

CAMPUS POLICING:

An Ethnography of the University of Cape Town Campus Control Unit

by

Lashias Ncube

University of Cape Town

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a Masters Degree in Practical Anthropology

The University of Cape Town has been given the right to reproduce this thesis in whole or in part. Copyright is held by the author.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

CONTENTS:

Abstract

INTRODUCTION

page 1

Campus Control and the baggage of history
The diversity of Campus Control Work
The Study

CHAPTER 1

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION OF CAMPUS CONTROL PRACTICE

page 8

Why participant observation
The ethnographic experience
Limitations of the data collected

CHAPTER 2

DEMYSTIFYING CAMPUS CONTROL - A POLICE FORCE OR SERVICE INDUSTRY?

page 20

Campus Control and the crime-fighting image.
The disparate range of non-crime aspects
The role of the private security companies.

CHAPTER 3

REFLECTIONS ON SOME CASE STUDIES

page 28

Burglary at Rondeberg Flats
The Baxter Confusion
The Forest Hills Shooting

CHAPTER 4

CAMPUS CONTROL AND THE MULTIPLE DISCOURSES OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.

page 39

The Student Protection Service.
The role of the community liaison officer
Reactive vs Proactive Policing

CHAPTER 5

CAMPUS CONTROL TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT

page 47

The Investigators' course
Crossing Boundaries
Blacks in Campus Control
The police mirror model

CONCLUSION

page 58

RECOMMENDATIONS.

page 59

ABSTRACT

The aim of undertaking the project was to investigate the activities of the University of Cape Town Campus Control unit. The study is based on the premise that there is an underestimation of Campus Control work. A number of basic questions were examined in the field. The researcher sought to determine, among other things, the extent to which the unit's work is invisible, and the extent to which the university community's reported ambivalence and indifference to Campus Control practice a result of a lack of clarity regarding the role of the unit within the university. The research also moved from the premise that there is too great an emphasis on the use of crime statistics as indices of the unit's effectiveness. The racial and gender configuration of assignments was also investigated as was the training offered to new and old recruits.

Participant observation as a body of different methods and techniques of research was used. The researcher spent six weeks in the field with the campus control officers in order to experience the demands of policing from "the native's point of view".

The unit is in the process of transforming. It seeks to embrace the discourse of community participation with a view to getting the entire community involved in the provision of its own safety and security. The community involvement initiatives are also designed to improve the relationship between the unit and the community. In the past, the relationship has been a very traumatic one, fraught with mistrust and had far reaching consequences for the unit's performance.

The study comes to the conclusion that both women and blacks in Campus Control are a case of structural marginality. The unit does not reflect the racial and gender composition of the community it serves. It was also discovered that some of the unit's glaring shortcomings are played out in the sphere of training.

The study should help members of the university community to understand and appreciate the role of this indispensable unit within the university community.

INTRODUCTION

On 2 December 1985, the University of Cape Town Campus Control Department came into existence with an initial staff complement of 36. The process of initiating the transition from contract to proprietary security began with the founding of this unit with a view to providing for the security of the university's valuable assets and the lives of its community. This indispensable unit stands out as the only university department that operates on a 24 hour basis, patrolling a total of 130 buildings scattered over 80 hectares of land.

Some people will reflect on the history of Campus Control with mixed feelings, some with repugnance, others with ambivalence or fond memories depending on how their lives were respectively touched or affected by the activities of Campus Control. A decade later the unit finds itself having, inevitably to transform again. This transformation means that the unit will have to espouse democratic values and embrace the discourse of professionalism required for the policing of a pluralist society. A process of redefining the philosophy of community protection is in progress. The objective is to promote the participation of all the sections of the university community in the delivery of their own safety and security with a view to creating a "user-friendly" and people oriented policing apparatus.

Bowser argues that the "voices attendant to community protection are extremely dynamic in nature and as such are likely to be addressed effectively when approached as an on-going holistic process than as individual issues for which solutions are shaped" (1994, p.4). He argues that solutions as complex as providing for the security of a university community are more likely to be effective when "evolved from within the institutional community than when imposed by external forces" (p.4).

The University of Cape Town is part of a broader society undergoing change. This change is painful for some and as such has been marked by extreme conflict and unabating violence. Because guns were allowed to proliferate, South African society is highly militarised, leading to crimes of a

violent nature. The bald fact is that UCT is part of a country with the unofficial and unenviable title of "crime capital of the world". Given this background one can safely say that UCT is not a sanctuary from the outside world of crime and therefore the problems attendant on the national policing apparatus certainly apply to Campus Control.

The university is faced with increasing demands from its community to respond more effectively to astronomical increases in crime on campus. This study attempts to show how these fears and anxieties about crime translate into demands for Campus Control services. Assumptions that crime is a major social problem that reflects a malaise in the university social structure predominate. As a matter of policy, the university is committed to a weapon-free campus. In a move congruent with this policy, the Vice Chancellor, Dr Stuart Saunders has gone on record as saying that he will ask the University Court to expel any student found in possession of a firearm on campus. This message went up recently on posters all over campus.

In a related development, the university recently instructed Campus Control to withdraw the firearm storage facility at Burnage, the Campus Control headquarters. The facility was previously offered to students, staff and visitors to UCT. The decision by the University Council has not gone down well with some of the Campus Control officers. Prior to this decision some officers used to bring their own firearms to campus when they reported for duty. Furthermore, they resent the fact that they were not consulted when the decision was taken.

Whatever the reasoning behind the withdrawal of the facility I believe that it is naive to think that because of the absence of such a facility people will simply stop bringing their firearms to campus, In fact they will do what others have always done - stop declaring them at Burnage.

Campus Control and the "baggage" of history

The history of Campus Control does place a heavy burden on attempts to forge a new relationship with the rest of the university community. The relationship has been fraught with antagonism and mistrust. There was a great mistrust of Campus Control by black students in the 1980s (The Equal

Opportunities Research Project Report 1995) for reasons explicable in historical terms given the deep-seated and well-founded suspicions of the policing apparatus in this country. Attitudes have not altered much and there is a considerable danger that Campus Control officers have been and will continue to be painted with the same brush as the state police. Students and other have thus developed their own accumulated common-sense assumptions about Campus Control practice. Some of these perceptions have been largely shaped by the decisively negative coverage the unit received over the years from the official student newspaper, Varsity.

The past continues to haunt Campus Control with far reaching consequences for present practice. The unit is now perceived by the rest of the university community and the officers themselves as a separate and peripheral community. Campus Control is therefore faced with the daunting task of having to overcome harsh public perception. It must be said however, that criticism of Campus Control, though often justified, only adds to what is already a thankless and stressful job made worse by lack of variation and incentives.

A paradigm shift is required. There is overwhelming evidence to suggest that the current ineffectual policing of university crime is not so much a result of inhibiting factors and resources as Campus Control management would like to us to believe, but a result of an ill-conceived policing discourse.

The diversity of Campus Control work

The discourse of Campus Control is broader than the objectives and principles espoused in its formal rules and Standing Orders. An understanding of the social world of Campus Control should therefore be informed by its formal and informal discourses, by both policy and the actual ways of doing.

The regulations governing Campus Control practice give the officers a certain amount of latitude for the exercise of their discretion. The definition of what constitutes an "emergency" or "minimum force" is left to the individual officer, so is the decision when to use handcuffs because "unless absolutely necessary handcuffs are not to be used on students and staff" (Campus Control Standing

Orders, p. 12). In fact, most of the officers' work is dominated by cases requiring the use of discretion; dealing with loud music and noisy parties, controlling rampaging crowds, and other petty nuisances such as dealing with drunks and minor "domestic disputes".

Campus Control functions extend beyond the detection of crime. This study explores the leading twin functions of the organization - a service industry or a police force? Officers also perform some unmethodical tasks however, underrated. Official crime statistics often used as an index of the level of criminal deviance in the university population and also as a measure of Campus Control effectiveness fail to capture some of these aspects of officers' work. A mass of Campus Control work is invisible and cannot be reflected in the statistics. Moreover, statistics do not show the ways of doing which are crucial to the assessment of any performance.

A lack of appreciation for Campus Control work is also due to the obscurity of the unit's proper province. The role of Campus Control is not understood by many within the university community. It is my contention therefore, that in the absence of a clear definition of the jurisdiction of Campus Control, a useful assessment of how they perform their duties is not possible and as such all uninformed accusations of Campus Control incompetence should be discredited or, better still, nullified.

"Us and Them"

There is a process of othering within Campus Control. The relationship between patrol officers and their managers has been dichotomised into "us and them". A most recurrent theme in the officers' accounts is their impassioned condemnation of the management. There is a consistent air of frustration in their accounts as they accuse their managers of not taking them seriously and making arbitrary decisions. Because of this the officers are demotivated and their morale is on the wane.

The gulf which exists between the managers and the patrol officers is largely due to a difference in orientations. The patrol officers depict the reality of policing on the ground while on the other hand the managers try to project to the community an acceptable formal by-the-book policing discourse.

Before I went out on patrol with the officers to witness what actually happens in practice, I had an interview with the Head of Campus Control and documents governing practice were recommended and made available for my perusal. The idea was to get a clear picture of what is **supposed** to happen in Campus Control practice before going out to confront the **reality** in the field. The notion of the discrepancy between policy and practice is one of the central issues of this study.

Some factors impinging on Campus Control practice

Providing for the security of UCT is always going to be difficult for a plethora of reasons. Campus Control officers do not enjoy the same status as the state police. They do not have the powers of a police officer. Unlike their United States counterparts they are not "authorised by statute to pursue beyond the confines of the university all perpetrators of crime when the offence has occurred within their jurisdiction" (Grierson 1994, p.4)

Campus Control problems are further compounded by the physical layout of the university. Much of the university is situated on public streets and most university facilities are open to the public. This has significantly influenced the style of security measures and policing employed by the university. Since it is virtually impossible to control access to the university, the trend has been to control access to buildings rather than the perimeter of the university. However, observations during the fieldwork showed that students staying in residences with controlled access, notably Baxter Hall and Groote Schuur Residence, give their non resident friends the secret codes thus compromising the effectiveness of this security measure.

One of the traditional goals of policing is to establish a sense of omnipresence (Bowser, 1994). The physical layout of UCT makes this goal impossible to achieve. The university has various satellite academic and residential facilities notably, Clarendon House, Liesbeeck Gardens, Medical School, Hiddingh Campus, among others. Consequently it has been difficult for Campus Control to establish a high profile presence in these places either through vehicular or foot patrols.

The Campus Control milieu is inherently dangerous. Officers regularly face life threatening situations. The outcome of some of the encounters with the people officers seek to control is not predictable and there is always the potential danger of sudden attack, verbal abuse and provocation. One officer admitted that in the face of blatant provocation "one needs to control his temper", even if it means walking away from the scene to avoid tempers from flaring up. It became evident during the course of the study that students verbally abuse Campus Control officers. The former are allowed to get away scot-free while the latter have no recourse.

The officers expressed concern about their safety. This stems from what they perceive to be inadequate equipment in the face of the violent crimes they encounter on and in the immediate vicinity of campus. Many are in favour of being armed. Going this route is in my opinion myopic as it fails to take into account the knock-on effects of such a development. I firmly believe that arming the officers will simply lead to a reciprocal development on the part of the criminals. The officers will only make themselves more vulnerable by carrying firearms. They (officers) will be heading for a sanguinary showdown with the gun-crazy, trigger-happy criminals who will simply delight in outgunning the officers should they try to stand in their way. The move is likely to further alienate and exacerbate the already poisoned relations with the university community, especially the students.

While some may equate firearms with competence and a reassuring presence, others will not be amused by the sight of armed officers on campus. I am bound to come under severe criticism from the officers and some of them will probably accuse me of betrayal particularly after they expressed to me unambiguously their desire to be armed. The officers' argument must be seen in the context of a society that is constantly being fed a diet of violent news; armed car-hijackings, burglaries, stranger and acquaintance rape. All these are reasons in favour of stepping up security.

The study

The study is based on the premise that there is an underestimation of Campus Control work. A number of basic questions were examined in the field, viz:

- * to what extent is Campus Control work invisible?
- * to what extent is the university community's reported ambivalence to Campus Control practice a result of a lack of clarity regarding the proper province of the unit?
- * is there too great an emphasis on measuring performance which is statistically oriented?
- * is there an underestimation of the non-crime aspects of Campus Control work?
- * the relevance of Campus Control training.
- * the racial and gender composition of Campus Control.
- * the racial and gender configuration of assignments.

Justification for this research is found in the fact that students and other members of the university community are both victims as well as perpetrators of criminal activities. Contrary to popular opinion, UCT, like any other campus in South Africa, is not a sanctuary from the outside world of crime.

CHAPTER 1

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION OF CAMPUS CONTROL PRACTICE

Research Procedure

On 22 January 1996 I met with the Head of Campus Control, Mr Doug Grierson, to discuss my research proposal. He suggested that I could find it useful to read Campus Control Standing Orders and two other reports, one by himself, a product of his visit to the United States where he had gone to study college security systems there. The other report is an evaluation of the UCT Campus Control Department by Mr Bowser, Director of Public Safety at Spelman College, Atlanta.

I was granted blanket permission to observe all the aspects of Campus Control work that I deemed relevant to my research. The head of the unit also sent e-mail messages to all his shift supervisors notifying them about my impending visits and requesting them to ask their officers to co-operate with me and assist where necessary. The communication of this message downwards was the first pointer to an institution which stresses the importance of observing its chain of commands.

We scheduled another meeting for January 25, with a view to discussing the issues arising out of the reports which had been suggested and made available for my perusal. In addition, I needed the interview to help me get an idea of what is supposed to happen within the unit (formal policing discourse), before I could go out into the field to witness for myself what actually happens in practice. The notion of the discrepancy between policy and practice is one of the central issues in this research.

Initially I was worried that the timing of the research would not be ideal (mid-January until the end of February). However, although the period chosen is not representative of the conditions under which the unit operates throughout the year I discovered that it is also arguably the busiest time of the year for the unit, with lots of parties and other activities planned for the Orientation Week. In

hindsight, I think I was in the prime seat to observe some of the most interesting aspects of Campus Control work.

On my first day out with the officers I was taken on a tour of the physical layout of the Campus Control jurisdiction. Campus Control headquarters are at Burnage, lower campus, and the unit has control rooms at all the other major and satellite campuses.

It was entirely left to me to decide which officers I wanted to accompany on their tour of duty. I had a bias towards the mobile patrol unit because they also acted as the response unit, attending all the scenes of crime and other disturbances. I also gave added weight to the night shift (8.30pm - 6.30am) because the unit's activities are comparatively higher at this time than at any other time of the day. Most of the time we waited at the Burnage control room for requests to come through and then responded. We also went out on routine patrols at designated times to designated places.

My role was to observe and document the manner in which the officers carried out their duties, the levels and nature of the intervention, and the kinds of cases attended. A starting assumption of this project was that performance measurement which is statistically oriented fails to take into account the skills demonstrated and the energies expended in each case, especially in handling tense situations. It was also assumed that certain aspects of Campus Control work are underestimated and underrated. In addition I intended to show how the community's anxieties and fears about crime actually translate into demands for Campus Control services.

Why participant observation?

"When you want to know what people actually do, however, there is no substitute for watching them or the traces their behaviour leaves behind" (H Russell-Bernard, 1988, p271).

The discourse of Campus Control work is broader than the objectives and principles espoused in the unit's Standing Orders and some of the documents which regulate its practice. The job involves some degree of autonomy and the use of some discretionary powers. This means that while certain

actions are recorded as required by procedure, officers may also do a great deal of work that is known only to the people on the scene and no one else. Analysis of Campus Control work requires a period of sustained participant observation to reveal much about the hidden agenda which determines many aspects of practice. Officers are therefore more inclined to deviate from the formal policing discourse as a result of a wide range of unwritten regulations about certain aspects and the way activities should be handled in practice. Participant observation made it possible to reveal the hidden efforts and the invisible mass of Campus Control work. Normally these aspects of the unit's work happen and are performed away from the public gaze and are not accorded the same status by the community as high profile patrols. These desultory tasks are often underrated and officers don't get any credit for them. Some of these activities do not fit into the classifications that exist for them to be recorded or they do not fall under the formal jurisdiction of Campus Control.

Through participant observation, it was possible to explore the cultural baggage which Campus Control acquired overtime and how it is sustained. Through this method, or rather body of methods, I was able to gain considerable insight to the nature of the problems attendant to the delivery of safety and security at UCT. I was also able to observe the manner in which the officers carried out their duties, the energies expended, the skills displayed and all other things which cannot be reflected in statistics.

The advantage of using participant observation lies in its elasticity. The method is not standardised. In fact, it is not a single method, but a combination of methods and techniques, ranging from informant interviewing to document analysis. Because of its open-ended nature discovery was maximised. The method allowed me to experience the demands of campus policing from the "native's point of view", to understand the officers' frustrations and to share the stress of the job with them. As a participant observer I was able to subject the unit to intense scrutiny. In addition, the behaviour of officers was treated as sources of data and yielded unsolicited information which is only acquired through participant observation.

Informants

Informants were a key source of data. Many items of evidence in this report consist of officers' remarks to me about themselves or others or about something which happened to them or their colleagues. These statements were usually parts of casual conversations and were made independently by the officers. Some were, however, direct responses to my specific questions. At times I deliberately took a stance and decided to play the devil's advocate by asking challenging questions such as; "From what I gather, you people are well paid and you probably shouldn't complain?", as opposed to "Do you think you are well paid for your services?" The idea was to encourage debate rather than just invite an affirmative or negative response.

I regarded the officers as my co-ethnographers because their years of experience working for Campus Control brought a wealth of insight into the inner workings of the unit. Their subjective and personalised accounts, although taken with a pinch of salt, were invaluable. The unit was founded long before the formulation of this study, therefore there was the obvious need to complement my observations with those of the officers who had been on the scene long before my arrival. It was also not possible for me to be at two places at the same time. The fact that the unit operates on a 24-hour basis was further justification for using officers as co-ethnographers. I relied on them to keep me up to date with what was going on in other parts of campus and in my absence.

Some officers were recommended to me as "data banks" for possible interviewing because they were thought of as the best qualified to talk about certain issues for one of two reasons. They were either the longest serving members of the unit or were directly involved in the events in question. I also relied on the officers to give context and meaning to what I was observing, interviewed them about their interpretation of the events, how they felt, and what was going through their minds during some of the major breath-taking interventions. Most accounts by officers were replicated by their colleagues, confirming their validity as sources of data and helping to define the recurrent themes.

Document analysis

Campus Control Standing Orders and other documents regulating practice helped to shape my understanding of the unit's formal policing discourse. In addition, some crime reports made in my absence were made available for my perusal to keep me abreast with what was going on within the unit. The notice-board was also full of instructions for Campus Control, coming from all sectors of the university, from heads of academic departments to sports administrators. Minutes of meetings posted on the notice-board were also a useful source of information.

Assessing my role

Defining my role in the unit's prestige structures was crucial. I assumed the role of an ordinary patrol officer. This role guaranteed me access to information on the ground. The role determined where I could go, whom I could interact with, and what I could observe. Assumption of this role was most strategic for obtaining information crucial to my research. In this surrogate role I was not only accepted by the officers themselves but was also able to achieve self-expression.

Initially, some officers were not sure of my role. Some thought I was a spy for the unit's management. Statements such as "Can I be straight with him John", and, "Shall I tell him everything", characterised my early relationship with some of the officers. However, as time progressed the role I preferred prevailed and rapport was established.

However, I also put the officers in awkward situations where they felt that they had to defend my presence at some of the scenes. They endured the abuse of rowdy drunk students for allowing me access into places I would not normally be allowed to go into as an ordinary student. In one instance I accompanied an officer to Baxter Residence, a female housing unit. It was after midnight and no male students are allowed in after this time. A student from this residence had asked Campus Control to cut her pad-lock because she had misplaced her keys. There was a sizeable number of male students standing at the access controlled door and wanting to take advantage of this moment to force their way in. The officer stood his ground and nobody was allowed in amid

accusations of favouritism and corruption because he allowed me to go in with him. This incidence was a reminder of the student role I had temporarily forfeited. I had nothing to show for my adopted role. The uniform the officers wore made all the difference and was a constant reminder of our different roles.

Some ethical issues

I battled with myself as to whether recording information by and about disputants and other recipients of Campus Control services did not constitute an invasion of their privacy and space. It raised the question as to whether the blank cheque permission granted by the head of the unit actually sufficed and gave me the right to observe the unit's clientele as well. The very fact that I was observing and documenting people's tragedies and miseries for academic purposes and for the sake of research also made me feel uncomfortable. In some instances I felt that overt note-taking on the scene was just not the right thing to do.

Burnage Control Room

Hanging out at Burnage was a very fruitful way of gathering data. People phoned and came in person to Burnage to request Campus Control services. Most importantly, officers retreated to the control room after each major intervention to write up the reports. However, activities here were dominated by officers reflecting on the just-ended interventions, how they could have been carried out differently, how things could have been different had a different gun been used, etc. This regurgitation process was a useful way of collecting data and filling up the gaps left as a result of the shift in attention on my part during the live interventions. Here officers also tried to downplay the seriousness of the situations they had just encountered and the danger they posed to their lives. They actually tried to derive some fun from them. They ridiculed, satirised, and impersonated each other, trying to reconstruct the executions, albeit exaggerated. Impersonating their superiors, using simulated situations to show how they are likely to react was a way of showing their discontent and disapproval of the way they handle some issues.

The ethnographic experience

Detachment has been one of the tenets of social research. The traditional objectivist methodology has been synonymous with the suppression of the researcher's subjective stance. There are certain things I would have wanted to say to and about the officers on the scene but could not. This however, does not mean that I was dispassionate throughout the research. I was very much an active participant and moreover, the very nature of the project made it impossible for me to be dispassionate. Some people would like to argue that objectivity was compromised in the process but I feel that the report would be impoverished if I tried to suppress the subjective self. The way I see it, mere observation and documenting are inadequate. The subjective self in itself constituted a valuable tool of research which instead of trying to suppress I accepted and acknowledged. By adopting this approach I believe I was able to understand better the deep structures and meaning inherent in the social world of Campus Control.

The whole fieldwork exercise was a process of mutual influencing. I influenced the officers and they reciprocated. As a participant observer I became part of the context I was observing. Therefore what I describe in this report is a product of my involvement. I could not be a passive observer. I found it appropriate to join the officers in their condemnation of all the criminal activities on campus, and the unfair treatment and misdirected wrath of parts of the university community which the officers suffered. It was only inevitable that I would intervene and get involved on a purely humane level. I could not just stand and watch and continue to overtly take notes on the scene of the shooting when the officers needed an extra hand to carry the victims.

As participant observer I was also exposed to the same dangers inherent in policing practice as the officers. There was always the potential and likelihood of facing situations whose outcome was unpredictable. The stress of performing routine and mundane tasks was a shared experience because whatever the officers did I was there in close attendance. The tensions of dealing with drunk students and intervening in volatile "domestic disputes" affected all of us who were on the scene.

On the scene of the shooting at Forest Hills one student asked me whether I was a police officer and why I was carrying a gun. I was not carrying a gun. He had spotted me putting a big enough object in my back pocket. It was my black wallet. The suspicion was bad enough and could have had serious repercussions for my life. The emotions were still very high and the students' friends had just been shot.

Officers are not always well received by some members of the university community and many do not appreciate their services. At times I found myself having to deal with my moral indignation and outrage at the way my fellow students verbally abused the officers and blatantly frustrated their genuine attempts to help them. I felt that it was morally outrageous that a student who was involved in a fight with his girlfriend could suggest that the reason the officer who was called to the scene intervened was because he wanted to have sex with his (the disputant's) girlfriend. "You can go and f... her, isn't that what you want?" he said.

At some stage I felt like I was beginning to act like one of the officers and beginning to see things the way they did. There has been bred into the unit an attitude of suspicion and processes of stereotyping have developed within it. The former is a result of the need to be on the look-out for signs of potential danger and criminal deviance and the latter a result of the attitudes which have developed overtime about who the major trouble makers are, the habitual noise-makers, and the "problem" residences. The processes of stereotyping are to an extent well founded and justified given the frequency of the complaints reported to Campus Control about these individuals or residences. Because of my long exposure to the unit's activities I was beginning to think along the same lines.

It is a well known fact that within the barrel of Campus Control there are some rotten apples whose actions need to be policed and continuously monitored. It came as no surprise, therefore, when some officers thought I was hired by the unit's management to observe, monitor, and report their activities. The influence of this assumption of my role must not be underestimated. There is absolutely no doubt that an element of professionalism is being inculcated into the officers. But it is

also possible that the officers were playing to their one-man audience. The interventions were meticulously and flawlessly executed and with scrupulous care.

Throughout the fieldwork it appeared as if the officers felt obliged to explain and justify to me all their actions. They always wanted to make sure that I understood why they did what they did. On my part I kept reminding myself that I was participating in a professional organisation and I was not going to be responsible for any ineptitude on the part of the officers. I tried as much as I could not to make any undue interference and to avoid any adjustments being made on my account which would compromise or jeopardise the normal operations of the unit.

There are some unforeseen problems associated with studying one's own community. Looking into the activities of Campus Control also meant that I was going to observe part of their clientele, the university community of which I am a part. One such problem manifested itself when a call came in from Groote Schuur Hospital notifying Campus Control that there was a UCT student lying in the morgue. The student had shot himself with his friend's gun. The identity of the student matched that of someone I had known for the past two years. We used to stay in the same residence and almost always watched sport on TV together. During the period I had known him it was inconceivable and there was nothing to suggest that he could be the kind to commit suicide. Campus Control officers were to confirm the identity of the victim and then notify his parents. It was at my insistence that the officers double checked his identity. As it turned out, and much to my relief it had been a case of mistaken identity. The two shared the same surname and initials. The real victim's name did not appear on the most recent list of all the students in the residence system which the officers used because he had been excluded from the university on academic grounds.

It was only natural that after a sustained period of participant observation I would feel indebted to the officers for their wonderful co-operation. I also felt indebted to the head of Campus Control for his advice and for allowing me to do the research. However, I felt uncomfortable when it appeared as if the officers were trying to enlist me into their "faction" when they started talking about their apparently polarised relationship with their management. A further dilemma for me was what appeared to be a deviation from my initial objective as stated in my research proposal. I had

indicated that I intended to come up with a sympathetic account of the unit, an objective on which perhaps the decision to grant me permission to do the research was based. (I am not in any way suggesting that permission would have been refused if the objectives were different). The reality of policing confronted me in the field. Officers performed some tasks which although not illegal, and in fact in my opinion commendable, are unequivocally disallowed by the unit's regulations as a matter of policy. There were also issues on which I vehemently disagreed with some of the officers. Would then a "sympathetic" account of Campus Control have to include or exclude these areas of disagreement and a description of the officers' activities which were clearly not sanctioned by their regulations?

On the whole, the exercise was a fulfilling one which got off to a slow start but gathered momentum with the arrival of more students for the activities of the Orientation Week. This meant more requests for Campus Control services and more cases for me to observe.

Through a sustained period of participant observation I was able to build rapport and clear all the misunderstanding about my role. I found the officers to be very friendly and helpful. The gulf between observer and observed disappeared. I felt like I was a new recruit under the tutelage of more senior officers and the whole process felt like an induction into the culture of the unit.

Most of the officers' stories about themselves and the experiences they remember most are those involving near-fatal encounters, their heroics, car hijackings at gun-point, and how these experiences continue to haunt them especially when they are called upon to deal with cases which remind them of these experiences. I remember the look in the eyes of the officers who were on the scene of the shooting at Forest Hills. Fear was written all over their faces. One officer remained in the car for some time, with his head down, before coming out to join the rest on the scene. I also remember telling myself that no case study was worth dying for. The tension on the scene was thick enough to slice with a hacksaw.

Most officers speak both English and Afrikaans although some are more comfortable with the latter which they speak among themselves. Because I cannot speak Afrikaans another adjustment was

made on my account and English became the "official" language of the research. One or two Afrikaans words were thrown in from time to time during our conversations but that did not bother me. Jokes were also told in Afrikaans and some officers were quick to translate these for my benefit albeit having lost their intended effect. An Afrikaans joke told in English may not be a joke at all.

University of Cape Town

Limitations of the data collected

The data collected is of a qualitative nature and cannot be quantitatively manipulated. The data does not lend itself to statistical analysis. Crime statistics have always been used as an index of criminal deviance in the population and as a measurement of Campus Control effectiveness. Information which does not translate to crime figures will probably not help much to raise crime awareness within the university community. Moreover the same community uses crime figures to justify the financial resources allocated to the unit. Inevitably, people will weigh the merits of case studies and qualitative data and compare them with quantifiable, statistically oriented data.

Most officers' accounts were personalised, subjective, and self-justifying, thus raising questions about the reliability and validity of data collected from these sources. Further questions will always be asked about the extent to which officers fashioned their behaviour since they knew that their actions were subjected to intense scrutiny. It must also be taken into account that the officers were presented with a rare opportunity to speak out and this opportunity gave vent to their frustrations. Their motives and intentions must be taken into account and their stories taken with a pinch of salt.

Taking notes while on the scene entailed a shift in attention. Actions were lost and frequently I fell behind the pace of the action. Although some of the gaps were filled by the interviews I had with the officers who were on the scene there was no substitute for observing for myself. In some situations, overt note-taking on the scene was just not the right thing to do. I had to take mental notes which I put to paper as soon as I got the opportunity. But then, the human mind is not infallible.

CHAPTER 2

DEMYSTIFYING CAMPUS CONTROL - A POLICE FORCE OR SERVICE INDUSTRY?

The difficulty that confronts anybody who tries to investigate the activities of Campus Control is that they have no clear-cut boundaries. The role of the unit is so opaque that it is difficult to tell whether it is a service industry or a police force. This vagueness of the role of Campus Control serves to confirm the fact that policing is not a single coherent set of activities that can always be discussed within the unit's objectives or mission - "**To protect and serve**".

Campus Control's mission is conceived of as the preservation of a valued way of life and the protection of human beings and property against injury or damage. This victim-centred perspective is justified by the belief that the university is under attack from criminal elements and that it is the God-given duty of Campus Control officers to fight them.

Campus Control and the crime-fighting image

An understanding of how Campus Control officers see their social world and their role in it is crucial to an analysis of what they do and their broad function. The officers project a crime-fighting image and treat patrolling as their central function. Their imagination is beset with the primacy of crime over offences, hence the emphasis on crime detection.

It appears that officers delight in quoting astronomical crime figures. What they do not realise is that those figures do not represent their policing effectiveness, they are not a measure of their preventive success nor a guide to their investigative skills. In fact, the undisguised fact is that these recorded crime statistics do not translate into statistics of successfully followed up and solved crimes.

It must be remembered that the unit is inhibited in a number of ways. The officers do not have police powers and cannot pursue the suspects beyond the confines of the university. Their capacity

as crime-fighters is also limited by the lack of equipment and suitably qualified personnel to be able to operate as a fully-fledged police force.

The crime fighting image of Campus Control must be understood in a particular context. The image is not only strongly adhered to within the unit itself, but also dominates public perception. Conditions are conducive for the image to flourish. It is given substance and justification by the fact that the university community is being fed a rich diet of violent crime news. The fear of this menacing culture gives the officers an excuse, if not a "right" to claim the crime-fighting role and see themselves as the people mandated to counter it (the culture of crime).

Further justification for the assumption of the crime-fighting role is found in the attribution of status to Campus Control work. The bulk of the unit's work, which is of a non-criminal nature is invisible and held in low esteem, as well as being ascribed low status by the public. The community ascribes status and priority to crime prevention and hence it makes sense that Campus Control officers have come to view their role as synonymous with crime-fighting.

The crime fighting image of the unit is depicted in its operations style. There are symbols valued by the unit which reinforce the police discourse; the uniform, the rank system, the codes used, etc., (see chapter 5).

Officers carry notebooks which they use at the scene of the crime to record important details which would not be easy to remember when they write up the crime reports. The popular maxim "no job is complete until the paperwork is done" applies to Campus Control officers. A lot of their work involves paperwork. In these notebooks the officers record the names of the people they have questioned on the scene, the time, etc. In the case of the burglary at Rondeberg 103, they recorded the missing items, TV, radio, CD-player, and the serial numbers of each one of them. This information was considered crucial to the investigation. And investigation is pre-eminently a policing matter.

It is one thing to assume the crime-fighting role and another to do the role full justice. Officers would be flattering themselves if they think that whatever arrests they made, however limited, were a result of the unit's fast response or their investigative skills. Success in clear-ups is determined by

the information provided to the officers by the community when they arrive on the scene. Other important factors which contribute to the speedy apprehension of offenders are if the victims or the officers themselves know the offender from the outset or if the offender is caught red-handed.

Public expectations of Campus Control are to an extent inflated by the officers themselves, through their perceived role and capacity as professional crime-fighters. As a result, the majority of the UCT community see the unit as not having a wider function than crime control. This does not help the unit much as it means that the community will continuously fail to take note of the unit's other equally important responsibilities, which have become somewhat eclipsed by the officers' crime-fighting image. Contrary to popular belief, Campus Control does not only operate as a crime-fighting unit, but as provider of a disparate range of other services. In fact, crime-fighting is in my opinion simply an obsession, but otherwise very little time is spent arresting offenders; that is the reality of Campus Control practice.

Some officers resent the non-crime aspects of their work. They see these activities as demeaning and as an unnecessary waste of valuable time and energy which could profitably be used to boost the crime-fighting initiatives. What the officers do not realise is that it is a bit risky to view their primary task as crime-fighting. There is overwhelming evidence to suggest that this cannot be accomplished. The unit does not have the resources to do the task any justice. Officers will continue to cultivate this image at their peril. They will have to deliver in this regard should the image prevail. But they also have to be awakened to the fact that continued polishing of this image will only lend the unit to accusations of incompetence and failure as the rate of crime shows no signs of subsiding.

Policing should not be seen as mainly the detection and prevention of crime. Campus Control capacity to affect crime rate is marginal. Their crime-fighting capacity is over-estimated and their role over-stated. In the 1996 *Orientation Week Booklet*, the unit's Crime Prevention and Community Liaison Officer reported the unit to be responsible for the safety and security of 4000 students in the university residence system and more than 4000 members of staff. The official student newspaper, after having conducted interviews with some officers quotes the figure at 20 000 (Varsity, 12 march 1996). Of course, the intended effect was achieved - to illustrate the hopelessness of the unit's staff complement of about 70 against the background of a huge clientele.

Strictly speaking, Campus Control has very little to do with the safety and security of members of staff, an observation that was confirmed by some of the officers. They also have limited contact with commuter students, who are in the majority. They can however, claim responsibility for the students in the university residences system since these, by virtue of living within the confines of the university fall under the jurisdiction of the unit.

There is just too much pre-occupation with dealing with actual crimes and quoting crime figures which unfortunately seem to be rising disproportionately to the rate of clear-ups. In other words, there is no parallel development in the rate of clear-ups. The most immediate index of Campus control effectiveness as a crime fighting unit should be the clear-up rate expressed as a percentage of crimes recorded. It must be said that Campus Control has had very limited success in this area and that each time crime figures are quoted, especially for media purposes (Varsity, 12 March 1996), the rate of clear-ups is conveniently but conspicuously absent.

The disparate range of non-crime aspects of Campus Control work

The non-crime function of Campus Control is least considered by the officers to be a central part of police work. Yet, in my opinion, this is the area where the unit seems to enjoy reasonable success. It is also the area which accounts for the bulk of the unit's work. It has been the unit's ability over the years, to provide assistance in a wide range of difficult situations which makes it such an indispensable service industry.

Most of the calls received at Burnage (Campus Control Headquarters) are service calls related to personal enquiries and difficulties, such as students needing bolt-cutters to cut their padlocks, loud music complaints, requests for escort services, as well as responding to alarms, most of which, as discovered during the period of research, were accidentally activated.

Burnage also serves as an information centre and the students' first port of call and line of defence. It is a source of information about other sectors of the university. It is in this regard that I developed an admiration for the officers' extensive referral skills. The officers also get requests to

deal with petty nuisances, drunks, domestic disputes, and often intervene in personal and interpersonal problems.

Campus Control falls under the Building and Services Department of the university. This is why some continue to see the unit's role as primarily to protect university property, since it was founded with this objective in mind. The officers conduct routine patrols on buildings and report anything out of order as well as rectifying it if they can. This role, which is viewed as not a strictly security one, used to be the responsibility of the custodial staff.

Certain requests made of Campus Control require the unit's immediate response. These - among others, medical emergencies - get precedence over any other activities. In those circumstances the mobile patrol unit is recalled or simply asked to re-route and proceed to the scene. During the research period no two equally urgent requests requiring immediate attention at the same time were made. It would have been very interesting to see how the officers were going to respond.

Frequently, officers are asked to intervene in domestic disputes. I was impressed by the way officers confidently handled the situations, how they managed to maintain peace in threatening situations without having to invoke their powers of arrest. The officers were very conciliatory in their approach. They were able to negotiate the solutions and gave practical advice. The most important thing, however, was the fact that the course of action was dictated by the victims, in most cases the female students who had been involved in fights with their boyfriends. Although they had the option of pressing charges, most were satisfied with the restoration of peace or the removal of the male disputant from the scene with the assurance that he would not come anywhere near the victim.

When female students staying in residences with controlled access request Campus Control to cut their pad-locks, they are in theory supposed to be accompanied by their sub-warden on duty who is also a student. But because most such requests are made very late in the night when "the chickens come to roost" after a late night out, and usually having had one drink too many, it is impractical to have the sub-warden present all the time.

The Jagger Library is also open until 10pm every day from Monday to Thursday. The library has been broken into on more than one occasion in the not-too-distant past. Students are also known to flout the library rules at will. They are also known to be careless, leaving their bags unattended for lengthy periods of time. Present practice is to have an officer posted at the Library from around 7pm until the library closes. Each time the officer comes across unattended personal belongings he leaves a Campus Control sticker with the message; "**you could have been RIPPED-OFF**". Similar stickers are now being left on offices which the officers find unlocked and the items found vulnerable.

Being a Campus Control officer means that one needs to be familiar with the rules and regulations of other university structures. For example, the officers are tasked with patrolling the UCT dam, property of the UCT Fishing Club. They have been instructed to constantly check for and remove all non-members, and also to make sure that the members themselves adhere to the accepted methods of fishing and use the prescribed equipment. This means that to be able to carry out this duty effectively, the officers must acquaint themselves with the club's rules and regulations.

Campus Control officers are expected to remove from university property all trespassers and to be on the lookout for all persons declared "persona non grata" whose identikits or photographs are posted at all the control rooms. This task is made difficult by the fact that the university is situated on major public roads and the fact that the university's academic and sporting facilities are open to the public. This makes it difficult for the officers to identify the trespassers. However, a certain category is very easy to identify - the street kids and "vagrants" otherwise known as "*bergies*". With the onslaught of the cold weather, these often find temporary shelter on university property. In some cases, especially with regard to the street kids, the officers have adopted the attitude that the inequalities of social and economic power are more significant than idealist philosophies in labelling behaviour criminal or enforcing the law (Uglow, 1988). They often allow the kids to stay on university property on condition that they "behave" themselves and leave before day-break. But the "*bergies*", who most of the time are intoxicated, and at times aggressive, are considered an eyesore and a social nuisance. They are often unceremoniously removed from university property irrespective of their conduct or at the request of members of the university community.

As a matter of policy, Campus Control does not give lifts to students. The number of requests for transport the unit gets is amazing. At times students just jump into the car and demand to be taken to their respective residences. They never miss the opportunity to tell the officers that the vehicles were bought "using our money". Usually when an exception is made, lifts are offered to students whose situations would have been assessed by the officers as desperate. These exceptions also have their own limitations. The destinations have to be within the university precincts. Although officers often seek the permission of their supervisors most of the time they just exercise their discretion.

Complaints about loud music predominate, with Liesbeek Gardens as the leading offender. It appears that students find it difficult to play music for their own consumption. Students in the residences close to Burnage, i.e., Leo Marquard and Tugwell Hall, are not at all deterred by their close proximity to Campus Control headquarters. One gets the impression that at times it becomes a battle of "sound systems" and tastes in music, with students trying to upstage each other. Other students respond, open their windows to see who can play the loudest while they sing along. The surprising fact is that the students are at times tolerant of the noise when the officers expect them to complain. It is at times when the officers least expect problems and when they think the residences are relatively quiet, that they often get complaints about loud music. Officers cannot take the initiative and ask the students to turn their music down unless they are asked to do so by residents themselves.

Officers have learnt to be very tactful in their approach and know that theirs is an unenviable and thankless job. They are very apologetic and always make it clear that they are there simply because somebody complained and that if it wasn't for that they would have been happy to let the "party" continue. In a typical and by now very predictable fashion, the officers are assured that there will be no further disturbances.

I noted that the offenders never fail to show their resentment at this kind of intrusion and social control. One officer found that one tyre of his Campus Control vehicle had been punctured, slashed with a knife at the Liesbeek parking area. He had just returned from one of the rooms to ask the students to turn down their music.

Complainants do not want to be present when the removal of trespassers takes place. Some also choose to complain about the loud music on conditions of anonymity. Offending students are known to confront the complainants should they happen to discover who they are. So those who complain would rather let Campus Control officers do the "dirty work" and let them incur the wrath of the offenders on their behalf. Could it be that the officers are getting paid to deflect the hostility of the offending classes from other members of the university community? If that is the case, then there is a serious contradiction here. The community cannot be talking about improving its relationship with Campus Control and at the same time expect them to do the kind of work that continues to make them unpopular and appear villainous.

The role of the private security companies.

Despite having its own security unit, the university continues to hire private security companies. The process can be understood as a reflection of the gap in the service provided by Campus Control owing to the shortage of personnel. It is also seen by the officers as a constant reminder of their inadequacies.

Liesbeek Gardens and Forest Hills are patrolled by Security Action Services (SAS). The role of SAS is even more vague than that of Campus Control. It is ironic that most of the complaints about loud music come from Liesbeek Gardens, and Forest Hills itself is not far behind, giving Campus Control officers' claims that SAS officers are never seen to be doing anything some credibility. Campus Control officers, the mobile patrol unit in particular, are still expected to go to these places to see if the SAS officers would have reported for duty and whether they do so on time.

Campus Control officers have not been able to hide their unhappiness about the process of contracting private security companies. They feel that SAS officers do not know anything about student culture, and as such are concerned only with performing their duty and could not care less about developing a relationship with the students. Although some of the officers' fears are founded, one gets the impression that a protectionist view has been bred into the unit.

CHAPTER 3

REFLECTIONS ON SOME CASE STUDIES

Case study 1: A culture of parties

Hardly 12 hours after the official opening of the university residences on 18 February, three house parties were running concurrently in Leo Marquard, Kopano, and Smuts Hall. Then came the formidable line-up, the "Big Three", the Rag Res Party (21 Feb.), the Big Bash (23 Feb.), and the UFUNDO Party (24 Feb). RAG (Remember and Give), the fund-raising arm of SHAWCO (Student Health and Community Welfare Organisation), and UFUNDO (Ujima Fund-raising Organisation) were the organisers of the respective parties.

The Rag Res Party and the Big Bash have both become permanent features of the Orientation Week. The three parties attracted large crowds including non-UCT students. Although the objective was to raise funds for disadvantaged sectors of the community, it would be naive to believe that the students attended all these parties with a conscious view to contributing to a good cause. Many were there to have fun the way they know best.

It is common knowledge that violence, vandalism and other social disorders are associated with alcohol abuse. It was in anticipation of these, and the memory of the rape that occurred after the Big Bash in 1995, that Campus Control was not going to take any chances. There was a notable security presence at all the parties this year. Provision for the security was a shared responsibility. A multi-agency approach was applied. The Campus Control community liaison and crime prevention officer met with all the stake-holders to discuss the security arrangements. To beef up the security and to complement Campus Control efforts the organisers of the parties contributed their own party marshals. In addition, there were no less than 10 officers from Peninsula Security. There was body searching at the entrance to the party venues, and the moral purity of the university community was guaranteed by the presence of female officers and marshals to facilitate the search of the females.

The parties came to an end with no major incident compared to the previous years. There was just one "minor" case of vandalism and malicious damage to property when students reduced one car to a huge heap of scrap metal. I gathered that the car had already been involved in an accident and students only "finished it off". I also noticed from afar, an ambulance pulling out in the car park, about 200 metres away from the Jameson Hall, venue of the Big Bash. Here (parking area) there was also a hive of activity. However, I could not get anyone to explain why the ambulance had been called.

Spontaneous street bashes are increasingly becoming fashionable. Students use their powerful, customised car radios for the party music. Other students then trickle to the "venues" and the numbers swell as they gather around the cars. Before one knows it there is full-blown party in progress. The Jammie Shuttle rank in front of Leo Marquard and Tugwell Hall was the venue for many such parties during the period of research.

"Mobile" satellite parties are also fast becoming part of popular student culture. These are the offshoots of the more formal and authorised parties. Students park their cars a few metres from the official party venues, play their own music using their car radios. They attract sizeable crowds from the major parties. These satellite parties often continue long after the end of the "mother" parties. They are by their very nature problematic and difficult to control and monitor. The culprits are often very defiant and verbally abusive, and they can always drive away when there is a Campus Control Officer in sight.

Case study 2.0 The Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU) Strike of 1991

While perusing some Campus Control documents I came across a letter from the head of the unit to his officers, congratulating on and thanking them for their loyalty during the strike. He commended their successful protection of the lives of persons and thanked them for having

competently guarded against assault to property. But most of all he was indebted to them for their decision not to join the strike.

People have always wanted to know on whose side Campus Control officers are. I believe that an analysis of the officers' actions during the strike should provide the much needed answers about their allegiances. Some people would like to take a competently different view from that of the head of Campus Control, especially those who still vividly remember the trail of destruction left behind by the actions of the militant crowds. Most will remember how the workers and their sympathisers' "right" to strike grossly violated other students' right to learn and attend lectures. Participants in the strike ran amok, using fire-extinguishers to disrupt lectures, and overtly intimidated non-participants. Roads were barricaded with burning objects and motorists were subjected to bumper-to-bumper driving before traffic eventually came to a halt. University property was vandalised and litter strewn all over campus. Given this background, some people would naturally want to know where Campus Control officers were when all this was taking place.

Case study 2.1 "Well done Bafana Bafana, Well done"

Five years after their readmission to the international sporting arena after decades of isolation owing to apartheid policies, the South African National Soccer Team, Bafana Bafana, were crowned the African champions on 28 January 1996 after winning the continent's most prestigious Trophy, The African Cup of Nations. This hour of triumph was greeted with wild scenes of jubilation around the country. At UCT and the immediate vicinity of campus, students broke into dance and song and seized control of Main Road, blocking traffic in the process. Rondebosch was in a state of acceptable chaos. Motorists literally drove on the wrong side of the road, students and others jumped onto buses and cars belonging to people they did not know. The SAPS Armed Response officers who were on the scene to monitor in order to avert any serious disorders watched with amusement. They did not try to spoil the fun by dictating the nature of the celebrations. Their mere presence was enough of a deterrent measure. The Campus Control officers I was with were all in agreement that this was a beautiful sight. Celebrations continued outside Leo Marquard and Tugwell Hall, less than 100 metres from Burnage. We were all in

agreement that these celebrations were only a momentary thing and were going to cease, and because the students' jubilation was controlled and peaceful, not a single officer suggested that the crowd be dispersed. Eventually the excitement subsided, the crowd dispersed and the officers' good judgement was vindicated.

When I got to Burnage the following day, there was a note from one departmental head of the unit to the supervisor of the shift on duty during the celebrations, demanding an explanation why there was no report on the "hooliganism".

Commentary

Crowd control is not a neutral technique of maintaining order. One feels that it has inevitable political overtones. The TGWU strike was perceived by the participants as a product of the inequalities of economic power. Soccer on the other hand was historically considered to be a sport blacks in this country. It was important for the predominantly white and coloured Campus Control officers not to lend themselves to accusations of racism by trying to disperse the jubilant predominantly black crowd. I also believe that the officers were conveniently absent from the scenes of vandalism and disturbances during the TGWU strike in order to avoid confrontations with the strikers. They didn't want to be seen as tools of the university administration since the union considered the administration the enemy. The head of the unit was to an extent justified to congratulate his officers for the manner in which they conducted themselves. While others may accuse them of sitting on the sidelines while the strikers vandalised property, my honest opinion is that in the circumstances they did very well. They treated the crowds in both cases with painstaking sensitivity. Crowd control is a controversial task. Officers did themselves proud by managing to free themselves from suspicions of partiality, whether racial, political, social or otherwise.

At the same time those who felt that the students' jubilation was an act of "hooliganism" must be understood. Their attitudes about crowds and marches and those who engage in them are informed by paranoia and the belief that such gatherings have the potential for violence. These attitudes are

also shaped by the common observation that when crowds are angry and jubilant they often direct that anger or jubilation at people or property.

Case study 3.0 Burglary at Rondeberg Flats

Just before midnight on 29 January 1996, the subwarden for Rondeberg Flats called Campus Control to report a case of house breaking. I attended the scene with two Campus Control officers to assess the damage. This was for the officers, the quasi-police, a break from the routine patrols and an opportunity to do the real police work. The officers were visibly excited. With pen and notebook in hand they started taking notes as soon as we arrived on the scene. The act was a well orchestrated one, professionally and brutally executed. The act itself was deplorable but we couldn't help admiring the efficiency with which it was executed. We talked about how the perpetrators could have gained entry. We re-enacted several different ways which we thought they could have used, weighing each one of them's credibility. We finally arrived at the conclusion that one of the presumed thieves went into the flat through the window which had the burglar-bar broken. They discovered that he couldn't open the front door from inside because it was double-locked, and then decided the door had to be prised. There was no doubt about how they got access to the inside room where the stolen items had been stored. The padlock which had been used to secure the room was cut into two pieces which lay helplessly on the floor. The room was ransacked and clothes and other assorted items were strewn all over the place. The officers then started putting together the pieces of evidence. It was established that the thieves got away with a TV, radio, CD-player, and other items, and that they must have panicked because they left some other valuable items in the room. The officers then took the serial numbers of the items from the boxes which were in the room, which further gave us the impression that the items were still relatively new. Then came the frustration; we could not get the occupant of the flat to tell us the details of the missing items. We later gathered that because it was university summer vacation the flat was supposed to have been vacated. Throughout the process we were careful not to touch too many items because there was fingerprint potential. After having assessed the situation the officers thought it warranted the assistance of SAPS. It was interesting to contrast the Campus Control officers' excitement and enthusiasm about this "big case" with SAPS officers' casual approach as if

to say "this is nothing compared to what we deal with everyday". In fact one Campus Control officer admitted that he had seen no worse case than this one during his six years with the unit.

There was further frustration and dilemma. The flat needed to be secured. It was around 01h00, and the maintenance department of the university would only be able to attend to the problem the following day. A number of other items were left vulnerable as a result of the break-in, fridge, stove, etc. Officers decided to just close the front door. Although regulations require that such premises be secured, there was nothing Campus Control could have done about this one. But what if the same presumed thieves or different people were to take advantage of the situation and wiped out everything in the flat which survived the earlier assault?

While we were still on the scene three students came forward to volunteer some information. Just when the officers thought they had some much needed witnesses their case suffered another severe setback. "Wait! we want to know what our names will be used for", said one of the students. They did not want their names used for media purposes for fear of the long arm of retribution. Their confidentiality was guaranteed. Although the students wanted to help they were afraid of what could happen to them if the perpetrators or their friends found out about the part they played. They feared for their own safety. This was further evidence of the fact that UCT does not exist in isolation. Nobody knows whether the thieves were UCT students or members of a well organised crime syndicate. We learned that the culprits were three men who drove away in a white Kadett, but that was just about all the information we got.

Case study 3.1 The Baxter Confusion

A member of His People Church phoned Campus Control to inform them that he had found three "African guys" in one of the rooms in the Baxter Theatre. Two Campus Control officers were asked to investigate the matter. They found the three men in the room in question who claimed that they had been given permission to stay there by the Baxter management. Apparently they had been staying in that room for nearly a week. The three men said they were from Johannesburg and had been hired to repair some of the seats in one of the concert halls. They however, did not have

written authorisation from the Baxter management. The three drew the officers' attention to a TV, kettle, and other items which they said they had been provided for their comfort by the Baxter authorities. Attempts to contact the Baxter manager for confirmation were fruitless. The officers took one of the men's ID number. They were convinced by the men's explanations and decided to let them stay.

University of Cape Town

Commentary

Imagine the officers' frustration at this otherwise implausible arrangement at the Baxter. It is totally inconceivable that, for whatever reason, any body could be allowed to stay in the Theatre. The renowned theatre houses a lot of priceless items donated to the university. Alternative accommodation arrangements could easily have been made. The officers took a very big risk by allowing the three men in question to stay. The obvious thing, which they would have wanted to do, was to throw the men out and seek confirmation later. But because they are used to taking orders from other university officials and are wary of making mistakes, they couldn't do that. That course of action could have been seen as tantamount to questioning the authority of the university official who was reported to have made the arrangement. Disciplinary action could have been pending in this respect, and officers were most likely to be severely reprimanded. On the other hand, officers are under obligation to protect university property, and if anything had gone wrong and it was later discovered that they had known about the presence of the three men but had done nothing about it, the consequences could have been more severe. This was going to be treated as an inexcusable case of negligence and dereliction of duty. Imagine the officers' anxiety as they waited for the following day to confirm the arrangement. This is just but one of the dilemmas which officers are often confronted with in their line of duty.

One would have thought that the people entrusted with safety and security of the university's valuable assets would have been notified about the Baxter arrangement. Communication of this kind of information is crucial to policing practice. The messages from the community are the most basic demands on Campus Control, and the Officers, actions are largely organised in response to these. Campus Control-community relations as a two way communication, will improve the exchange of information. I noted during the research that the flow of information to Campus Control officers in face-to-face encounters with the students is minimal. The two cases above illustrate the importance of the public and not the officers as the main discoverers of crime.

Communication from the bottom up is most pronounced within the unit. The communication is in the form of crime reports submitted by the officers to the respective heads of departments within

the unit. The messages to the management are also in the form of grievances and requests for clarification. Lateral communication between shifts facilitates smooth transitional hand-overs and the communication of shared grievances and suggestions on how best to deal with them. Minutes of each shift's meeting are posted on the notice-board for all the other officers to read.

Most messages from the top down are of the "see to it" nature. It appears that there is no adequate feedback from the management to the officers on the reports they will have submitted. The officers said that this is a major source of frustration and demotivation. Officers submit computer print-outs of detailed reports which are often handed back to them with no accompanying comments. The reports, some of which were shown to me regularly by the officers, were either simply ticked or signed by the respective departmental heads. The officers said that they need constant feedback on their performance.

Officers are also frustrated that most of the instructions they get from the other university departments are given without adequate rationale. Until recently, communication between the unit and the academic departments was one-way, with the latter giving the instructions and the former carrying them out. Frequently officers repeatedly find the same offices unlocked with a number of valuable items left vulnerable. Officers said that they have been writing reports about these and submitting them to their superiors. They claimed that nothing seems to be done about it. As a result of this, Campus Control intends to submit to Bremner, the university administration, a petition calling for the adoption of a policy on "security carelessness". The document will recommend that a staff member whose office property is stolen due to negligence and carelessness "should be asked to pay the whole amount of expenses incurred due to the loss".

Case study 4: The Forest Hills Shooting

At 23h55, on 19 February 1996, a call came through from one of the Forest Hills subwardens informing Campus Control about a shooting in Block B. We responded immediately and arrived at the scene in just under five minutes. The crowd at the scene was hysterical. SAPS arrived about three minutes later and the dreadful sound of their sirens reminded everyone that danger was in the

air, and added to the tense atmosphere. Everyone was barking instructions to Campus Control officers. Officers ran up the stairs in record time to attend to one of the victims who was unconscious. Students on the scene thought the officers' best was not good enough and continuously urged them to move even faster. There was a feeling of uncertainty, the perpetrator was still on the loose and bullets could just start flying again. For me, this was more than what I had bargained for. I would rather have been somewhere else. I told myself that no case study was worth dying for. I was afraid of getting caught in the crossfire. One officer stayed behind in the car with his head down, and when he later came out, fear was written all over his face. Three students had been shot, one in the neck, another in the arm and the third in the hip. Campus Control officers carried them to the vehicles. We rushed two of the victims to Groote Schuur Hospital and SAPS took care of the third. At the traffic lights we looked left and right, and convinced that the road was clear and safe we urged the driver to go through the red light. Officers were prepared to take some risks to save lives. The drive to the hospital felt like a marathon one. The fact that I was in the same vehicle with one of the victims scared me even further.

We then went back to the scene to try and get some information about the shooting. Five shells were found in the ill-fated flat.

Forest Hills Complex is under Security Action Services (SAS), a private security company. The SAS officer on duty was not of much help. In the first place, he gave us a wrong description of the perpetrator's get-away car. One version of the story claimed that the perpetrator, a 34-year old UCT student and resident of University House, was involved, prior to the shooting, in an altercation with the people he later shot. It was alleged that the three victims, for unknown reasons, assaulted him in a lift in Block C. Evidence of the assault was there in abundance. The floor of the lift was a horrible spectacle. It was covered with blood and we couldn't use it when we wanted to get to one of the subwardens' flat on sixth floor of the same block to ascertain the identities of the victims. The perpetrator went back to his house and came back armed with a 7.65 mm pistol which he used to inflict his revenge. He later handed himself over to SAPS, Mowbray branch.

Campus Control conducted a search at the perpetrator's house and recovered an SAR Folding BUT machine gun, together with three full Banana magazines (90 rounds), and some spare rounds of live ammunition in a plastic bag. The weapon was hidden behind a suitcase in the bedroom.

In a parallel development, a student from University House received a warning note accompanied by an envelope containing four 9mm cartridges.

Commentary

The above case serves to illustrate the point that has been repeatedly made in this report, namely that UCT is not a sanctuary from the outside world of crime. Students are both perpetrators and victims of these violent crimes. This case study also shows how the revenge motive can easily lead to a reversal of roles, from victim to perpetrator.

It appears that the university administration continues to concoct excuses for a security system that is full of loopholes. Forest Hills complex is just too big for one officer to both walk the beat and operate the semi-automatic gate facing the main road. Following the shooting, the head of Campus Control sent a message to the Director of Students Housing, expressing his concern at the lack of his unit's involvement in Forest Hills. The director's response seemed to imply that since Campus Control recommended SAS to him, then they should shoulder part of the blame for the external security company's failures. The director said that he had received several complaints about SAS officers sleeping on the job. The simple fact here is that the issue of security at Forest Hills cannot merely be reduced to simple accusations of dereliction of duty whose credibility/justification are even in doubt. This is an issue about a security system that is flawed and inadequate and needs to be revamped. The situation must be rectified, otherwise Campus Control will continue to unfairly take the flak for inadequacies for which it is not responsible.

CHAPTER 4

CAMPUS CONTROL AND THE MULTIPLE DISCOURSES OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

"Community policing is a conveniently elastic term for what its advocates wish to see become the dominant ethos of policing" (Weatheritt, 1987).

Solutions as complex as providing for the security of the University of Cape Town are not easy to achieve. They are "more likely to be effective when evolved from within the institutional community than when imposed by external forces" (Bowser 1994, p.4). The Campus Control style of reactive policing has been a far-cry from this principle.

The idea that the community should not be seen as a passive agent of policing but an important part of organized crime prevention forms the central tenet of community involvement in Campus Control activities. The idea requires Campus Control to redefine its role in crime prevention and to abandon the tendency "to corner the market in crime prevention and detection and [the assumption that they are] the sole agency with responsibility for community order" (Newman 1983 cited by Bright 1987 p.37). It is now conventional wisdom to see community participation as providing a coherent set of answers to policing problems whose solutions have been elusive.

Community policing is founded on the premise that participatory ideas of conciliation and consultation should replace a reactive policing discourse which has lost touch with what the community wants. The latter is thought to be alienating and ineffective and not concerned with the principle of accountability. It is therefore hoped that with the cultivation of improved relationships with the community, the development of preventive and non-conflictual aspects of policing would be encouraged (Weatheritt 1987).

The community participation ethos develops within Campus Control as a reaction to the unit's traditional style of reactive policing. Reactive policing has been held solely responsible for causing

the estrangement of the policing unit and the community and for creating public indifference, suspicion and animosity (Alderson 1979). It is also generally accepted that reactive policing is emphasized at the expense of preventive policing. Because it alienates the community, reactive policing is also thought to cause the forfeiture of public cooperation which is crucial for obtaining information about crime.

Some community participation ideas are based on the belief that the people themselves can and wish to contribute to the solution of their problems. The community and the formal policing unit both recognize some common ground and the need for inter-agency cooperation. This is believed to have the effect of making the community recognize the legitimacy of the policing unit. The unit in return must then be seen to be acting on the principles of accountability and neutrality.

The debate on the involvement of the community is as much about social relationships and the balance between authoritarian and democratic forms of social control as it is about crime (Uglow, 1988). It addresses the issue of the ownership of Campus Control, indicating that it should not be the sole property of the university administration but of the entire community. Crime prevention should therefore not be uniquely a function of Campus Control. Other structures should begin to take leading roles in crime prevention initiatives. The achievement of practical results in campus policing, such as the apprehension of offenders should be secondary and the efforts at preventing crime should have priority.

The university community is the consumer of Campus Control services. The security needs of the community vary from one social group to the next and by race and gender. The degree of success of Campus Control is to a large extent measured by the amount of support and cooperation the unit receives from this diverse community. Hostility or even a lack of confidence on the part of a significant portion of the community will have severe implications for Campus Control practice.

The hostility and suspicion of the community have haunted Campus Control and have as a result affected the morale of the officers, making them less enthusiastic about their job. Much of the resentment of Campus Control practice stems from alleged officer misconduct when some officers

in the unit were accused of stealing from the community they were supposed to serve. This point can be illustrated by the fact that the university's Chemical Engineering Building is now a "no go" area for Campus Control officers. Their services are no longer required there. A series of thefts in the building with Campus Control officers as prime suspects led the injured department to ask Campus Control to withdraw their services.

Campus Control should also be seen as a social function. They are also a kind of social control and a system of authority that defines and responds to deviant behaviour. Partial responsibility for defining deviant behaviour has always been assumed by the university community. The great majority of cases handled by the unit are brought to its attention by members of the university community and others living within the immediate vicinity of campus. In fact, most complaints about loud music in Liesbeek Gardens come from non-members. Campus Control officers are despatched in response to these requests and complaints. This means that the community decides what is deviant behaviour and what warrants Campus Control intervention.

The prime determinant of success of clear-ups is information immediately made available to the officers by members of the community when the former arrive on the scene of the crime. The crime is likely to be resolved if adequate information to positively identify the perpetrator is made available by the community and not because of the officers' investigative skills.

When officers receive requests or complaints from the community they have very little information about what they are going to find. Information given to them over the radio from the control rooms is often disjointed and not given in full. At most they have broken shorthand statements such as "shooting at Forest Hills", "Burglary at Rondeberg 103", "noise at Liesbeeck Gardens - please check it out". On arrival at the scene, officers find themselves heavily dependent on the members of the community to assist them to structure situational reality.

Consent is also regarded as one of the features of community participation. In pursuance of consensual policing as a goal, the community has to recognize the legitimacy and authority of Campus Control and agree to be policed. The community should express a willingness to cooperate

with the officers. In the past officers have been and continue to be openly defied by some members of the community. In an account related to me, the officers claimed that academic staff show scant regard for the officers' authority. The account has it that when the unit organised an impromptu blitz as part of its exercise, people refused to produce their identity cards. The exercise, I was told, was called off when one deputy vice-chancellor phoned the head of Campus Control to inform him that his officers were "harassing" people. The head of the unit in turn radioed his officers to tell them that the exercise was off. With a consensual relationship in place and all members of the community cooperating and recognizing that Campus Control officers have a job to do, officers would have no reason to call the academic staff "those arrogant professors".

The Student Protection Service (SPS)

Partnerships such as the Student Protection Service (SPS) are a sign of approval for cooperation with Campus Control. In the past the relationship between the students and Campus Control has been characterised by mingled satisfaction and hostility. This serves as an indication of the value of the services rendered by the unit. The students may not like Campus Control that much but they have never been able to boycott its services.

The SPS is further testimony to the fact that campus policing requires the energies of both Campus Control and the entire university community. It is another way of getting the students involved in creating a safe environment and is also a product of the conviction that the best way to combat crime is through presenting a united front.

The SPS comes in two pilot schemes. There is the Walk Safely Programme which was introduced in September 1995. The programme employs students to provide escort services along the so-called "walk-safe-route" between Robert Leslie control room, upper campus, and Burnage, lower campus. The other scheme is the Residence Watch Programme which will involve a basic patrol of the perimeters and confines of the residences.

Student patrols undergo a full day's training during which they are expected to become familiar with the operations of Campus Control. Their role is restricted and they are not allowed to intervene physically. Already there is lack of clarity regarding the weaponry the students are allowed to carry. What I gathered is that they are only allowed to carry pepper spray and a radio. However, I noted that male Student Patrols in particular also carry batons.

Already the SPS is showing signs of male dominance. This is not because the female students are prejudiced or discriminated against but simply a result of lack of enthusiasm on their part. Some women feel that it is not safe for them to provide escort services to other students at such "ungodly" hours (19h00 - 01h00). One hopes that this does not serve to perpetuate the view that women lack the physical attributes to do any policing work.

Several explanations have been given for the development of the SPS. It is hoped that the relationship between Campus Control and the student body will improve and that through Student Patrols, the community will experience the demands of campus policing and get to appreciate the services of Campus Control. It is also a way of trying to curb the astronomical rise in crime since Campus Control are thought to be starved of human resources. The SPS is also an initiative in pursuance of the concept of community participation and the realisation that the essence of accountability is community involvement. This way it is hoped that the the cure for crime will come from within the institutional community itself.

The role of the crime prevention and community liason officer

The history of Campus Control is one that most officers would not like to be associated with and would like to quickly forget. The unit cannot change the past but can at least make things better for itself by improving its image through embarking on a vigorous information campaign. The unit's activities during the university Orientation Week was one such step in the right direction.

Campus Control was one of the many exhibitors on the Plaza throughout the Orientation Week. They had their uniform on display and took advantage of the freshers' curiosity to explain to them the role of the unit and the services they offer including giving them a few security tips. The Orientation Week Booklet for 1996 also had pages 8-9 devoted to security issues and made an attempt at defining the role of Campus Control.

A very strong theory among some of the officers is that the old students are responsible for inculcating negative ideas into the freshers. The timing for countering this perception could not have been better. It is as if it was specifically designed with a view to getting to the new students before they could be fed a diet of damaging and negative ideas about Campus Control. These efforts were spearheaded by the unit's liaison officer.

The immediate challenge facing the officer is to make the university community understand the proper province of Campus Control, whose obscurity has never been in any doubt. She will have to make sure that the community's expectations of the unit are informed and realistic. The objectives of her initiatives would have to impact on the university community mindset, which is indifferent at the moment. The liaison officer is also going to be looking at ways of getting the entire community to work together in creating a safe and secure working and living environment. Her tactics will include liaising with the university newspapers, the Monday Paper and the official student newspaper - Varsity. This is not a bad strategy considering that Varsity has in the past seized with gusto all stories about officer misconduct. Hopefully she is going to be able to use the same paper to rebuild the ailing image of Campus Control.

The Campus Control rhetoric of transformation must start translating into substance. The unit will now have to be more receptive to the suggestions of the community and to help allay their fears and anxieties about crime. Identifying these anxieties should also be a shared responsibility. The unit needs to recognize that some groups are more vulnerable to crime than others. There is an urgent need for the institution of initiatives to cater for the security needs of special risk groups such as women, while more student involvement in the concept of "Partnerships" which the unit has begun

to implement should bring about improved community vigilance and assistance in coordination of response to criminal acts.

While on routine patrol during the fieldwork I noted that some students are not security conscious. The same can be said about the academic staff. A lot of valuable items are left vulnerable in insecure premises. In one incident, a staff member stepped out of his office for no more than five minutes. On his return his lap-top ASP 386 computer had disappeared from an unlocked cubicle. In parallel situations, students frequently leave notices on their doors to the effect that they are away for a certain period of time and when they are due back. These students will need to learn that one never leaves such notices on the door especially in residences situated directly on public roads and often frequented by street kids and "bergies" (vagrants). This is likely to provide perfect opportunities for would-be thieves to carry out their exploits without having to worry about being caught red-handed.

The unit will have to learn from the community what is expected of it and the changes necessary for it to earn the respect and trust of the community. The unit will also want to correct the impression that it is concerned more with the protection of university property than with preventing personal victimization (Bowser 1994). The language of cooperation will have to be used in fostering any of the unit's future projects. The ways in which the university community perceives policing and its understanding of what the threats to UCT are, its views on appropriate policing methods all need to impinge on Campus Control policing discourse.

Reactive vs proactive policing

Campus Control is talking about a paradigm shift, a shift in emphasis from its traditionally reactive approach to proactive policing. I am concerned that the sudden embracing of this latter approach is making the unit blind to the merits of the former. The way I see it, it should not be an either-or situation. The two must complement each other. In fact, it must be said that reactive policing, the fire-brigade approach, as it is pejoratively known in some university circles, has served the community with a reasonable degree of success over the years. I would like to take the risk and

argue that Campus Control, while at the same time they may prevent and deter crime through increased surveillance, their approach should remain reactive. The reactive approach is flexible and provides immediate response in cases of emergency. Their role should remain primarily to respond to the demands made on them by the university community. I admit that the concept of proactive policing is a seductive one, but adopting it to the exclusion of reactive policing could be futile.

"We are under-staffed"

The impression I got from the officers is that they have their hands full all the time. When asked what they think about their performance they always say that "in the circumstances we are doing remarkably well". But what are those circumstances? The unit is under-staffed, lacks the financial resources, and has less vehicles than it would rather have. Officers believe that an increase in personnel will work preventively against crime through the resultant greater surveillance. This should in theory allow for the speedy apprehension of offenders.

Although the argument in favour of increased personnel has its own merits, there is no guarantee that it will reduce the astronomical rise in crime. In fact, my firm conviction is that this will impact negatively on the community involvement initiatives. Increasing the number of officers will result in further intrusion and possibly less participation on the part of the community as they will feel well catered for and more dependent on Campus Control.

Studies on the effect of increased personnel have not been decisive. They, however, try to instil a cautionary attitude to the perceived effectiveness of increased spending. Sherman (1983) argues that increasing police coverage does not affect crime control beyond the baseline achieved by having police at all. This view is supported by Uglow (1988) who argues that the visibility of police, especially on foot, is important, but that once there is at least one officer walking the beat, additional officers on the same beat seem to have less effect.

CHAPTER 5

CAMPUS CONTROL TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT

If all the rhetoric about professionalism currently prevalent in Campus Control is to translate into reality, then one cannot emphasise enough the need for the institution of a well-structured staff training and development programme. In mitigation of such a development is the background of some of the recruits. Because of the university's policy, the recruits have had to come from within the other university departments, notably the gardening and cleaning departments. It is not surprising therefore, that some of the most glaring shortcomings of Campus Control are played out in the sphere of training and recruitment.

On the basis of what I was told by the officers and my own observations I can conclude without hesitation that the training available to Campus Control officers is either ill-conceived or of no relevance to the bulk of their work. The training offered does not do justice to the responsibilities the unit is entrusted with; providing for the security and safety of the university's valuable assets and the members of its community. One would have thought that the inadequacies imposed on Campus Control by the lack of arms and other resources would be compensated for by the provision of a well-structured, well thought out, and comprehensive training programme.

Training and its relevance to Campus Control work

Campus Control recruits undergo a one week orientation programme. During this orientation process they are taught how to use the communication and support equipment. Training in the basic life-saving skills - first aid, fire fighting and basic computer skills is offered. Despite information to the contrary by the Head of Campus Control, officers said that there is no structured on-going in-service staff training and development programme in place.

Most officers expressed concern that some in their midst are not as fluent as others in their use of the equipment at their disposal, especially the 150 000 volt stun-baton and the "tonga". Their fear is

that they are not certain how their colleagues would react in desperate situations and that they would not be surprised if they used the equipment indiscriminately because they have not had any training on how to use them. The Standing Orders stipulate that the baton should be used as a last resort "first to strike legs and then arms" (Campus Control Standing Orders, p.12).

The absence of an on-going training and staff development programme is perceived by some officers as a calculated and deliberate ploy by the management, carefully designed to keep the officers down and to maintain the status quo. The officers claimed that by so doing the managers reckon they will be able to control their subordinates with ease. In addition, the officers said that they are reminded of their inadequacies at the slightest opportunity in order to make them feel unqualified to question the decisions and orders of their otherwise more experienced superiors. Apart from the absence of a staff development programme, officers are further frustrated by the lack of opportunities for promotion which are virtually non-existent unless someone resigns or retires and the need to fill the gap arises.

Officers have not been able to see the value of the courses they are made to undertake because upon completion of such courses they are not given any certificates. They are further given the impression that it does not really matter whether one passes or fails a course. It also makes a mockery of the probation period because although some recruits have failed to acquit themselves well as reported by the other officers, none of them has been turned down or ordered to re-do the relevant courses.

Physical training and unarmed combat are vital aspects of security work, yet there are strikingly absent in the Campus Control repertoire. Because of the fact that there has never been any training in these areas, officers are not certain how they would react if the situation demanded that they come to the rescue of their colleagues.

Training in vehicular patrols is also taken for granted and perceived as unnecessary. A driver's licence is seen as sufficient prerequisite. One officer endlessly apologised to me for "going out of bounce" when we were on mobile patrol saying that it was only his first day and as such did not

really know where to patrol. The purpose of vehicular patrol should be to impact on personal victimisation. If that is to be achieved, then proper coaching is imperative in this regard.

The investigators' course

This course, which is recognised by the Security Officers Board of South Africa was offered by an outside agency to 12 new and old recruits. They were taught how to handle exhibits, knowledge of law, rights, and how to protect the scene of crime, among other things. I was informed that the same course in its entirety is offered to SAPS officers.

My impression of the course is that it was of no immediate relevance to the bulk of Campus Control work. It was an ambitious course and perhaps a result of an envious organisation trying to mirror the operations of the state policing apparatus. In my opinion, which was replicated by most officers, the course did very little to equip the officers to deal with the realities of the social environment in which they work.

Rauch's (1992) observations about police training certainly apply to Campus Control. She observed that officers are taught many of the skills which are valued by the organisation as opposed to those valued by the community they serve. It is in this context that suggestions to the effect that the course was to a large extent influenced and valued by the managers considering their background in the military and police are not too far-fetched. What Campus Control officers need is a course specifically designed for Campus Control, taking into account the needs of their clientele and most importantly to remember that they are not a police force. They should accept that they cannot "compete" with the police and should have the courtesy to acknowledge their limitations.

As far as "the knowledge of the law" and "rights" aspects of the course are concerned I must make it known that not once when we were on patrol do I recall officers dealing with a case that required the invocation of their legal powers. A training which emphasises legal knowledge and law enforcement misses the crucial point that "action will always be the product of judgement made in concrete situations that cannot be submitted to rules" (Shearing 1991, p.58). What is needed

therefore is a training that equips recruits with the appropriate skills and information for the exercise of their discretion (Rauch, 1992). The social contexts in which Campus Control officers carry out their duties are fluid and as such it is not possible to anticipate fully the situations the officers are going to encounter.

However, there were some valuable components of the course, albeit few. The course was practical in as far as the officers were made to complete replicas of some of the crime registers and crime report forms they are going to be using in their work. The protection of the scene of crime and the handling of exhibits are also crucial aspects of investigative work. Officers are required to protect the crime scenes and assess if the situation warrants finger-print checking and then decide whether to request SAPS intervention.

It makes sense therefore that Campus Control officers be trained to cope with the work that accounts for most of their activity, the social aspects of their work. The acquisition of interpersonal and crisis management skills is essential in this regard. Frequently and at the invitation of House Committees Campus Control demonstrate to students in the university residences how to use fire extinguishers. All the demonstrations I have witnessed so far throughout my five years at varsity have been conducted by the Head of Campus Control himself or by some professional fire-fighter who is not himself a member of Campus Control. It is advisable that these duties be delegated to junior officers as this will help to boost their confidence.

There are within the organisation some people who bring a wealth of experience to the unit. There are officers with advanced fire-fighting skills and security acumen which unfortunately the unit has not been able to exploit. These are the ones who were very critical of the inept handling of training issues and the less than professional performances by some of their colleagues. It is not only financially prudent but also good for the morale of the officers which at the moment is at its lowest ebb, that Campus Control should identify these individuals with a view to developing an in-house training team.

Officers said that they would want to see the training period extended to one month with the introduction of refresher courses for trained personnel offered on an annual basis. The on-the-job training which in my opinion forms the basic form of socialisation into Campus Control culture should also be taken seriously.

Crossing boundaries - women in Campus Control

As already shown in chapter 3, the presence of Campus Control at the scene of the shooting at Forest Hills was felt and noticed by those who were on the scene. However, no mention of the significant role played by the officers on the scene was made in the Argus report the following day. In fact all credit went to SAPS. The supervisor in charge of the shift which provided the officers who attended the scene was so incensed that he decided to write to the university Vice Chancellor, Dr Stuart Saunders to correct the misrepresentation and tell him about the role played by Campus Control. He only wanted to "let you know that **your boys in blue** was there".

In the Burnage Control Room, one photo taken in 1985 stands out - that of the Vice Chancellor, in typical army fashion, like a commander-in-chief inspecting a guard of honour, being introduced to the all-male Campus Control officers, "**the boys in blue**". According to the officers, they are affectionately known by the Vice Chancellor as "**the boys in blue**".

On the surface, women look as if they are well integrated into Campus Control. A close inspection shows that is not the case. In fact, the organisation has been a restricted arena for women. It is a sphere that is synonymous with masculinity. Women are a case of structural marginality and an intrusion into male space. There is a process of gendering of Campus Control work. Women's marginality is played out in their exclusion from the mainstream areas of patrolling, especially at night. This area of the organisation's work is regarded as a male preserve.

All in all there are nine women in the unit. One is a recent appointee, the community liaison and crime prevention officer. Conventional wisdom has it that the area of community participation is another "soft area" into which women are channelled. The investigations department is headed by

another female. The rest of the women are confined to the control rooms or the offices at Burnage doing the administrative work.

The ordering of human relations into patterns of deference and condescension, respect and disregard, and command and obedience (Ortner and Whitehead, 1981) is a prominent feature of the unit's organisation. The unit subscribes to the traditional masculine imagery hence the biological differences are socially translated into a perceived natural lower status. Campus Control organisation reinforces the cultural assumption of male supremacy and female subordination. It mirrors the social patterns found in the wider society in which the masculine world view predominates and women are condescended to.

As a result of a gender-based chauvinism which reinforces the belief in force as a means of problem solving (Brogden 1991), a cult of masculinity has developed within the unit. The masculine outlook is rationalised by giving primacy to the view that the policed environment is dangerous and that since the major perpetrators of crime are hardened and "mean" males, women lack the physical attributes to deal effectively with them. This perceived menacing culture has solely been responsible for the preponderance of male officers for their iron image to counter their criminal counterparts.

Because of gender differentiation in Campus Control the stereotyped opposition of domestic and public is clearly brought out. The organisation of this unit reproduces the relationships of power, with some women permanently rostered on the day shift and confined to the control rooms or offices. This confinement amounts to an extension of their domesticity.

In a related profession - the police force, whose operations this unit tries to replicate, Young (1991) noted that women who breach(ed) the boundary to go on patrol would have to become surrogate males and prove beyond reasonable doubt that they have what it takes to patrol the "street visible" dangerous classes. He argues that some women have acquiesced to this male power game and have even embraced a distrust of the feminine view, that they have sacrificed their femininity, assuming male characteristics, and cultivating masculine attributes to fit the masculine model.

Most male officers in Campus Control were reluctant to talk about their female colleagues. They tried as much as they could to evade the subject. Some however, did not mince their words and made it abundantly clear that it would be irresponsible on the part of anyone to suggest that women should be allowed to go on patrol. I was told that, officially, the women do not go on patrol during the night shift, and that if for any reason they did then they would have to be accompanied by male officers as they are also seen as needing protection just like the people they seek to protect. One male student actually hoped that I would recommend to the unit's management to get rid of all "the useless old women in Campus Control". "I am better off alone in my drunken stupor", he said, "than feel secure and safe escorted to my residence by one of those women". I hope I am safe to make the assumption that the view that women lack the physical strength predominates even among the male students.

When I asked some of the officers how they relate with their female colleagues I got the typical response that they get on well. One officer said that he was a happily married man and as such did not have anything to worry about. The other said that the "problem" with one of the women is that she allows men to "touch" her but because "she is moody" she is totally unpredictable. What is significant about these two officers' comments is that they do have one thing in common - both allude to the female body. Young (1991) argues that the female body is lusted over and drooled at.

Although it is generally accepted within the unit even by the women themselves that balancing the demands of a career and the pressures of a married life is a daunting task, women in Campus Control remain indispensable. A revised system of patrolling and assignment configuration requires a major structural and conceptual shift in cultural and ideological attitudes. It is also advisable for the "moral purity of the community" (Young 1991, 199) that the unit continues to employ women. The university community has had more than its fair share of sexual offences. It is necessary in this context that there should be female officers to take statements from the victims as they are able to empathise with them better than their male colleagues. I also noted that invariably, female students are obliged to be out late on account of their studies or to attend social functions. Whenever they sought escort services they were escorted by male officers either on foot or car. Female officers would best fulfil this role even if they had to be accompanied by their male colleagues. They have

also been useful facilitating the search of female students at the entry to party venues making sure that no weapons are taken in.

Blacks in Campus Control - another case of structural marginality

The Campus Control staff compliment is predominantly white and coloured. The unit has been accused of racism, sexism and nepotism because of its racial and gender assignment configuration (Bowser, 1994). There are only six black officers in the unit and none in management positions. This has made it impossible for the unit to have any credibility among the black students. It is imperative that Campus Control should mirror the composition of the community it serves in order to gain a reasonable degree of fairness and impartiality. The majority of the students in the university residence system are blacks and it is this category of students that officers frequently come into contact with.

Campus Control officers' accounts suggest the development within the unit and the eternalisation of certain myths and views about black officers. The stories have it that one black officer was caught drunk and drinking while on duty, a common accusation levelled against officers irrespective of their race. This level of unprofessionalism and dereliction of duty could not be condoned or tolerated, so the officer was dismissed. Since this one case, officers said that this has been used as an excuse for excluding blacks from the unit. This one case and other cases of alleged misconduct have been enough to rationalise a blatantly discriminatory process. Those who have tried to advocate for the employment of blacks have been constantly reminded of this case and that "these people" are irresponsible, the officers said. The same accounts have it that some white officers were found guilty of worse forms of misconduct but either got away scot-free or the punishment was not commensurate with the misdemeanor.

The role of the black officers could only be described by some officers as one of facilitating communication. At times black students deliberately use their own language just to spite and frustrate the officers. I remember how two students who were caught removing hub-caps from vehicles said something to me in Xhosa to the effect that the officers were harassing them because

they were black. One officer said that black officers would be useful in these circumstances. This role does not however, suggest that the officers are fully accepted into the unit, but that they are useful when their colleagues need to be bailed out.

Grierson's report (1994) shows that the US college security personnel is highly educated, holders of university degrees. The UCT Campus Control compares unfavourably in this regard. "The present practice at UCT of having to take unqualified personnel is understood but needs consideration" (Grierson 1994, 9) Although not exactly illiterate the staff is not highly educated, black, white and coloured alike. Some officers said that there could be two or three officers who are completely unable to read or write.

The racial composition of this unit has to a significant extent been shaped by the university's policy regarding employment. Until recently (February 1996) the unit has not been able to attract suitably qualified personnel because they did not have the authority to advertise outside the university. The new recruits have had to come from the university's redeployment pool. The pool comprised mainly of people from the gardening and cleaning departments of the university. The most important point to note however, is that this pool was/is predominantly coloured and should be explained in historical terms. It grew out of the apartheid labour practice which employed coloureds at the expense of blacks. This means that while UCT claimed to reject all forms of discrimination this no so subtle form of discrimination continued within a part of the university until 1996. It raises the question as to whether the university administration was not aware of the racial composition of this pool.

The police mirror model and the "militarization" of Campus Control

"Years of hard-won experience, gained especially in Rhodesia and elsewhere, improved training methods, modern equipment, modernized counter-insurgency techniques, have all contributed to the respect South Africa Police enjoys throughout the world today" (SAP Yearbook, 1991, p.57, quoted by Rauch, 1992)

Military experience is valued as a good foundation for policing. Burnage does not look like a military establishment and the officers do not carry guns. However, the unit relies heavily on military symbols to sustain its military values. The rank system, the type of the equipment used and the codes are all reminiscent of military and police symbols. Within Campus Control one finds officers and managers with army and police experience gained through years of service in Rhodesia or South Africa. Some officers said that they had been "on the front" fighting in the "bush wars". At least one officer continues to work for both Campus Control and the military. Campus Control in keeping with its military image has just added to its command structure, a recent appointee, the crime prevention and community liaison officer, a candidate who spent eight and half years with Umkonto weSizwe, the ANC military wing.

Campus Control Standing Orders spell out the officers' "powers of arrest" and the handling of "prisoners". Other symbols in the unit include the distress calls - "**MAY DAY**", the 911 recording system, the emphasis on prestige structures and rank where a white line on a blue badge denotes with more lines representing a higher rank. Officers are often involved in high speed chases in pursuit of fleeing suspects and at times go through red traffic lights. All this happens despite the fact that the unit's vehicles are not equipped with sirens (they are just simple Toyota Venture vans) and are not specifically designed for high speed chases which are usually conducted in a seemingly reckless fashion. All these activities and symbols point to a repertoire reminiscent of the police force or the army.

Although some of these symbols are unavoidable because after all Campus Control is a security unit I would like to argue that the philosophical precept which values military or police experience as the basis for good policing served more to alienate the student body than to improve the level of professionalism within Campus Control. I would also like to argue that Campus Control's envy of the professionalism attributed to the state police backfired and actually accounted for the hostility it faced (faces?) from the student body owing to the historical notoriety of the security apparatus in this country. The Campus Control uniform resembles that of SAPS and it must be remembered that the students'(especially black students) relationship with SAPS was fraught with suspicion, mistrust

and antagonism. I am perhaps also safe to conclude that the students subscribe to the universal view that police are not allowed on campus.

University of Cape Town

CONCLUSION

There can never be any doubt about the important role played by Campus Control in the delivery of safety and security for the entire university community. The unit offers crucial services whether as a police force or a service industry. The University of Cape Town would be best advised to retain this indispensable unit, more so because as an in-house security unit, it does not have external competing missions, and can afford to focus all its energies within the university precincts only.

The unit deserves to be commended for its efforts through the concept of "Partnerships", geared at overcoming its history of a traumatic relationship with the university community. These efforts should see the emergence of a new-look unit, spurred to greater achievements by the encouragement and support of the community. The community as consumer of Campus Control services is finally going to impinge positively on official Campus Control policing discourse.

I hope that this report will benefit both Campus Control and the university community. The obscurity of the role of Campus Control must to a large extent be held responsible for the unit's unenviable relationship with the community. This report has attempted to define that role with the understanding that because of the discretionary nature of the work there can only be guide-lines, and that the unit's practice cannot always be submitted to a given set of rules. The report further indicates Campus Control's willingness to relinquish its monopoly of campus security services in favour of recognising the community's role and the advantages of applying a multi-pronged approach and united front to deal with the problem of rampant crime on campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Several recommendations and suggestions have been given throughout the report and here I just list some of them.

- * Campus Control's racial and gender assignment configuration should begin to mirror the composition of the community it serves.
- * The university community must be made aware of the proper province of Campus Control so that its expectations are informed and realistic.
- * Should there be an increase in the operations budget of Campus Control, it should not only provide resources aimed at increasing the number of officers, but also at improving the training in areas which account for the bulk of their work.
- * The role of private security companies should be clarified for the benefit of both Campus Control and the community as whole.
- * Campus Control should consider developing an in-house training team. Going this route is not only financially prudent but will also enable the unit to harness the officers' latent skills.
- * The unit's management should learn to delegate. Fire-fighting and other demonstrations by Campus Control at the invitation of house committees should be carried out by junior officers in order to boost their confidence and their moral.
- * The vigorous information campaign that the unit has embarked on should try to give a balanced coverage of all the aspects of the unit's work. So far there is too much emphasis on crime and nothing on the unit as provider of a disparate range of non-crime related services.

* While Campus Control seeks to embrace the principle of proactive policing, its primary role should remain reactive in the sense that it should be able to respond flexibly to the demands made on it by the community. The two principles should be complementary.

* The unit must also be aware of the unintended contradictions in some of the principles it seeks to adopt. For example, increasing the number of officers for greater surveillance while well-intended may impact negatively on the community participation objectives. Increased number of officers may bring about more intrusion into people's lives but could also mean increased assurance and dependency leading to a sense of safety and security, but failure to see the need to get involved in the provision of one's own safety and security.

* Communication at all levels should be encouraged. In this regard more foot patrols should be encouraged because they are more community oriented than car patrols and promote co-operation and information exchange on face-to-face encounters with members of the community. Vehicular patrols on the other hand can be counter-productive with regard to crime control because the officers are cut-off from the public, thus reducing co-operation and information flow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alderson, J. 1979. Policing Freedom.
Plymouth, Macdonald and Evans, London.
- Bowser, S. 1994. An evaluation of the University of Cape Town Campus Control Department. An Equal Opportunities Research Project. UCT.
- Bright, J. 1987. Community Safety, Crime Prevention and the Local Authority, in Policing and the community, Policy Studies Institute, London.
- Brogden, M. 1991. Policing South Africa, An Agenda for Incremental Change. Institute of Criminology, University of Cape Town.
- Brogden, M. 1993. Policing for a new South Africa.
Routledge, London.
- Campus Control Standing Orders.
- Enloe, C.H. 1980 Police, Military and Ethnicity: Foundations of state power.
Transaction Books, New Brunswick, USA.
- Grierson, W.D. 1994. Visit to the United States and UK, an Equal Opportunities Research Project Report, University of Cape Town.
- Howes, G. 1975. The Police and the Community.
Lexington Books, Great Britain.
- Newman, K. 1984. Report of the Commissioner of the Police for Metropolis, London.
- No Time For Crime On Guard*, Varsity, 55, 3, 1996.
- Ortner, S. and Whitehead, H. 1981. Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality. Cambridge University Press.
- Partnerships for Protection: An Equal Opportunities Research Project Report. University of Cape Town, 1995.
- Rauch, J. 1992. Policing Discourses and Violence in South Africa. Project for the Study of Violence, University of Witwatersrand.
- Rauch, J. 1992. South African Police Basic Training: a Preliminary Assessment. Project for the Study of Violence, University of Witwatersrand.
- Shearing, C. 1991. Disciplining the Police: The Development of Police Management Practices. Centre for Criminology, University of Toronto, Canada.
- Sherman, L. J. 1975. An Evaluation of Police Women on Patrol in a Suburban Police Department. Journal of Police Science and Administration.

South African Police Year-book 1991.

Uglow, S. 1988. Policing Liberal Society.
Oxford University Press

University of Cape Town Orientation Week Booklet 1996.

Weatheritt, M. 1987 Community Policing now, in Policing and the Community. Policy Studies Institute. London.

Willmot, P. ed. 1987. Policing and the Community.
Policy Studies Institute, London.

Young, M. 1991. An Inside Job: Policing and Police Culture in Britain. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

University of Cape Town