Deliberative Security: Policy Making for the Police Based on Deliberative

Dedy Tabrani

The Member of National Police Indonesia

ABSTRACT: The paper puts forward of approache which will help to promote Evidence Based Policy (EBP) in decision about of security policy.The aim of this paper is to identify lessons and approaches from EBP in developing democratic security. In a deliberative security framework, the policy formulation process not only emphasizes the protection and fulfillment of human rights, but also provides public space for society to be actively involved in the formulation and evaluation of policies in the security sector. This article uses the Evidence Based Policy (EBP) approach which to informs the policy process, rather than aiming to directly affect the eventual goals of the policy. Security is related to socio-political values and security is a process of negotiation and contestation, so a process involving society or deliberative security is needed.

KEYWORDS: Security, Deliberative, Evidence Based Policy, police

I.   INTRODUCTION

The idea of using evidence to inform policy is not new. In ancient Greece, Aristotle put forward the notion that different kinds of knowledge should inform rulemaking. This idea involve a combination of scientific knowledge, pragmatic knowledge and value-led knowledge (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Ehrenberg, 1999). Evidence-based policymaking (EBP) has gained political in the UK in the early 1990s.

So what evidence is appropriate to use as a basis for policy making? Evidence includes expert knowledge, published research results, statistics, consultations with stakeholders, previous policy evaluations, the internet, results from consultations, cost estimates of policy options, and output from economic and statistical modeling (Marston dan Watts, 2003). Another expert, Campbell emphasized that evidence can come from various sources and not always from research, in this case the evidence refers to the best current knowledge, but must be relevant, representative and valid (Davies,2004).

The use of evidence in policy making (evidence based policy) today is increasingly considered very important and has become a demand. One of the basic policy evidence that can inform policy is the results of research. The use of inaccurate research results in policy making can lead to policy failure. The paradigm shift in evidence-based policy making opens up great opportunities for researchers to participate in policy formulation through collaboration with policy makers.

In democratic countries, community involvement in policy formulation is necessary, including security policy issues. This is based on the assumption that the essence of security threats is threats to human citizens, rather than threats to government authority and sovereignty. Therefore, societal considerations need to be prioritized in the formulation of security policies. This means that the perspective of law enforcement and security politics must also be balanced with more empathetic approaches in placing all the richness and complexity of human experience into serious consideration: socioeconomic, anthropological, psychological, cultural, etc.

To answer the importance of community involvement in the security policy-making process, I use the term "deliberative security" to practice policy-making design for the police. In this sense, what I mean by deliberative security is a rational process of dialogue/participation (deliberate) in the dynamics and governance of the security sector.

The word deliberative comes from the Latin words "deliberatio" which means "consultation," "considering," or "deliberation." The concept of "deliberative" itself is a term adopted or extracted from the concept of thinking about how democracy is understood and implemented. In this case, the term "deliberative" has traditional roots as a discourse on deliberative approaches to democracy. Two important principles in deliberative security are democratic values and a security framework or system. Therefore, deliberative security seeks to integrate the basis of the security system on the dimensions of society and humanism.

According Chambers (2018), the origins of deliberative thinking on democracy can be traced to the tradition of deliberative democratic thinking which was first introduced in the 19th century by John Stuart Mill and John Dewey and further developments were introduced in the 20th century by Joseph Bassette (1980), Bernard Manin (1987), Joshua Cohen (1989), and John Rawl (1993).

Deliberative Security: Policy Making for the Police Based on Deliberative

At its peak, Jurgen Habermas (1996) was the main figure who brought the concept of deliberative democracy widely known through his monumental work published in 1992, namely "Faktizitas und Geltung," which was translated into English in 1996 with the title "Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy.

The deliberative approach to democracy is an approach that emerged from the debate discourse during the French Revolution between John Locke's tradition of liberalism and Rousseau's Radical Democracy (Bohman& Rehg, 1997). The liberalism tradition views the existence of the state through legal and institutional instruments as having the task and function of providing guarantees of freedom and security for society. On the other hand, in the tradition of Rousseau's thought, the state and law, in carrying out their function of realizing the general will of society, not only guarantee freedom and security through democratic laws and institutions, but the state can also demand commitment and sacrifice from society (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987).

One of the questions asked by adherents of deliberative democracy is how democratic legitimacy is built and implemented. Is democracy sufficiently based on a procedural democratic assessment or is it based on a rational and good political assessment, namely prioritizing facts in the interests of the people and not just procedural doctrine, oriented towards the future and the general interests of society? In this context, deliberative democracy offers the idea that democratic legitimacy is not only based on procedural democracy through institutional and legal instruments or decisions of the will of the community, but also on the extent to which the process of establishing democratic legitimacy takes place and is carried out. In other words, deliberative democracy emphasizes community participation in dialogical and synthetic decision making.

Based on the above, the concept of deliberative democracy requires several things, including:

First. Public area. A space where the private and public spheres are interrelated to articulate common problems. Therefore, public spaces require means to communicate information and opinions that enable society and the state to establish reciprocal communication. Public space makes it possible to give birth to a dialogical and synthetic process between society and the state through a communication system which is expected to function to force the political system to be sensitive to public problems (Habermas, 1985).

Second. Objective and Rational. procedures for democratically forming opinions and aspirations among citizens as a source of political legitimacy (Habermas, 1996). Rational discourse can be realized if it meets conditions, including: inclusive, free from coercion, and open or symmetrical. Objective and rational, oriented towards the interests of society and the long term.

Third. Accountability and Transparency. Political policy requires officials to openly explain the reasons for decisions taken to citizens, even if some citizens do not agree with the results of the decision-making process. Fourth. Impartiality and Pluralism. Political decisions are made by accommodating all opinions and assessments collectively based on impartiality, that is, arguments for political decisions that can be accounted for in the public sphere involving all interested parties equally or non-partisanly.

The basic assumption of deliberative democratic thinking is that there is a public space where political decisions can be tested and accounted for in front of society so that they are open to revision and criticism from society. In this context, a deliberative approach to democracy is expected to be able to realize what Morlino calls "quality democracy", namely a stable institutional order through institutions and mechanisms that function to create freedom and equality for citizens. In this case, quality democracy can only be realized when the three dimensions of democracy are implemented, namely 1) procedural democracy, namely the supremacy of law, participation, competition, accountability; 2) substantive dimensions of democracy, namely the rights to basic freedoms and conditions of equality in the social, political and economic fields; 3) the outcome dimension, namely the capacity of the political system to respond to citizens' questions (Morlino, 2011).

II. METHODE

The approach used in writing this article is qualitative with a descriptive analysis model. The theory used in this research is the evidence-based policy approach as a mechanism for identifying security policy processes that are capable of translating the principles of deliberative democracy into security policy.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This article offers a deliberative approach to the security policy making process. Deliberative security is a democratic security approach that involves citizens in a two-way conversation between security authorities and citizens. Therefore, it is first necessary to understand what security is and how security policies are established.

1. Security Concept

a. Security is related to socio-political values

In the constructivist approach, security is no longer understood philosophically as a situation free of dangers, but security as an 'idea of societal values' and a normative concept that is used universally with an affirmatively different meaning. Therefore, the term 'security' is no longer independent or objective, but security is related to political values; individual values and societal values. Security in this sense is the result of socio-political construction, namely a process of socio-political interaction in which social values and norms, collective identity and community traditions also influence security policy.

Deliberative Security: Policy Making for the Police Based on Deliberative

Constructivist thinking in security tends to be influenced by realism thinking in international relations. From this perspective, security is always intersubjective or security is what security actors create (Wendt 1992). Intersubjectivity in security places the state as the main actor in security. In other words, the state is a symbol of the security system which has the responsibility to create a sense of security for its citizens. From this perspective, the realization of security and prosperity can only be realized if the state appears as a Hobbesian monster (leviathan) that has absolute power and is feared by its citizens.

Therefore, there are two things that can be drawn from the approach to the security perspective. From a realist perspective, objective security can be achieved when the dangers posed by various threats, challenges, vulnerabilities and risks can be avoided, prevented, managed, overcome, reduced and adjusted by values that include the values of individuals, community groups, countries or regional international organizations. or global. From a constructivist approach, security can be achieved once perceptions and fears of security 'threats', 'challenges', 'vulnerabilities' and 'risks' are mitigated and overcome.

b. Security as a process of negotiation and contestation

The expansion of the security dimension to include aspects of security concepts and actors ultimately emphasizes the 'society' dimension which influences the state's perspective in interpreting security. Therefore, security policy will be greatly influenced by subjective assessments by security actors in defining what security is. In other words, security is a securitization process carried out by security actors against security objects and sources. From this perspective, security objects and sources are addressed critically, which gives rise to discourse regarding the expansion of security, widening security, deepening security, and sectorialization of security Günter, 2011).

In a policy context, security as a securitization process presents a process of negotiation and contestation between political actors and security actors in a country to determine the security policy agenda. In this case, the process of negotiation and contestation will give rise to a discourse battle about security among actors. In other words, security policy will be influenced by actors who are more dominant and stronger in determining the referent object for the political security policy agenda. Therefore, the security framework as a social construction process is a process of negotiation and contestation in articulating security discourse regarding reference objects involving various political and security actors. Thus, security policy will always give rise to a security policy dimension that is state-centric (Laswell, 1977).

2. Deliberative Based Security Policy

The use of deliberative concepts in security policy is an effort to create a security system governance framework that is not only focused on the idea of the state as the object and subject of security policy. In contrast, deliberative security seeks to make people's lives (societal security) the object and subject of security (referent object). Therefore, the deliberative security approach emphasizes the importance of always human-centred design in setting the security policy agenda. In other words, a deliberative security approach needs to take into account the complexity of human experience; social-economic, political, psychological, etc., as the basis for security policy formulation.

Therefore, it is necessary to analyze the stages or processes of security policy which are able to translate the principles of deliberative democracy into security policy. In the context of the policy process, there are many approaches in the public policy literature. For example, Lasswell (1977), the most common approach to the study of public policy, separates the process into a number of functional components, which include, among others: agenda setting, policy formulation, solution selection, policy design, policy implementation and monitoring, and evaluation. In general, the fundamental components of the policy process outlined in the literature on public administration include: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy making, policy implementation, and policy evaluation.

For the purposes of this paper, the functions of the policy processes are simplified into four categories: 1) Agenda Setting, 2) Policy Formulation, 3) Policy Implementation, and 4) Monitoring and Policy Evaluation. For each different part of the policy process, Iamm revise the work of Pollard and Court (2005) to outline some specific issues regarding use of evidence.

Table. 1. Components of the Use of 'Deliberative' in the Security Policy Process

Stage of the policy process	Description	The Use of Deliberative
Agenda setting	Awareness and priority given to an issue	Deliberativeness refers to the extent to which society is involved in identifying security problems. The key factor is determination Security issues are communicated to the public.
Formulation	There are two key stages to the policy formulation process: determining the policy options and then selecting the preferred option	The state's understanding of the security situation and the differences in security choices and decision making are always human-centred design or human security (societal security) in setting the security policy agenda.

Implementation	Actual practical activities	policies are implemented in accordance with policy design. Implementation of security policies by involving elements of society. For example, a community policing system or building police partnerships with the community
Evaluation	Monitoring and assessing the process and impact or an intervention	An objective monitoring mechanism involving elements of society

The table above illustrates the security policy cycle oriented to a humanitarian perspective (human security) which places humans or society as objects and subjects of security (referent object). In other words, deliberative security provides space for society to be actively involved in the formulation and evaluation of security policies.

In the context of security actors, the concept of deliberative security is developed from discourse on democratic security through the paradigm of contemporary security thinking; widening security, deepening security, and sectorialization of security. In the context of deliberative security, the meeting point of these three security ideas refers to a perspective that the concept of security no longer leads to the dominance of state security, but rather to the idea of human security.

IV. CONCLUSION

Security policy cycle based on deliberative refers to democratic community involvement in overseeing the policy cycle in the security or police sector through the stages of policy formulation; agenda setting, formulation, implementation and evaluation. From this perspective, deliberative security provides an instrument for open access to citizens who have the capacity to convey security arguments based on human security in every process or stage of security policy formulation. Meanwhile, the state's task is to create deliberative democratic values that are conducive to articulating a security framework.

REFERENCES

1) Brauch, H.G (2011), Coping with Global Environmental Change, Disasters and Security: Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, vol 5,Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Science & Business Media.
2) Chambers, S (2018). "The Philosophic Origins of the Deliberative Ideal," in Andre Bächtiger, John S. Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark Warren (eds), The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
3) Davies (2004) 'Is evidence-based government possible?' Jerry Lee Lecture, presented at the 4th Annual Campbell Collaboration Colloquium, Washington DC
4) Ehrenberg, J (1999) Civil society: the critical history of an idea, New York and London: New York University Press.
5) Flyvbjerg, B (2001) Making social science matter: why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again, Cambridge, UK: University Press.
6) Habermas, J (1985). The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. I: Reason and the Rationalization of Society Beacon. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985.
7) Habermas, J. (1996). Between Facts and Norm: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
8) Habermas, J. "Popular Sovereignty as Procedure," in James Bohman dan William Rehg, (eds), (1997). Deliberative Democracy:Essays on Reason and Politics. Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute.
9) Lasswell, H.D (1997), 'The Politics of Prevention', in Psychopathology and Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
10) Marston, G. and Watts, R. (2003). Tampering with the Evidence: A Critical Appraisal of Evidence Based Policy. The Drawing Board: An Australian Review of Public Affairs. 3 (3). 143-163.
11) Morlino, L (2011). Changes for Democracy: Actors, Structures, Processes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12) Pollard, A and Court, J (2005) 'How Civil Society Organisations Use Evidence to Influence Policy Processes: A literature review', ODI Working Paper 249, London: ODI.
13) Strauss, L and dan Cropsey, J. (1987). History of Political Philosophy. Chicago and London; The University of Chicago Press, 1987.