 40 participants: 2 days each.

5. Organisation and holding in a country to be determined, of a regional two-day seminar to compare the results of the national diagnoses and attempt a first regional approach.	1. Seminar held, with 50 persons in attendance (including five high officials from each participating country).	1. Report of the Regional Coordinator.	1. Regional Coordinator: 10 days. 2. 50 participants: 2 days each.
6. Publication and dissemination of the results of the diagnoses.	1. Publication of 50 copies and 100 pamphlets of each national report, and of 100 copies and 100 pamphlets of the regional report.	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation...	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 weeks.

Results 2, 3 and 4 expected:	Reduction, in said area, of the most serious and frequent forms of crime, and of the citizens' feelings of insecurity vis-à-vis such forms of crime, and improvement of the image of the police and the criminal system.		
Activities	Success indicators	Verification means	Necessary inputs
1. One-day workshops in each participating country, delivered by international experts for the presentation of experiences carried out in other countries.	1. Preparation, by the international experts, of a proposal on the experiences carried out in their countries. 2. Workshops held in each participating country, with 40 persons in attendance in each of them.	1. Reports of the Regional Coordinator.	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 months. 2. Three international experts: 20 days each.
2. Organisation, in the selected area of each country, of an operational police structure for the application of the action plan.	1. Installation, in each area, of an operational police structure.	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation.	1. Police personnel and resources to be determined.

3. Training in each participating country of previously-selected police officers and civilian society representatives for the application of the action plan.	1. Police officers and civilian society representatives trained.	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation.	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 weeks.
4. Advertising campaigns announcing the implementation of the action plan in the area.	1. Publication and dissemination in each area, of 100 pamphlets and announcements in the media (locally and nationally).	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation..	1. Regional Coordinator: one week.

5. Joint intervention in the selected area of each country.	1. Reduction of the offences selected. 2. Reduction of victimisation. 3. Reduction of the citizens' feeling of insecurity. 4. Improvement of the image of the police and the penal system.	1. Criminal statistics. 2. Second public opinion survey. 3. Second interview with key persons in the area.	1. Regional Coordinator: 6 months. 2. One national consultant and one assistant per country: 3 months each. 3. Police officers and civilian society representatives and resources to be determined.
6. Organisation and holding, in each participating country, of two-day seminars for submission and discussion of the results of the intervention.	1. Seminars held with 40 persons per country in attendance.	1. Reports of the Regional Coordinator	1. Regional Coordinator: 10 days per country. 2. One national consultant and one assistant per country: 10 days each. 3. 40 participants per country: 2 days each.

7. Organisation and holding, in a country to be determined, of a two-day regional seminar to compare the results of the action plans and establish the Project's follow up.	1. Seminar held, with 50 persons (including five high officials of each participating country) in attendance.	1. Report of the Regional Coordinator.	1. Regional Coordinator: 10 days. 2. 50 participants: 2 days each.
8. Publication and dissemination of the Project report.	1. Publication of 600 copies of the Project report (100 per country) and of 1,200 pamphlets (200 per country).	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluación.	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 months.

Result 5 expected: Encouragement and assurance of the civilian society's participation in the identification and solving of the problems of crime and citizen insecurity in the area selected of each participating country.

Activities	Success indicators	Verification means	Necessary inputs
1. Participation of the civilian society in the preparation of the diagnoses and in the implementation of the action plans.	1. 75% of the organisations and/or persons identified at the start of the Project maintain their participation in it until its conclusion.	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation.	

Result 6 expected: Promotion of inter-institutional co-ordination on the subject of citizen security.

Activities	Success indicators	Verification means	Necessary inputs
1. Establishment, in each participating country, of an inter-institutional committee to coordinate the implementation of the action plans	1. Committees established. 2. Regular meetings (whose frequency remains to be determined).	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation.	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 weeks. 2. Representatives of the institutions involved and the civilian society to be determined.

Result 7 expected: Initiation of the process of creation of a Central American databank on crime and citizen insecurity.

Activities	Success indicators	Verification means	Necessary inputs
1. Design of a generic databank model on crime and citizen security.	1. Design prepared and submitted to the Office of the Director of the IIHR and the local authorities involved.	1. Design approved and submitted to the Office of the Director of the IIHR and the local authorities involved.	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 weeks. 2. One international expert: one month.
2. Identification, in each participating country, of the data sources, and compilation and analysis thereof.	1. Sources identified. 2. Compilation and analysis made.	1. National consultant drafts. 2. Regional Coordinator's evaluation.	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 weeks. 2. One national consultant and one assistant in each country: one month each.

3. Organisation and holding, in one country to be determined, of a two-day regional workshop for the submission and discussion of the national reports on the databank and ways in which a Central American data bank could be established in the sector.	1. Workshop held with 40 persons (including five high officials from each participating country) in attendance.	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation.	1. Regional Coordinator: one week. 2. 40 participants: 2 days each

Result 8: Assurance of continuity of the actions undertaken within the framework of this Project.

Activities	Success indicators	Verification means	Necessary inputs
1. Publication and dissemination of the Project report.	1. Publication of 600 copies of the Project report (100 per country), and 1,200 pamphlets (200 per country).	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation.	1. Regional Coordinator: 2 months.
2. Determination of follow-up methods.	1. One regional seminar in a country to be determined, with 50 persons (including five high officials from each participating country) in attendance.	1. Regional Coordinator's evaluation.	1. Regional Coordinator: 10 days. 2. 50 participants: 2 days each.

APPENDIX

MODEL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

I. PROBLEMS OF THE COUNTRY

1. From the following list of problems, which, in your opinion and by order of importance, are the THREE MOST IMPORTANT ONES that THE COUNTRY has at this time?

Problems	Order of importance
01. Health	_____
02. Unemployment	_____
03. Housing	_____
04. Poverty	_____
05. Crime	_____
06. The cost of living	_____
07. Education	_____
08. Public corruption	_____
09. Loss of traditional values (i.e.: religion, family disintegration)	_____
10. Other (specify)	_____
99. DK/DA	_____

II. CRIME

2. In your estimation, has the crime rate increased, declined or remained the same in THE COUNTRY, over the past few years?

1. It has increased _____

2. It remains the same _____

3. It has declined (go to question 5) _____

9. DK/DA (go to question 5) _____

3. And IN THE AREA OR NEIGHBOURHOOD WHERE YOU LIVE, do you feel that the crime rate has increased, declined or remained the same over the past few years?

1. It has increased _____

2. It remains the same _____

3. It has declined (go to question 5) _____

9. DK/DA (go to question 5) _____

4. If your answer is that the crime rate has increased or remains the same, what do you believe the reason is for the crime rate increase or for its remaining the same IN THE AREA OR NEIGHBOURHOOD WHERE YOU LIVE? Indicate, by order of importance, THE TWO MAIN CAUSES.

01. Unemployment _____

02. Drug abuse _____

03. Alcoholic beverage consumption _____

04. Police ineffectiveness _____

05. Lack of severity on the part of judges _____

06. Lack of education _____

07. Loss of traditional values
(i.e.: religion, family disintegration) _____

08. Poverty _____

09. Deficiency of the law _____

10. Lack of severity in prisons   _____

11. Other reasons (specify)   _____

99. DK/DA   _____

5. In your opinion, which are, by order of seriousness, the THREE MOST SERIOUS OFFENCES that are committed IN THE COUNTRY?

Offences	Order of seriousness
01. Armed assault	_____
02. Street assault with intent to rob	_____
03. Rape	_____
04. Swindling	_____
05. Homicide	_____
06. House burglary	_____
07. Kidnapping for ransom	_____
08. Other (specify)	_____
99. DK/DA	_____

III. VICTIMISATION AND INSECURITY

6. During the past year, has any of the persons living in this home been the victim of any of the following offences? If she or he has been the victim of more than one offence, indicate each such offence.

Offences	Number of times
01. Armed assault	_____
02. Street assault with intent to rob	_____
03. Rape	_____

04. Swindling _____

05. Theft at the workplace _____

06. Homicide _____

07. House burglary _____

08. Kidnapping for ransom _____

09. Other (specify) _____

10. None1 _____ (go to question 16)

99. DK/DA _____ (go to question 16)

7. <u>If you have been, or any of the persons living in this home has been the victim of one or more offences,</u> where did this happen? (indicate the places where any of the offences mentioned before were committed)

01. In the house _____

02. In your neighbourhood _____

03. Near the workplace _____

04. Near the study place _____

05. On the bus _____

06. Other (specify) _____

99. DK/DA _____

8. In which month of the year did this happen?

01. January ___   02. February ___   03. March __

04. April ___   05. May ___   06. June ___

07. July ___   08. August ___   09. September ___

10. October ___   11. November ___   12. December ___

99. DK/DA _____

9. On which day of the week did this happen?

01. Monday ___ 02. Tuesday ___ 03. Wednesday ___

04. Thursday ___ 05. Friday ___ 06. Saturday ___

07. Sunday ___

99. DK/DA ___

10. At what time? (mark with an X)

1 a.m. 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 a.m.

13 p.m. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 p.m.

99. NS/NR ___

11. How many offenders were involved?

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 or more ___ DK/DA ___

12. Did you or your relatives report the incident to any authority or institution?

1. Yes _____

2. No (go to question 15) _____

9. DK/DA _____

13. If you or your relatives reported the incident, to whom, or to which institution was it reported?

01. The police _____

02. The Prosecutorial Agency _____

03. The courts _____

04. A human rights organisation _____

05. The media _____

06. Other (specify) _____

99. DK/DA _____

14. Which was the result of having reported the incident?

    01. The authorities did not do anything _____

    02. The authorities solved the case _____

    03. An investigation has been made _____

    04. Other (specify) _____

    99. DK/DA _____

15. If you or your relatives did not report the incident, why did you not report it?

    01. The authorities would not do anything _____

    02. It is dangerous (I am afraid of a reprisal) _____

    03. I did not have evidence _____

    04. It wasn't anything serious _____

    05. I did not know how to report it _____

    06. The place where I could report it is far away _____

    07. Other (specify) _____

    99. DK/DA _____

16. With reference to the PLACE (or NEIGHBOURHOOD) where you live, do you feel very safe, safe, not too safe, unsafe, or very unsafe faced with the possibility of being the victim of assault, burglary, battery or any other type of offence?

    01. I feel very safe _____

    02. I feel safe _____

03. I feel not too safe   _____

04. I feel unsafe   _____

05. I feel very unsafe   _____

99. DK/DA   _____

17. And, with reference to the COUNTRY in general, do you feel very safe, safe, not too safe, unsafe o very unsafe faced with the possibility of being the victim of assault, burglary, battery, or any other type of offence?

    01. I feel very safe   _____

    02. I feel safe   _____

    03. I feel not too safe   _____

    04. I feel unsafe   _____

    05. I feel very unsafe   _____

    99. DK/DA   _____

18. Have you taken any of the measures mentioned below to protect yourself from crime? If so, which?

Measures	1	2	9
	Yes	No	DK/DA
01. Installation of window bars or fences	—	—	—
02. Buying a watchdog	—	—	—
03. Installation of alarm devices	—	—	—
04. Hiring a guard	—	—	—
05. Asking the police for help	—	—	—
06. Buying a weapon	—	—	—

07. Getting organised with the
    neighbours   —   —   —

08. Other (specify)   _____

IV. PENAL POLICY

19. In your opinion, which should be, by order of importance,
the THREE MOST IMPORTANT GOVERNMENTAL AC-
TIONS with respect to crime?

Measures	Order
01. Increasing the severity of the punishment	_____
02. Building more prisons	_____
03. Creating crime prevention programmes	_____
04. Broadening inmate-rehabilitation programmes	_____
05. Increasing the number of police officers	_____
06. Improving economic conditions to prevent crime	___
07. Other (specify)	_____
99. DK/DA	_____

20. In your opinion, is the performance of justice system IN
THE COUNTRY good, fair, bad, very bad?

1. Good   _____

2. Fair   _____

3. Bad   _____

4. Very bad   _____
9. DK/DA   _____

21. Do you believe that the justice system IN THE COUNTRY
has improved, remained the same or become wore during
the past year?

1. It has improved   _____

2. It remained the same   _____

3. It has become worse   _____

9. DK/DA   _____

22. In your opinion, does the police in charge of your neighbourhood or area provide a very adequate, an adequate, a not too adequate or a not adequate at all service concerning the struggle against crime?

1. Very adequate   _____

2. Adequate   _____

3. Not too adequate   _____

4. Not adequate at all   _____

5. DK/DA   _____

23. Do you feel that the police patrols your neighbourhood or area very often, often, little, very little, never?

1. Very often   _____

2. Often   _____

3. Little   _____

4. Very little   _____

5. Never   _____

9. DK/DA   _____

24. Do you believe that the police violates human rights in the struggle against crime?

1. Always   _____

2. Almost always   _____

3. It depends   _____

4. Almost never _____

5. Never _____

9. DK/DA _____

25. Among the following institutions, which do you trust the most for your personal protection against crime?

    1. The army _____

    2. The police _____

    3. Private guards _____

    4. None _____

    9. DK/DA _____

26. Given the opportunity, would you be willing to collaborate with the justice system?

    1. Yes (go to question 28) _____

    2. No (continue) _____

    9. DK/DA (go to question 28) _____

27. If your answer is "no," which would be the TWO MAIN REASONS for you not to collaborate with the justice system?

    01. Too much red tape _____

    02. The procedures are unknown _____

    03. The law is unknown _____

    04. It costs too much money _____

    05. It doesn't do any good _____

    06. Lack of trust in the justice system _____

    07. Transportation difficulties _____

08. Fear of reprisals in the case of a crime   _____

09. Otras (especifique)   _____

99. DK/DA   _____

28. Do you agree or disagree with the intervention of armed groups outside the law (like the Death Squadrons), which eliminate offenders on their own?

    1.   In agreement   _____

    2.   In disagreement   _____

    9. DK/DA   _____

29. Do you agree or disagree that groups of neighbours from your neighbourhood arm themselves to combat crime on their own?

    1.   Agree   _____

    2.   Disagree   _____

    9. DK/DA   _____

30. Do you agree or disagree with the application of the death penalty?

    1. Agree   _____

    2. Disagree   _____

    9. DK/DA   _____

31. If you agree with the application of the death penalty, which offences would deserve the death penalty? YOU MAY MARK UP TO THREE TYPES.

    01. Homicide   _____

02. Rape _____

03. Swindling _____

04. Kidnapping _____

05. Street assault with intent to rob _____

06. House burglary _____

07. Other (specify) _____

99. DK/DA _____

32. Over the past year, which of the following institutions do you believe has violated human rights the most? YOU MAY MARK A MAXIMUM OF THREE

01. The Catholic Church _____

02. The Judicial Branch _____

03. The Government _____

04. The political parties _____

05. Public officials _____

06. The Army _____

07. The Police _____

08. The Human Rights Advocate's office
(or a similar agency) _____

99. DK/DA _____

33. And which has protected human rights the most?

01. The Catholic Church _____

02. The Judicial Branch _____

03. The Government _____

04. The political parties _____

05. Public officials   _____

06. The Army   _____

07. The Police   _____

08. The Human Rights Advocate's office
     (or a similar agency)   _____

99. DK/DA   _____

34. Some persons say that human rights protect more innocent citizens or the victims of an offence. Others say, on the other hand, that they protect offenders more. What do you believe?

1. They protect the offenders more   _____

2. They protect those who are innocent and
     the victims more   _____

3. They protect everyone equally   _____

9. DK/DA   _____

35. Thinking about the country a year ago, do you believe that the protection of human rights is better, the same or worse at this time?

1. Better   _____

2. The same   _____

3. Worse   _____

9. DK/DA   _____

V. PERSONAL DATA

36. Sex:

   1. Male   _____

   2. Female   _____

37. How old are you exactly? _____

38. Taking into account all incomes, what is
    your family's approximate monthly income? _____

39. Which grade did you pass last in school?

    01. None _____

    02. Elementary _____

    03. High _____

    04. Technical _____

    05. College _____

40. Are you presently employed?

    1. Yes _____

    2. No _____

41. Which is your occupation? _____

42. Number of persons who live with you in this house _____

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

It would be desirable for the firm taking the survey to indicate, on a drawing or map of the area selected, the location of the homes surveyed. This is of basic importance, since it would make possible the following:

- To find the effective victimisation locations (question 6), and those locations where a high insecurity feeling prevails (question 16), since generally they are different phenomena;

- to assess police presence (questions 22 and 23); and

- to establish differentiated action plans in specific locations of the selected area.