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ABSTRACT

The prevention of narcotics crime is a crucial problem in Indonesia. Dealing with a complex and multi-layered narcotics distribution network, it is not easy to control the drugs market. This study investigates the efforts to prevent narcotics crime through the Community Policing approach, namely by involving the community. Through the concept of governmentality, the study found that narcotics crime prevention needs to distinguish various types of communities involved. The research proposes three different models. When coping with deprived neighbourhoods, narcotics crime prevention goes beyond "disciplining others" (governing others). As such, it also involves the actions of "governing the self." Community policing needs more than collaborating with the anti-narcotics community since the problems are related not only to awareness of "anti-narcotics". In fact, it also deals with the roots of social problems in an area.
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INTRODUCTION

Many studies suggest that modern policing must involve the community, namely through Community Policing, to reduce crime, prevent crime, reduce fear and resolve problems in society (Uchida et al. 1992; Eck, 1995; Weisburd and Eck, 2004; and Ranzzoni, 2015). However, research related to the application of Community Policing approaches to prevent narcotics crime has yet to gain its traction. This study attempts to elaborate Community Policing as endeavour to suppress narcotics crimes in a region.

The concept of community policing requires police to proactively cooperate with various elements in the community. Community policing is defined as "a policy or strategy that aims to obtain more effective and efficient results in controlling crime, reduce fear of threats of crime, improve life quality, and improve police services and police legitimacy through proactive independence, based on community resources to change conditions contributing to crime ")(Friedman, 1992:21). In other words, Community Policing is policing activities in the form of collaboration between police and the community, to identify security problems or disruptions and ways to resolve them. Community policing can be viewed as an organizational strategy geared to prevent environmental crime and disruption, as well as a policing philosophy inherent in every police function (Reksodiputro, 1996; Meliala, 1999; Chrysnanda, 2005; Sutanto et al., 2016:36).
Through the concept of Governmentality from Foucault (1988:19), this study explores how the community responds to Community Policing efforts, particularly in a metropolitan deprived neighbourhood, which is otherwise known as “Kampung Narkoba” (the Narcotics Village), namely Kampung Ambon Cengkareng, Boncos Palmerah and Tangki Tamansari, all of which are situated in West Jakarta.

The concept of governmentality plays an important role in the Foucault's analysis of power, for several reasons (Lemke, 2000:3). First, it offers a perspective that goes beyond the concentration of power, both as consensus and violence. Secondly, it connects technology of the self with technology of domination, which emerges between the composition of the subject (citizen) and the formation of the state. Third, it helps to distinguish power and domination.

Governmentality can be seen as an arrangement in society, which is formed through a long historical process in the West, resulting in a modern state (Administrative State) as it is known today (Foucault in Burchell, et. al, (Eds), 1991:102-3). In a modern state, the government no longer controls its citizens through coercive power techniques, courts, or law enforcement, but through persuasive, discourse-based and productive aims. It is therefore interesting to see how the concept of governmentality is applied in the context of community involvement in the prevention of narcotics crime, through community policing, because it certainly calls forth certain power relations, both structural and relational (Anderson, 2005).

This research was conducted in the West Jakarta police area, known as the biggest narcotics market in Indonesia, as evinced by the highest circulation rate (Machfud 2013). Community Policing for the prevention of narcotics crimes in West Jakarta has been carried out since 2006 through numerous initiatives, one of which is by creating Anti Narcotics Artist Communities and Anti-Narcotics Entertainment Venue Management Communities. Then in 2014 the idea of Community Policing was developed through the Door to Door System (DDS) program. The activities were carried out by paying regular visits to residents' homes, construction of police posts and skills training involving several public agencies and private companies aimed at reintegrating social ties and improving the welfare of citizens. However, in fact the circulation of narcotics is still relatively high in areas where Community Policing is carried out.

Implementing Community Policing is admittedly not easy inasmuch as many factors determine its success (Friedman, 1992). Moreover, preventing narcotics crime in deprived neighbourhoods such as "Narcotics Village" is complex. This is even more so in areas where people tend to be tolerant of the circulation of narcotics in their environment, and even some of them depend their lives on narcotics, either directly or indirectly. How does Community Policing respond to such complex and severe challenges?

Foucault understands power as something that exists and comes from everywhere at all times; power is not an institution, structure, or property (1978:93). This notion is different, for example, to Gramsci’s idea which analyzes power in the context of ideology, or a network of hegemonic forces, where power arises in the order of hegemony due to relations in terms of binary opposition, such as leaders and leaders, rulers and rulers and so on (Daldal, 2004:149-50). Power in Foucault's view is a relation. Furthermore, power relations are divided into three types: strategic games between free parties, government technology, and conditions of domination. He said that “we must distinguish the relationships
of power as strategic games between liberties – strategic games that result in the fact that some people try to determine the conduct of others – and the states of domination, which are what we ordinarily call power. And, between the two, between the games of power and the states of domination, you have governmental technologies” (Foucault 1988: 19). That is, the government (or rather, government technology) lies between "strategic games" and "domination". How can this view of power relations explain Community Policing, especially in the context of preventing narcotics crime? This is the focus of this research.

**NARCOTICS CRIME AS THREAT TO COMMUNITY**

Illegal drugs are not just a crime, but also a business affected by economic principles, namely supply and demand (Machfud, 2013). Indonesia is in a strategic position in trade traffic, thus evoking a great opportunity to narcotics market along with its trajectory. Indonesia is a great market with potentially great price. It is a great market because Indonesia is the fourth largest population in the world after China, America and India. Great price occurs because the price of narcotics in Indonesia is regarded as the highest, compared to other countries, which is indicated by the prices in Indonesia being higher than those at world level by 200 percent (Siswandi, 2011:143-145). This substantial price difference causes the swift flow of narcotics into Indonesia. In addition, the emerging market opportunities and being a transit country can also be seen from corrupt country because its officers can be bribed and the legal rules are weak (Trumbore and Woo, 2014; Boivin, 2014).

Illegal drugs has become a global threat. The global expansion of narcotics crime activities since the 1990s generated the distribution of around 300,000 tons narcotics per year, which quadrupled to 1.4 million tons in 2001 (Naim, 2005:77). This is due to the lenience of legal instruments and various technological conveniences in globalization, so that drug trafficking becomes faster, more efficient, and easier to conceal. The expansion of the narcotics market by an international narcotics syndicate is supported by several factors, such as easy transactions in trade sector, easy distribution of goods and services, easy human mobility throughout the world, currently large demand for narcotics, free trade, global financial system, and the advance in transportation and communication(Nitibaskara, 2001:144-145).
The highlight of the chain in narcotics circulation is the producer group (Figure 1). In the case of Indonesia, most producers are overseas, namely those who are interested in trading narcotics in Indonesia, given the wide disparity in prices in comparison to market prices in other countries. Indeed, there are also some narcotics producers in the country (Indonesia), but the number is relatively small and limited to certain types of narcotics that can be produced easily. In the next layer lies big dealer who is a major figure in narcotics distribution who controls the market and extensive sales network. Some of them have been arrested and sentenced to prison, but are still able to control the circulation of narcotics in their networks.

"We cannot map the network, but from a number of large cases revealed, the origin was from prison. But actually [those in] prison are also intermediaries even though they control awareness ... The biggest network and those who control it are actually from abroad ... From abroad, then they contact their intermediaries in Indonesia, and contact the networks in prison that already have links outside the prison. And these links take the "goods" and then circulate them with the control of the employer in prison... "(DA, Head of Sub Directorate of Narcotics at the Directorate of Narcotics at the Jakarta Metropolitan Police, 1 March 2018)"

The head’s statement confirmed the dealer network scheme created by the author. Community Policing is basically not dealing directly with the first layer (producers) or the second layer (big dealer), but with the communities, especially those infected with narcotics. Within the community, there is a network of distributors consisting of small dealers, retailers, couriers, and users. These communities are integrated into the local environment, such as in Kampung Ambon and Tangki, or in the form of groups that are somewhat separate from the general public such as the nightlife center for workers.

The West Jakarta area has an area of 12,615.14 Ha, and is known as a business center, as well as a nightlife center in Jakarta. The level of urbanization is high for there are many workers and migrants. As
a corollary, it is fraught with numerous crime factors (criminogenic). The narcotics distribution center can be divided into two groups. First, there is Narcotics Village, which is a number of vulnerable locations in West Jakarta, namely Ambon Cengkareng Village, Palmerah Boncos and Tangki Tamansari. Kampung Ambon has a long history as the center for drug trafficking. Currently it is home to around 2,000 families, with many possessing kinship ties.

At first, the police found it hard gaining the access to enter the area, because of hostility from the community. Police investigations were often hampered because the residents covered each other and the perpetrators had some hiding spots scattered among people's homes. Tangki Village, Tamansari, is not formed by kinship ties, but rather by the circulation of narcotics protected by economic interests, namely the business continuity of the owners of nightclubs, hotels, stalls, street vendors, boarding houses and other service businesses that support residents' life.

Second, the nightclub, where drug trafficking goes hand in hand with the entertainment business, is substantial to the distribution of narcotics. Some examples of one-stop entertainment concept include discos, karaoke, cafes and SPA (massage with sex service) in one location, such as Malioboro, Alexis and Crown. The nightclub concentration in one area re-enlivened the city (as Tamansari and its surroundings) in the evening until now (S, manager of nightclub, May 16, 2018). Police officers cannot just enter targetd locations and did the search, unless they obtained the permission from the superior and coordinated with management. Though the circulation of narcotics in entertainment centres, actually the distribution of narcotics continues through a system involving visitors and the "Inside dealer". This system works in tandem with business owners. Interventions can only be carried out by top-level officers, such as the Sector Police Chief (Kapolsel), or other officers at the police station.

THE FAILURE OF POLICE RESPONSE

The police in the West Jakarta have been attempting to suppress drugs crimes in various ways. First, they deploy the hot-spot policing approach, which is mapping vulnerable areas. The analysis of circulation pattern and narcotics network made three vulnerable locations under the spotlight, namely Ambon Cengkareng Village, Tangki Tamansari and Boncos in Palmerah. In this case, the police applied a repressive approach, namely through going undercover, building a network with informants, searching and arresting, and legal proceedings against the perpetrators. Second, they implement the approach to the community. It was realized that repressive actions alone were insufficient, because the resistance of narcotics networks collaborated with residents. Therefore, the police combined a repressive approach and the so-called Community Policing approach. This can be seen from the monthly work target, namely 50 (fifty) cases for repressive initiative and 10 (ten) activities for pre-emptive one. Third, they carry out counseling activities (also known as Binluh) especially informing the dangers of narcotics, discussion with the community, community empowerment, and dialogical patrol. These three approaches were carried out for Ambon Village and Tangki Village. As for the Boncos Urban village, only the repressive approach was carried out, because the location was previously a garbage disposal area, not a community residential area.

In Kampung Ambon, the police built an Integrated Post to establish relations with the community. Various activities are carried out such as counseling, skills development and community sports. The
existence of the Integrated Post was proven successful in reducing residents' hostility towards the police, so the officers were not afraid anymore to enter Ambon village, as what happened before. In Tangki village, the police succeeded in mobilizing several anti-narcotics groups, such as the Anti Narcotics Artist Community, the Anti Narcotics Entertainment Management Community, Citra Bhayangkara, and so on. The aim was to make it easier for the police to control the circulation of narcotics in entertainment centres.

However, the police response in suppressing narcotics crimes has proven to be ineffective. The data obtained from a short half-month operation in 2017 in West Jakarta, named Operation Nila Jaya, showed that the police revealed 67 involving 87 people. This data illustrated that narcotics crimes in West Jakarta still had high intensity and were evenly distributed in every place, even though Community Policing activities have been carried out.

Table 1. Nila Jaya Special Operation (conducted from 15 to 29 November 2017)

| NO | Work Unit                              | Crime incidents | Number of Suspects |
|----|----------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1  | Departmental (resort) Police           | 29              | 34                |
| 2  | Sectoral Police of Metro Tamansari     | 6               | 9                 |
| 3  | Sectoral Police of Tanjung Duren       | 3               | 5                 |
| 4  | Sectoral Police of Cengkareng          | 5               | 6                 |
| 5  | Sectoral Police of Kalideres           | 5               | 5                 |
| 6  | Sectoral Police of Kembangan           | 2               | 2                 |
| 7  | Sectoral Police of Palmerah            | 3               | 4                 |
| 8  | Sectoral Police of Kebon Jeruk         | 5               | 7                 |
| 9  | Sectoral Police of Tambora             | 9               | 15                |
| TOTAL |                                      | 67              | 87                |

Source: Data from West Jakarta Metro Police Resort, 2018

Based on interviews and observations, there are various factors that hinder the effectiveness of narcotics crimes prevention held so far, especially through Community Policing. These factors appertain to the following issues:

1. Community response denoted a camouflage or was manipulative in nature. The community response of Narcotics Village and the nightclub community to Community Policing was oftentimes camouflage or manipulative attitude. They acted cooperatively with police officers, but actually it was done to disguise the illegal activities they did, so they were not monitored, and the officers consequently had to take the required action.
2. Narcotics were a part of the business: for managers of night live centres, Community Policing for prevention of narcotics crimes is contrary to business interests. They limit themselves in cooperating with the police, only to prevent common crimes, such as fighting, internal theft, or embezzlement by employees. But with regard to the circulation of narcotics, they are reluctant to forbid it because it is considered part of employees’ responsibilities in serving their guests "(S interview, manager of the night club Mahkota Tamansari, West Jakarta, May 16, 2018). In addition, there was a system involving inside dealer and outside dealer, where the manager only prevented drug trafficking by Bandar Luar (interview S, investigator at West Jakarta Police, May 17, 2018).

3. Participants had diverse objectives. Community participation in anti-narcotics communities was motivated by a variety of motives. On many occasions, they aimed only to strengthen personal legitimacy in the eyes of the public. For example, many members of Citra Bayangkara who had personal goals in this membership, for example, desired to be the head of the neighborhood association, control the street stalls, and take charge for other economic purposes (interview Y, chairman of Citra Bayangkara, March 14, 2018).

4. Integrated post was ineffective. The presence of integrated posts in Kampung Ambon was proven ineffective because it was not supported by changes in environmental design which could otherwise reduce the chance of drug trafficking (interview S, Head of Narcotics Metro West Jakarta Police, February 26 2018).

5. Operational constraints were at play. The police faced limitations in Community Policing partly because repressive activities took precedence over resource allocation. Various Community Policing activities were not effective because they were not carried out continuously, coupled with the lack of support and high-quality personnel, limited budget, ineffective network of cooperation and coordination of institutions, and weaknesses in community empowerment as well as environmental management involving the city government.

These issues point out that Community Policing in narcotics-prone areas such as Kampung Ambon and Tangki village has not been effective in preventing narcotics crime. Friedmann (1992:21) explains that Community Policing means crime as a phenomenon produced by social factors, which practically cannot be fully controlled by the police. As such, it is necessary to collaborate with community members as individuals and groups. In addition, Community Policing is not solely focused on crime, but also deals with improving the life quality of community. Three interrelated elements in Community Policing involve citizen involvement, problem solving in the community, and decentralization of decision making to the lower level. These three elements have not worked effectively for the case of Narcotics Village, especially because the police still put repressive efforts ahead of Community Policing.

Wright (2002:143) defines Community Policing as a set of specific techniques implemented by the police and the community to work in a partnership at the local level. It is concrete efforts to promote community justice and social control by mobilizing social resources within a certain group of people. In the context of narcotics crime, justice and social control are more difficult to define, especially because the circulation of narcotics is seen as an (illegal) business considered beneficial for some citizens. Therefore, the partnership was not successfully carried out, and the aim of preventing narcotics crime was not achieved.
Organizing communities to engage, participate and support Community Policing is not easy. Some members of the community still consider order and security to be police matters, not their business. Somerville (2009:261) argues that Community Policing will be successful if it rests on the structural compatibility between the police as an organization and the initiative of organizing the community itself, as two separate systems (self-organizing system). The weaknesses of Community Policing for the prevention of narcotics crime in West Jakarta represents the lack of public awareness to cooperate with the police. Citizens as individuals and groups still see Community Policing as a police interest, not their fundamental interests. As in the case of Community Policing in Tangki village, people who were involved in Community Policing turned out to have their own interests, which had nothing to do with the purpose of preventing narcotics crime itself.

Aitken et al. (2002) explain that narcotics control strategies in developed countries always rest on three inseparable components, which comprise of reducing demand, reducing supply reduction, and reducing the impact on addicted users (harm reduction). The police mainly work on the supply reduction component, in the sense of trying to ward off and prevent the network of dealers from offering narcotics in an area. Through Community Policing, the police tried to incorporate the demand reduction component, in the sense of campaigning for the dangers of narcotics, expecting that no more people would become entangled in narcotics consumption and become a new market for drug trafficking. In addition, the police also collaborate with other institutions, especially biofuels and health institutions, to deal with the aspect of harm reduction, which is treating narcotics addicts through the rehabilitation process.

The findings of this study show several obstacles which make people reluctant to involve themselves in preventing narcotics crime. First, economic dependence on income earned from narcotics circulation has been at play, both directly and indirectly. Although people in a community understand the dangers of narcotics and the severity of the threat of punishment, the relatively large income from their involvement in the narcotics distribution network (plus the difficulty of finding an alternative job or source of income) encourages them to take risks. Those who are not directly involved are reluctant to help the police because of insecurity or fear of reporting people with whom they interact everyday (neighbors, friends, or even relatives).

Second, the power of narcotics networks drive someone involved in it to remain in the circle, especially for safety reasons. If such a person is involved in Community Policing, then his involvement only reaches the level of pretense or camouflage. It could even be that they play a role in helping the distribution network, by taking information, recognizing police strategies, and allowing the dealer network to adapt.

Third, dependence or addiction makes it difficult for someone to nullify the need for narcotics. In other words, they depend on the network of dealers to get their needs. If they are involved in Community Policing, the bio-power is more powerful than is their awareness as participants in preventing narcotics crime. Not infrequently they return to using narcotics, because of the influence of the addiction or association with fellow users.

Given these challenges, community Policing as a means of preventing narcotics crime cannot easily achieve its objectives, due to the various characteristics and factors described above. The application of the Community Policing for the prevention of narcotics crimes must take into account such obstacles,
which are not found in other types of crime. Community policing in the context of demand-reduction deals with supply-reduction, or harm-reduction, requires an understanding of police-community relations, as a form of governmentality, dealing with drug trafficking networks as an (illegal) business. For this reason, a more effective policing model is needed, so that narcotics crimes in an area can be overcome and prevented.

DEVELOPING AN EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY POLICING MODEL

The researcher followed up on the findings of the abovementioned studies by developing a more effective policing model, namely through data mining with the Delphi technique. The Delphi technique aims to get expert opinions about a social phenomenon in consideration of a policy (Mustofa, 2013:237). Through this Delphi method, it is expected to find a reliable consensus from experts by means of in-depth interviews interspersed with feedback from the opinions of experts themselves (Mustofa, 2013:238). In this study, the Delphi technique involved three academic experts and three competent officials; a public policy expert, a criminologist, a police science expert, West Jakarta mayor, the Director of the Metro Jaya Regional Police Binmas, and the chairman of the Provincial Narcotics Agency (known as BNP). The aim was to obtain opinions, opinions, suggestions, analyzes, and/or arguments from competent experts and officials in order to build a more effective model of Community Policing in preventing narcotics crime. The implementation of the Delphi technique was carried out twice.

Table 2. The Result of First-round Delphi

| No | Issues                | Questions                                                                 | Core Principles                                                                 |
|----|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Institutional network | Is political policy that regulates the relationship between various authorities in preventing narcotics abuse really necessary? So that prevention of narcotics crime is not only carried out by authorized legal institutions. | Prevention of narcotics crimes requires cooperation and a strong institutional network, because it deals with a complex network of dealers and sometimes classified as organized crime |
| 2  | Environmental management | What are the policies of the local government in the regulation of urban environment and business arrangements for nightclubs to ensure that they are conducive to preventing narcotics crime? | Good layout and environment will help reduce vulnerability and criminogen potential in an area |
| 3  | Community policing    | How should the community policing program be implemented and the development of a community policing strategy by the Police to ascertain that later on it can support the prevention of narcotics crimes? | CP is an effective and efficient policing model, but requires special effort in ensuring its effectiveness |
|   | Power relations | Relationships in community policing allow reciprocal access to control between the police and the community, which in turn can lead to relations and contestation, and this can have negative or positive implications. How can such negative implications be prevented? | Power relations between the police and the community must be placed in the appropriate context; different for example between CP in a settlement with CP in a nightclub |
|---|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | Accountability  | How can accountability be built in various power relations so they can prevent irregularities in each institution or community?                    | Supervision in CP is necessary to make sure that accountability and transparency are well established in the process of police and community cooperation |
| 6 | Repressive efforts | Crime prevention is sometimes ineffective because crime keeps recurring, especially from actors who originate outside the community’s domain.            | A repressive approach is needed in affected communities, but in a community free from narcotics the pre-emptive approach is used |

In the first Delphi, several basic principles were obtained, which illustrated the weaknesses of police efforts in suppressing narcotics crimes, especially in vulnerable areas (deprived neighbourhood). Experts emphasized six aspects which needed to be taken into account in addressing narcotics crime, as shown in Table 1. The results of the first round of Delphi showed the need for strong institutional networks, environmental management, application of Community Policing, police sensitivity to applicable power relations, accountability, and more selective and accurate implementation of repressive actions. The relationship between concepts can be shown as in Figure 2, which demonstrates that each element is basically interrelated.

Also, the results concluded that the police were still focused on achieving targets (disclosure of cases), as a standard measure in police organizations, so that they were more directed at repressive measures such as searches, pursuit of perpetrators, arrests, filing cases, and attempts to dismantle or cut drug traffickers. Although repressive efforts were extremely pivotal in order to suppress and limit the movement of perpetrators of narcotics crimes, the effects were often only short-term. Every repressive action taken by the police was taken into account by narcotics dealer networks, by adjusting their operational tactics, changes in sales techniques and circulation locations, efforts to bribe law enforcement officials to secure business, and various other responses which kept narcotics crimes flourishing.
The expert discussion in the second Delphi concluded that the Community Policing model to prevent narcotics crime did not need to be uniform. It was better to develop models that specifically addressed the needs of the community according to the characteristics of the region and the varied level of problems of narcotics crimes in each region. In general, models of Community Policing can be developed in three different categories, depending on target communities. These included communities affected by narcotics, nightclub communities, and communities free from narcotics. One reason was that the power relations that developed in these three categories were not different in that each had a different power relationship. As a corollary, it called forth different approach in Community Policing. In summary, the details can be seen in Table 3.

The first Community Policing model is devoted to communities infected with narcotics. In communities infected with narcotics, such as Ambon, Tangki, and Boncos villages, power relations have been instilled by a network of narcotics dealers through their agents, including distributors, small distributors, retailers, and users. The power of the dealer network lied in the economic value of the products they traded illegally, as well as the need and dependence of the community on sources of income obtained from the circulation of narcotics, both directly and indirectly. Therefore, the Community Policing model in such places had to answer the social problems with which the community grappled.

The actions required include the followings: (1) providing an alternative source of income to replace the income obtained from the narcotics trade, including providing training, additional skills, capital and business opportunities, and various other economic empowerment activities; (2) strengthening anti-narcotics discourse in order to overcome the power of narcotics discourse as an economic commodity, namely through education, anti-narcotics campaigns, health education, improving the quality of life, religious teaching, and so on. These supports change people's attitudes and behavior; (3) improving spatial planning and social environment in order to reduce the effect of criminogens on the community, both those who have been infected with narcotics and those who have not; (4) restoring narcotics addicts through comprehensive rehabilitation, taking into account environmental, family, social groups, schools.
and so on to ensure that the perpetrators remain away from abusing narcotics.

Table 3. The Result of Second-round Delphi

|   | Model I (Infected Community) | Model II (Nightclub Community) | Model III (Narcotics-free Community) |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Issues | Strong power relations have been instilled by drug trafficking networks through their agents, including distributors, small distributors, retailers and users. | Circulation and use of narcotics in THM becomes an inseparable part of the night life itself | Displacement effect occurs, in the form of transfer of narcotics circulation locations to areas that have been considered clean of narcotics |
| Challenges | The Model of Community Policing in Narcotics Village must answer the social problems that have permeated the community due to the widespread circulation of narcotics | The Community Policing Model for the nightclub community must take into account business and lifestyle factors that encompass nightlife, to limit the space for the network of narcotics dealers | Community Policing must actively detect and identify changes in the pattern of narcotics circulation, when displacement effect emerges, and prevent and deter the effect so that narcotics-free communities do not turn into narcotics-infected communities |
| Actions | 1. Providing and developing alternative income sources 2. Strengthening anti-narcotics discourse dealing with the power of narcotics discourse as an "economic commodity" 3. Improvement of spatial planning and social environment to reduce the effect of criminogenic on the community | 1. Repressive actions and law enforcement must inevitably be carried out on the nightclub community, so that there is no impression of omission or "unauthorized permission" to the circulation of narcotics in nightclub. | 1. Providing stronger resilience and deterrence to the community, as a form of joint vigilance between the police and the community 2. Paying attention to, detecting and identifying market expansion efforts |
The second model is aimed at nightclub community. The problem with the nightclub community is that the circulation and use of narcotics is an inseparable part of the nightlife itself. For nightclub managers, it seems as if there is a synergy of interests between the nightclub business and the distribution network, so it is difficult to expect them to be serious in the anti-narcotics movement. The Community Policing Model of the nightclub community must therefore take into account business and lifestyle factors associated with nightlife, with the aim of limiting the space for the network of narcotics dealers. Repressive actions and law enforcement must inevitably be carried out on the nightclub community, to ensure no impression of omission or "unauthorized permission" to the circulation of narcotics in nightclub.

The supervision strategy for the nightclub community can be done through the Panopticon surveillance, which is a form of supervision in which supervision is carried out discontinuously but leads to a continuous effect (Foucault, 1972-1977:148-152). The police panoptic arena in nightclub includes: (1) parking lots, where continuous supervision tasks are delegated to security guards and parking attendants; (2) karaoke rooms, nightclub and toilets, namely supervision carried out with the help of employees and managers of entertainment venues; and (3) The area around the entertainment area, which is a wider area wherein supervision is assisted by surrounding community. If these panoptic arenas are effective, the presence of officers is only in the form of guidance, control or supervision. At certain times, police can randomly carry out operations in the form of searches on the spot and visitor urine tests to strengthen the surveillance effect. The aim is to monitor visitors and their relationships. The police can also conduct indirect supervision, which is creating a deterrent effect by placing a police patrol car complete with rotators that live in the front yard of entertainment centres, or by making it a regular patrol route.

Third, the Community Policing model for communities free from narcotics. Communities free from narcotics are often forgotten in prevention programs for narcotics crime because they are considered invulnerable to the risk of narcotics crime. Despite high frequency, when a community is infected with narcotics suppressed by repressive actions by the police, a displacement effect often takes place, namely the transfer of narcotics circulation locations to areas free from narcotics. This means that the same narcotics distribution actors will move their activities to other places so that their illegal business continues. If left unchecked, it is very likely that areas or communities previously considered clean will become exposed to narcotics and turn into a community infected with narcotics, thus becoming a new social problem. Therefore, Community Policing must actively detect and identify changes in the pattern of drug trafficking when their displacement effect occurs. It also needs to ensure that narcotics-clean communities not transform into narcotics-infected communities. This means that Community Policing in
these communities is considered substantial in order to prevent the spread of narcotics crimes. Community policing in such places must effectively provide stronger resilience and deterrence to the community, as a form of joint vigilance between the police and the community.

The concept of Community Policing has so far developed with a variety of new models, which try to adapt this idea to better suit the needs in the field. One of the latest concepts is governance-based policing or so-called "governance-based policing" (GBP). According to Ferrandino (2012:52), GBP aims to encourage the policing process to pass the controlling phase, to the management phase, until finally it reaches the enabling phase, which is the phase where the community is able to independently prevent threatening crimes security and order in a region, as well as being able to bear the burden of social problems in the environment (self-help).

The principles of GBP include policing as a network, cooperation in the public and private sectors, emphasizing the negotiation process and persuasion among participants involved, actualizing empowerment skills, focusing on community independence (self-help), and its characteristics as an open system. The GBP concept helps Community Policing achieve its effectiveness in crime prevention. In a narrower sense, GBP concept is a constructive criticism toward the policing carried insofar to cope with its weaknesses, as revealed in this study.

GOVERNMENTALITY AND NARCOTICS CRIME PREVENTION

In order for Community Policing to reach the enabling phase, cooperation and partnership must be based on governmentality. According to Foucault, governmentality is considered to be the most effective condition for regulating modern society. In this respect, the practices of power are related to guidance, namely forms of self-government, which structure and form areas of action that may be carried out by subject/citizen. The concept of power as "guidance" does not exclude forms of consensus or the return of violence in society. This concept only underlines that violence or consensus is reformulated as ways of governing between one person and another, so that its nature is "element" or "instrument", not "foundation" or "source" of power itself (Foucault 1982:219-222). Simply put, governmentality is a dynamic view of power and adapts to the changing social context in society.

If applied in the prevention of narcotics crime, governmentality can be interpreted as formal regulatory mechanisms through "government administration", as well as regulation through self-control, family guidance, education and formation of the human soul, and so forth, each of which is very comprehensive. In other words, the prevention of narcotics crime does not only involve legal disciplines, criminology, and public administration, but also includes philosophy, religion, medical science, pedagogy, psychology, and so on. Community policing thus cannot be seen as limited as a formal collaboration between the police and "anti-drug communities", but all efforts that involve broad "the conduct of conduct" (Foucault in Burchell, et al., (eds), 1991). That is, Community Policing must include practices of "self-discipline" (governing the self) and "disciplining others" (governing others), in order to prevent narcotics crimes in an area.

The three models abovementioned portray different power relations in various types of communities, therefore calling forth context-bound modification to each approach. Particular attention must be paid to the deprived neighbourhoods of "Narcotics Village", presuming that narcotics is not merely a matter of violation of law, but also economic problems, environmental regulation, regional
image, and various social problems that accompany high levels of urbanization in the region. Prevention of narcotics crime through Community Policing thus must involve the city government, health services, schools, skills and business training, religious institutions, and so on. These are expected to help solve the social problems that trigger narcotics crimes in the region.

Repressive approaches are carried out through searches, pursuit of perpetrators, arrests, filing cases, and attempts to dismantle or break the network of narcotics dealers. This is part of the act of "disciplining others" (governing others), namely forcing the public to comply with regulations that prohibit narcotics abuse. The pre-emptive approach through Community Policing is to include actions "self-discipline" (governing the self), where the community is empowered to be able to supervise, control, and direct its own behavior, so that it does not abuse narcotics or depend on the narcotics business as a distributor, retailer, courier, and so on, involving narcotics dealer networks.

The findings of this study indicate that people are still afraid or reluctant to be involved in preventing narcotics crime. The stigma of narcotics crime as a serious and dangerous crime makes people tend to be afraid and reluctant to report, provide early information, or help the police to limit the circulation of narcotics in a region. Furthermore, there are several obstacles for the community to play a role in preventing narcotics crime, as found in this study. First, the development of narcotics crimes within a certain geographical scope (Narcotics Village) is supported by social ties, even kinship ties, so that the perpetrators can hide and disguise their activities by mingling in the community. On the contrary, those involved are also reluctant to report, for fear of being threatened with safety and because of the intimacy with the perpetrators.

Second, narcotics crimes can also develop in random and loose communities, such as the nightclub community, where criminals can mingle with people who have the same needs or hobbies in the community. Circulation of narcotics is obscured by night entertainment activities, making it difficult for the police to keep suspect under their radar. Community involvement in the nightclub context is also difficult to establish because the community is loose, and narcotics are still considered part of night entertainment activities.

Third, one of the important community involvements in the prevention of narcotics crime is through attention and reports concerning addicts. Drug addicts are more easily detected by their closest family than outsiders, so the family is actually a source of accurate information about narcotics addicts. However, until now it is still rare for families to take the initiative to report to the police, so that addicts can be given treatment and rehabilitated. Addicts are generally only discovered after dealing with the police, for example being caught in an operation. There are various factors that prevent people from reporting their families who become addicts. At some point, this results from the ignorance or lack of information, so they worry that their family members will be punished, instead of being subject to treatment. The other assumption is that because they are still anxious about the stigma of narcotics crime. These people are presumably embarrassed to report their family members who are known to be addicts. It may also be due to unprofessional police services to provide security, lowering public confidence and trust in the police. As a consequence, people are reluctant to rely on police services to deal with family members who become addicts.

The concept of Community Policing requires role, participation, and active involvement of the community, not just the initiative of police officers. Even in the concept of governmentality, it is the
citizens who become the main actors in Community Policing, namely by increasing their independence and their ability to self-help and self-governing. The community needs to be given the confidence to supervise narcotics crimes in their territory, help victims (narcotics addicts), nullify the space for the network of dealers, and help the police to disclose every narcotics dealer movement.

CONCLUSION

The concept of governmentality can be seen as a criticism of the perspective of Community Policing, which has emphasized cooperation at the formal level, namely the relationship between police and "communities" formed in a community. In the prevention of narcotics crime, for example, Community Policing only emphasizes police cooperation with anti-narcotics communities. Even though the problems at hand are not just campaigning for awareness of "anti-narcotics", finding the roots of social problems that cause narcotics crimes to flourish in an area is another important concern.

Governmentality also offers a new perspective, presuming that prevention of narcotics crimes must be carried out simultaneously between "self-discipline" (governing the self) and the act of "disciplining others" (governing others). Community policing which only emphasizes governing others, without touching the governing self, will hardly achieve its objectives, especially for narcotics crimes that are faced with the power of a network of complex and multi-layered traffickers. The police are not only dealing with perpetrators of crimes in a region, but also taking issue with the resistance from a network of dealers, which is a big business. Price disparities, weak supervision, the ineffectiveness of the legal system, and various other factors have caused Indonesia to become an easy target and encourage producers to distribute their narcotics into Indonesia. What is more, in the long run, the police cannot battle the power of the distribution network on their own, unless they involve the community, which in the broadest sense is known as Community Policing.
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