

# **English translation of discussions between Brazilian police officers and community residents**

## **(including codes of individual speech acts)**

### **Codes for all groups**

#### **1. The speech act stays at a high level of deliberation**

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,<sup>1</sup> which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories or humor, refers to the common good, respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

#### **2. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low**

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

#### **3. The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation**

This third category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level. Participants do not manage to give to the discussion again a direction. In the case of the Colombian ex-combatants, for example, this would mean that the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the peace process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the peace process.

#### **4. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high**

This fourth category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level. Participants are successful in adding new aspects to a topic already discussed or to formulate a new topic, in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants relevant for the peace process. Success means that good arguments are presented why an old topic should be further discussed or why a new topic should be put on the agenda. In this way, the speech act opens new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

### **Group 1 of Brazilian police officers and community residents**

#### **Participants**

**Patrício**, community resident, 15 to 24 years old, high school education

**Martinho**, community resident, 63 years old, middle school education

**Rosicleide**, community resident, 40 years old, incomplete high school education

**Maria Augusta**, community resident, 51 years old, no information on education

**Iranilce**, community resident, 39 years old, incomplete high school education

**Pedro Paulo**, community resident, 25 to 39 years old, high school education

**João Ricardo**, community resident, 35 years old, incomplete middle school education

**Otacílio**, community resident, 33 years old, higher education

**Luiz Augusto**, community resident, 30 years old, incomplete middle school education

**Laércio**, community resident, 25 to 39 years old, incomplete higher education

**Patrick**, community resident, 60 years old or more, incomplete middle school education

**José Pedro**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, high school education

**Hanna**, Police Officer, 40 to 59 years old, higher education

**Apoena**, Police Officer, 15 to 24 years old, higher education

**Goeldi**, Police Officer, 40 to 59 years old, high school education

**Júnior**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, incomplete higher education

#### **Moderator**

How can we build a culture of peace between the police and the community?

#### **Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

What I think about building a culture of peace is this: how we can break the stigmas. How to break the stigma of being a resident of the community in the eyes of the police and the society, and the stigma of being a cop in the eyes of the community. I found very interesting, for example, the point of this dynamic. If I saw her [*points at Hanna, a police officer*] in the street with that uniform, I wouldn't expect her to draw flowers. Because, as community resident, this uniform reminds me of fear. I wouldn't imagine that he [*points at Apoena also a police officer*] would draw a cross and think of Jesus, the importance of Jesus' love for all of us who are here. When he leaves the house, he thinks of how to bring joy to people who are in the barracks where he works and the

people he meets. In addition, if I met any of the five *[points at the police officers]* without those uniforms, even the relationship would be different. Similarly, when they enter the slum *[favela]*, they already have this huge stigma of entering into a slum community. I think that this activity that we are doing establishes the possibility of breaking this stigma. We can collectively create actions to achieve that. For example, when Marcia raised the possibility of an encounter with the police, the Casa do Beco staff said "No, let's look for a neutral space. The school, the BH Cidadania *[space provided by city hall for this sort of meetings]* etc." Because, if the police starts coming in and out of this place, it can give the rest of the community the impression that we're associated with the police. And that's not good for Casa do Beco, because we attend the most diverse profiles. And this is all because of the stigma. I think that maybe, there is this strong difficulty of saying things, because as a community resident who suffered several instances of police violence, I carry this fear with me. And when this offer of discussion comes up, we have the opportunity to collectively deconstruct the fear of both sides. We can think of deconstructing the fear of the police that each of us have, and - I probably do not know well the length of it, but - the fear of the community that the policemen have.

*Justification of code:* In this first speech act, Pedro Paulo addresses the problems experimented by the participants<sup>2</sup>. He shares part of his feelings and fears with other participants, being both very sincere about his opinions and also respectful to all police officers in front of him. He even highlights which kind of thoughts were motivated by the drawings made by the police members. Since there is a history of brutality, violence and oppression between the police and slum residents, Pedro Paulo touches on two sensitive issues: "stigma" and "fear". He invites other participants to acknowledge that these feelings are present in both sides. He thus builds an emotional atmosphere for a truthful communicative exchange, albeit a difficult one. Furthermore, Pedro Paulo plays the role of a deliberative leader when he emphasizes that it is actually possible to build a culture of peace between the police and the community; and he stresses how this group discussion may be a way of doing so.

### **Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

What you are saying is interesting, Pedro Paulo. My vision of the police is... Actually, I have two *[visions of the police]*. I don't go out at night much, I prefer to stay at home. So, the more police there are in the streets, the safer I feel. On the other hand, there are the bad policemen, whom I see coming up and down the community with drug traffickers and thieves during their work time. So, why are they so close together? You see them dealing, collecting, bringing stuff... So which kind of policemen do I want to see? I want to see the policeman who gives me security, who offers me safety, but on the other hand I know that most policemen are responsible for this lack of safety that exists in our community, because they allow the increase of new criminals. Things goes like that: "Make your dealings, and if you give me some *[money]* I will make things easier for you".

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide interacts directly and respectfully with the previous speech act from Pedro Paulo, by supporting his argument. Rosicleide introduces a crucial distinction between the policemen who work honestly to keep public safety and

---

<sup>2</sup> In the beginning of the discussion, the participants made drawings and talked about their meaning to the group.

the policemen who become connected to the crime network. She raises the issue that “bad policemen” contribute to attract new criminals, and they are responsible for deteriorating the security in their neighborhood. Yet, by making this distinction, she admits that “the more policemen there are in the street, the safer I feel”. This is a respectful statement and a recognition of the value of the police job. Therefore, deliberation stays at a high level.

**Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

I want to object a little to what you say about the term “majority”. As a community resident, it bothers me when I go to debates at the neighborhoods, and people use this term to talk about the favela: “the majority of people from the favela are criminals, the women are prostitutes, and they have bad nature”.

*Justification of code:* Pedro Paulo speaks up his mind and this time to clarify an issue that bothered him in Rosicleide’s last speech act. Actually, Rosicleide did not mention any kind of “majority” as Pedro Paulo claims. However, it is possible to understand her talk as some sort of generalization regarding the police officers and the slum’s habitants. Pedro Paulo contests the stigma of community residents, who are usually seen as outcasts in society: as criminals, drug-dealers and prostitutes. He contributes to the debate stating how bad these generalizations are to this kind of discussion.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

But I’m not the majority, ... They ... are the minority.

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide indicates that she actually agrees with Pedro Paulo. Thus she emphasizes that most slum’s residents do not fit to the usual stereotypes. Yet, her speech act is very brief and she does not develop her argument. The term ‘majority’ seems a little ambiguous – it is not clear if she referring to the ‘majority of the population’ (who holds a distorted representation on slum residents) or the majority of people who lives in poor neighborhoods or even to criminals.

*(Interruption)*

**Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

This community has about 40 thousand residents. It’s only a minority of them that cause problems with drugs and violence. So I keep thinking - I’m talking about myself - whether this prejudice isn’t being reproduced in the same scale, when I say that the majority of policemen are associated with crime. Because if it was the majority... Just like, if most of the slum dwellers were criminals, the city wouldn’t even exist, if most policemen were associated with criminals the situation would be a lot worse than it is.

*Justification of code:* Even though Pedro Paulo interrupts Rosicleide, he brings the argument up, by defending that both sides should not be stereotyped. He reflexively applies the critique that misrepresentation applies to both slum dwellers and the police officers. He argues: if the majority of police officers were corrupt and the majority of inhabitants were criminals, the situation would be clearly much worse. In his way, Pedro Paulo once again plays the role of a leader; and he builds a bridge to the other side (the local police).

**Hanna, Police Officer (code 2)**

It is interesting, isn't it? It's an extremely simplistic view, attributing to a professional class - that she herself said is the minority - a social problem. (*Sarcasm; irritation*)

*Justification of code:* In her very first speech, Hanna, a police officer, is disrespectful to Rosicleide's point of view, by classifying it as an "extremely simplistic view". She uses a sarcastic tone to discredit the two previous statements. Thus the level of deliberation drops from high to low because Hanna offends Rosicleide as well as Pedro Paulo's opinions. Yet, Hanna does not present any other point of view, story or relevant information to group participants.

#### **Laércio, community resident (code 4)**

When Márcia [*moderator*] first told me about this meeting through Facebook, I thought at first, "I'm not going". But then I remembered: "it's Márcia", so let's have this discussion. Before the elections, I had this same conversation with Fernando Pimentel's team [*left-wing candidate running for governor's election*], and I said what I'll say here. The first time I was slapped in the face by a cop, I was 10 years old, at my doorstep. Well, I had my share of anger during childhood, and I can speak about it with complete assurance and no prejudice at all. It is the same situation to most young poor black kids from slums – Am I lying, João Ricardo? [*Points to another participant*] Is it like that or not, Pedro Paulo? [*Points to Pedro Paulo*] I told the same thing to the current governor, and I think we are in a very advanced discussion about demilitarization of our police. I actually suggested that we changed the name from demilitarization to humanization of the police. When Rosicleide said what she said, it wasn't a simplistic formulation. It is what she sees. If I'm going to say whether the disrespectful, racist and uneducated police officers are a minority or a majority... [*He changes his line of thought*]. When I teach here at the hill, they'll treat me in a certain way, and when I teach at a school at São Bento [*a rich district in Belo Horizonte*], I'll be treated in a completely different way. So if I talk based on my experience, I can say that most of police officers are disrespectful and racist. But this is my [*personal*] experience, I'm not thinking about a more general context. So this is what I think: this humanization of the police needs to happen right now [*outrage*]. We know that the slum is seen as a dangerous place, and that the media plays a huge role in representing people living in slums as marginalized. Even when one of us goes into another slum, we can't help but think, "Am I really going into that slum?" That happens at the Pedreira, at Cracolândia [*place known by its concentration of crack users*]. But we know better. I have a history of drug and alcohol abusers at home, so we know how this works. This is my life experience, and I have been suffering in the hands of the police officers for 32 years for being black, poor, and a slum habitant. So, it's humanizing right away. I never had a nice experience with the police department. I'm a biker, a capoeira practitioner, I'm currently having a training in journalism, and I never had a nice interaction with the police. [*Emphatic*]

*Justification of code:* Laércio steps up as leader when he makes a very personal and touching statement, sharing his negative experiences and feelings related to police officer's past mistreatment, racism and prejudice. Most of these issues are sensitive and hard to be told in front of other people, especially in front of those who represent the police force, which abused him in the past. This sort of testimony may be helpful to open the way for other participants to share their true feelings. So it may help to build confidence for other participants to engage in real debates. In this sense, he also acts as

leader when he defends Rosicleide and Pedro Paulo's previous arguments against Hanna's sarcasm.

**Maria Augusta, community resident (code 1)**

Personally, I never had a problem with the police. I was not born in this community, but I've lived here for 24 years, and my disappointment with the police happened because of my son. When I couldn't carry him anymore, he started walking around. Then came my bad experience with the police. One day I woke my son, so he would take the younger one to school (I was very tired). A gentleman had been robbed, down there, and the police was there looking for whoever did it. They ran into a man going to work, and stopped to question him, and almost ran over my son. They put the car into reverse, and if he had not dodged it, the police would have ran over my 4-year-old son. [*Hesitation*]

*Justification of code:* Maria Augusta tells a personal story to corroborate the previous speaker's assessment that the police are typically disrespectful; and they abuse from their power threatening vulnerable people, like her 4-year-old son. Code 1 applies here because the story is related to the discussion at stake and Maria Augusta contributes with a vivid example to illustrate the police violence.

**Hanna, Police Officer (code 1)**

Is this debate about each one's personal impressions on the police work? Is that the debate? Because it is a police force that is present in the entire state of Minas Gerais. If you are to enumerate every situation that each of you has lived, I don't think we'll have a debate. In my opinion, at least. If we are also going to enumerate all the times I've been attacked or mistreated by someone from the community – I leave next year, after almost 30 years in the police – or if the police is to do that, we will be here for a long time. I think the debate here is general, not about specific cases of each person. Am I wrong? [*Intensity*]

*Justification of code:* Hanna is once again aggressive against the community members' set of complaints. This time she tries to step up as a leader of discussion, aiming to change its direction to what she believes to be the best way to have a debate. She appeals for participants to bring into discussion deeper diagnosis of the police work, instead of "personal impressions" and "singular cases from each person". Since Hanna contests other participants' statements and personal stories, through an aggressive tone of voice, she threatens to disrupt dialogical cooperation. Yet, the level of deliberation does not drop after her comment. By intervening in this way, Hanna actually tries to rule out criticisms on the police based merely on personal experiences.

**Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

I don't think that the idea of reaching a general proposal is incompatible with sharing individual experiences. I would like to hear you [*police members*] talk about what happened to you, because it's a viewpoint that we don't know.

*Justification of code:* Pedro Paulo disagrees with Hanna's last statement. He contends that a debate can include both personal experiences and general diagnosis and statistical data. He reinforces the view that personal stories can play an important role in debates, by helping others to acknowledge and understand problems in a more sensitive way. While Pedro Paulo confronts the police officer's authoritarian position, he invites her also to tell her experiences. He suggests that group participants could better understand

the police's side through this gesture. By re-establishing an atmosphere of empathy for sincere and respectful exchange, Pedro Paulo helps deliberation to stay at a high level.

**Hanna, Police Officer (code 1)**

And I don't have this view of fear from the favela that he [*Pedro Paulo*] mentioned. I teach at the favela, and I chose that. At the biggest favela in Contagem [*city near Belo Horizonte region*]. I am also a teacher, and most of our colleagues chose this, because the interaction is so much richer. You either invited the wrong officers, or the debate simply isn't going to flow. Are we [*the police members*] going to stay pinned against the wall here, so each one can offend the police? [*Intensity*]

*Justification of code:* Hanna keeps on defensive. She refuses to admit that police officers may be prejudiced against slum's residents and treat them disrespectfully. She uses her personal story as a teacher in a school located in a slum to reaffirm her claim. She also emphasizes the fact that each police member participated in this group discussion voluntarily; what in opinion indicates that police members are not prejudiced against slum residents. Then Hanna states that the discussion in the group aims not exerting pressure on police officers but actually debating about possible ways to build a culture of peace. By attempting to redirect attention to the original question placed by the moderator, Hanna helps to keep the level of deliberation high. Yet, after Hanna's harsh rejection of personal experiences as a valid way to take place in debates and her rejection of criticisms on the police force, the atmosphere for communicative exchange is more hostile.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

This is also interesting: we do not see all favelados [*slums' residents*] as thugs or criminals, not at all. I have several friends who live in slums, and personally, I see a minority [*that fits as thugs or criminals*], but everyone is compliant with that minority. Why? People do not report the crimes... Because of fear and impunity. We, are not enemies of the community. Are there bad officers? Unfortunately there are, just like there are bad people who live in the slum, who live in the Santa Lúcia neighborhood, who work for the government... There are bad people in several places, bad professionals. It is up to the offended person to respond appropriately, making a complaint. Now, we cannot make a general judgment. I do not judge the entire community, because [*I know*] it is a minority. When we head for work, do not feel afraid of entering the community. That's not it. Because we are trained. If we put it this way, we are afraid of simply going out in the street. But we are prepared to face difficulties, and still several policemen die. Do you understand? There is some fear regarding that minority and the reaction from the people in the slum. For example, if I approach you [*Laércio*] – since you said you had negative experiences –, you don't have a star on your forehead. If I'm suspicious of you, I will simply say “please, young man, lean against the wall and we will search you”. If you do it without problems, I will think that you are a good citizen, without illicit involvements, and we can move on. "Thank you, and good night". But, if you react violently and don't accept it, I'll start thinking: “something is wrong” you are hiding something. However, if I hit you, assault you or anything like that, then I am wrong. As you said, if that happened, you should report it and make a [*official*] complaint. I think it is interesting when each one tells what happened to them personally. But, it is also interesting to bring it up in general terms, about the coexistence between the police and community, so we can try to solve issues. You don't need to be afraid of the police. The police is not your enemy. We are

here to keep order and keep you safe. Unfortunately, we have to fight this criminal minority, because, for instance: the men who are involved in crime do not think even once before putting drugs in the hands of people's children. And guns as well. Many of these cases of kids who steal in this region, do it to support their drug addiction. So, we fight these people. Unfortunately, we can't count on the support of the entire community, in filing reports. This has to change.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro is the second police officer to manifest in the entire discussion and he speaks just after an aggressive interaction between Hanna and Laércio. Nevertheless, José Pedro clearly defends the police officers' point of view. He tries to justify the mistakes of other police members and defends why this kind of inappropriate behavior is no longer acceptable in police force. He presents rational argumentation and some stories to support his point. In a way, José Pedro is somehow challenging slum resident's common sense view, because he implicitly states that part of the problem of crime and violence is due to the inaction from slum's resident. The residents do not make complaints nor help the police as they should in his opinion. Still, he can be considered as deliberative leader, because his points on the police officers' misbehaviors, on the difficulty to identify a criminal (e.g. the absence of clear signs such as a star in the forehead) and on the role of community to cooperate to fight crimes. These issues will be strongly debated afterwards.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

But it takes too long when we file a complaint. Do you think that's because it is in the favela?

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide interacts directly with José Pedro's last statements and she adds an issue not considered by him – that is, it takes a very long time for the police to take an effective action after a complaint is made. Rosicleide also brings back the discussion on prejudice, arguing that such lack of action is due to the police's neglect regarding claims issued by slum resident. By doing so, Rosicleide defies José Pedro's simple logic that 'making a complaint' would be enough to solve the problem. Yet, she is not aggressive.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

But that's because there is a work of... No, it is not like that anywhere. You need to understand this: there has to be an investigation. It's not like this: someone says "there are drugs and guns at João Ricardo's house". We cannot simply go to João Ricardo's house, knock down the door and go looking for drugs. [*Hesitation*]

*Justification of code:* José Pedro and Rosicleide start a true dialogue about the issue. José Pedro claims that the true problem is not related to some sort of prejudice, but rather to the police overwork. He also clarifies that all citizens live under laws and rights, and thus a police officer cannot decide by his own to investigate someone's house without judicial support. Thereby José Pedro is trying to inform all participants of a more complex situation that restricts the police's actions.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

But, for example, there is a car playing loud music at my door. The police just won't come by. [*Interruption*]



*Justification of code:* Rosicleide seems to understand José Pedro's argument, but she is also not convinced of it. To support her argumentation, she offers another illustration of how the police is neglectful and inefficient to attend the population. Rosicleide seems to be a bit stubborn. However she is also taking her chance of presenting and testing her ideas; and insisting to provide evidences by means of everyday examples.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

That is not up to us. Look, the social defense system is wide. It's not just the police. To apply a penalty, to punish the person who is bothering you, you need a measurement of the volume intensity. Our law demands that, so you need to schedule a measurement by the municipal authorities. And sometimes you schedule it, they arrive and there is no music anymore, right? What do we do? We, the police, can [only] ask the person to lower the volume.

*Justification of code:* Once again, José Pedro clarifies that not every problem should be reported to the police or even that the police can solve certain kinds of problem by itself. He tries to explain that several institutions are responsible for managing different parts our everyday lives. In this specific case, he explains what Rosicleide would need to do to receive an appropriate answer from the governmental institutions. Although this is a very specific question, José Pedro helps the deliberation with this explanation.

**Ivanilde, community resident (code 2)**

But I don't feel like I'm convinced by this reason: I leave home at 6 AM and I get home at 6 PM. So, I don't feel familiar with what happens in my neighborhoods, because I'm living my life. Understand? I leave in the morning and whatever happens, it happens. I arrive back late and have my things to do, I need to take care of my home and that's it. I don't feel acquainted with what happens outside my door, do you understand? I think...

*Justification of code:* Ivanilde also responds to José Pedro's accusations of omission. She uses her personal experience to justify her opinion. In other words, how could someone that works the entire day be accused of complicity with local crimes? She is also pointing the fact that José Pedro's previous statement may be too simplistic. Still, Ivanilde's utterance could be bad for deliberation, since she redirects the discussion from matters of collective concern to a personal stance; she disengages from public concerns and does not show any solidarity towards the police work or even towards her own community.

**Hanna, Police Officer (code 4)**

Madam, the Federal Constitution dictates that security is not only my responsibility. It is yours as well. If community is not involved with this security, we won't have safety, we just won't. *[Interruption; authority]*

*Justification of code:* Hanna again interrupts other participant in an aggressive way. Still, she does not interrupt the flow of deliberation. Although rude, she explains that the security responsibility does not lie only on police department's back, but is actually the duty of every Brazilian citizen. In this sense, she is adding an important information for the discussion and supporting José Pedro's argument about a shared responsibility on security issues. She reframes the problem of public safety as a problem that concerns all.

**Ivanilde, community resident (code 1)**

I know that. Yes, yes, but absolutely no one who lives in the slum would come into conflict with drug dealers for nothing. That is not about compliance. That is because I won't have any protection after I report them. There won't be any cops at my door. Moreover: I own my house, I live here, I don't pay IPTU [*municipal tax*], I don't pay anything and I will have to run away, just like many other cases I have seen before here. [*Indignation*]

*Justification of code:* This time the dialogue happens between Ivanilde and Hanna. Ivanilde admits that Hanna has a point. Indeed the security issues are also her responsibility. Nonetheless, Ivanilde presents a new problem that was not mentioned so far: slum's resident live daily with criminals and drug dealers next door. While the police may come, they always go away, Ivanilde still uses her own life as an example. Nevertheless, she no longer mentions that she is "too busy" with her own daily work routine to care about what happens outside her door. Now she brings to conversation good reasons for living the way she does. She points out that she could risk her life and her house if she challenges the local drug dealers. She is sure that she will not be protected by the police too. Therefore, she is insisting that she is not a complicit because she does not want to risk her actual situation. While these utterances may sound egoist, Ivanilde is being truly sincere and exposing what is probably the major issue – extreme vulnerability - that hinders local residents from reporting local crimes to the police.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

There is a way of filing reports in which you don't identify yourself. Call 181.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro just adds a simple information as a straight answer to Ivanilde's claim. This utterance is almost an off topic, since it is poorly related to the peace discussion. On the other hand, José Pedro is trying to provide support for his theory that people have means of helping the police. He is also presenting an important information to other participants in deliberation.

**Laércio, community resident (code 1)**

Well, about the police being trained, it's hard to even ... What training... It's difficult to say it... [Takes a deep breath] what kind of training is that actually? All this kindness, this nicety... All the times I was a suspect, what was I suspect of? What makes me a suspect? That's my first point. The second is that I have never been approached with such kindness. Well, if a police officer approaches me in that [*respectful*] way, I would say right away: "congratulations, because that has never happened to me". Something like the officer saying, "Please, lean against the wall and I will search you", that has never happened to me. I have a son who will be 15 [*years old*] soon. Recently, I arrived home in a hot day. He was using the computer, and I asked him to go buy some ice cream for us. I only had a 100 Reais bill [*the highest bill in Brazilian currency*], and he happily went to buy some ice cream. When he got to the ice cream shop, a cop was there and said "Hey, hey, what money is that?!", and he said "It's my dad's". The officer replied, "Who is your father?" He was suspicious of him because of the 100 bill. So I had to sit down with my son and talk things over with him. When you have a son, you say to him "You got to really respect the cop, or you'll take a beating, there's no way. Whatever he says, you keep your head down or you'll get beaten, and it has

happened a lot to me”. That was a negative experience for me. Then, I really want that a police officer would never approach me in that way again. *[Emphatic]*

*Justification of code:* Laércio is truly frustrated with the police members’ previous speeches, especially with José Pedro’s explanation of how they ask a citizen to be searched. Laércio starts telling a story to strongly contest these statements. First, he emphasizes that in his whole life he has never been treated with the kindness described by José Pedro. If he could experience this kind of good treatment by the police, he would not only appreciate this behavior, but he would even praise the police officer. By his tone of voice, Laércio is not being sarcastic, but highlighting the fact that he is truly doubtful if any police officer could be kind and polite by doing his or her work. This story could disrupt the deliberation, since it “attacks” a central point of the police’s side deliberation [most officers are actually not aggressive while doing their jobs]. However, Laércio’s story is so personal and touching [especially because it mentions an outrageous example that occurred with his own son] that it did not affect the deliberative engagement between the participants. Actually, this story contributed for a police officer telling a story of his own too.

### **Goeldi, Police Officer (code 1)**

What I am going to say here is for those who imagine that everyone is alike. Unfortunately, there is prejudice from both sides and there may be some police officers who behave in a wrong way. But nowadays there are preventive mechanisms: one report via 181 is enough. You say what is happening, and everything will be investigated with the greatest possible carefulness. And this misbehaving cop will surely be punished, if he is proven guilty. For example, I was born at Cabana *[very poor region of Belo Horizonte]*, and I lived there for 26 years. My mother left for work every day, and my father was a retired night watchman, retired because of an accident. It was a hard life for me and my brothers. But my mother was able to keep me and my brothers at home, with a lot of discipline. Obviously, there were bad things on the streets, but if we stepped out of the line by just a little, things would get ugly *[spank]*. There was discipline at home. The few encounters I had with cops during my childhood – they were few because I stayed mostly at home – were good. So much that I wanted to become a police officer. One day, 5 years into the police force, I was walking down Independência Street, which is the main one at Cabana. I was getting some gasoline for my brother, and a ROTAM car *[XXX]* came and approached us. I just said to my brother “Gilmar, do everything our fellows ask”. We were asked to put our hands on the wall and such, and I didn’t feel offended by it. “Lean over there, do you have any guns?” That’s standard procedure. There is no way of guessing whether who’s a good person or not. It’s like that everywhere, not only at the Aglomerado *[slum]*, but also at Pampulha *[a rich area]*. This attitude of ROTAM would be the same in Pampulha or in Savassi *[rich areas]*, if they *[police officers]* considered someone suspect. Another time, at the Anel Rodoviário *[a junction of several avenues]*, my brother’s car was parked in a very strange place. The police came, approached us, but I wasn’t offended. I know this procedure. We sometimes get very bothered, but it’s the simplest thing. I know some cops are a little aggressive, but if there is an excess of it, just report it. And if we don’t stop to search people, we can’t work. *[Intensity]*

*Justification of code:* After a long discussion, this is the first line from Goeldi. Probably inspired by Laércio’s story, Goeldi decides to share his own personal stories, but aiming to defend the police’s side. By sharing this story, Gilbert tries to argue on both fields of

the discussion. First of all, he aims to dismiss the argument that police officers are prejudicial against slum's residents by arguing that he was born and raised in a slum himself. Second, he tells some stories of how he was addressed and investigated by other police members and how the experience was smooth and very different from Laércio's point of view. Thus, he implies that one's reaction to the investigation may be the most important behavior to be treated kindly.

**João Ricardo, community resident (code 1)**

Hanna said she thinks there was not an actual debate happening. I think that it was through what the group has shown, through each one's individual experience that caused the debate to actually start happening. You [Hanna] started to explain it, imposing yourself, and I think that started the debate for us too. We can say that everyone has their own personal experience. You said it, but we do have this experience as a community too. ROTAM used to come up here, and that was the only contact we had. You see, this was our experience with the police, which doesn't mean that is the case with you here. Personally, I am glad that the five of you came to represent the police department. Since you are wearing that uniform, you are obviously going to answer for the bad cops, who have abused the community. Anywhere you go, there will always be someone complaining about the police. I have also worked for the Police administration and for the riot police, I participated in some workshops, and I watched a bit of your daily routine over there. How the training works...., and, it's just like that man said, the same things happen in the community – there are cops who... commanding officers who want to do a good work, who want to make sure that cops – and that's your vision [Hanna] – have of the correct approach. However, there are also those cops who don't make that interaction correctly. Unfortunately, you will have to listen to these complaints every time you go to a community meeting. But it is also a good thing to see this point of view because when that communication happens... I was happy to come here because we are only going to be able to build a society – ours and yours – if we manage to see each other's point of view. You have your own view from inside the police. It is your work; and you have to get [the perspective of those] inside the community. There is the criminal who doesn't want to get caught, and he will shoot at you. You have your family, like us, but it is good that we are here, so we can understand your point of view, and you can understand ours. Do you understand? She [Ivanilde] can also have this kind of trust. We have seen here that the complaint [made by the community residents] becomes known by at the criminals. How come? Do you understand? It would be nice to answer that question for us. [Hesitation]

*Justification of code:* João Ricardo directly criticizes Hanna's previous speech and especially her attempt to impose herself over members of the community. Still, he is not aggressive in his voice tone or general talk. He actually tries to show Hanna that she was mistaken before. In special, João Ricardo emphasizes the importance of storytelling for deliberation. He claims that is important to understand the other side's point of view to build a peace culture. In a way, João Ricardo is stating that both sides do not know each other properly. Therefore, this sharing of personal views is an important part of the process. Finally, João Ricardo reminds Hanna that they are part of the police force and that their uniform carries a strong symbolical meaning. It reminds people of different situations and previous violent actions done by other police officers. He argues that it is something that each police officer will need to deal with, when attempting to get in touch with the community. Thus he is acting as a leader of this group, defending the importance of the previous storytelling processes, while also

stating how important is to listen to the other side to improve communication and decrease the barriers between them.

**Goeldi, Police Officer (code 1)**

I'm sorry, the anonymous complaint become known here? I did not understand.

*Justification of code:* Here, Goeldi is only asking for a clarification from João Ricardo. As they are discussing the importance of anonymous report, this line cannot be considered as off topic.

**João Ricardo, community resident (code 1)**

Let's assume that everybody starts filing complaints about a [drug selling] spot that is troubling the entire community. This drug dealer, somehow... And that is what she is trying to say, what everyone is trying to say... That's it... The society does not trust Disque Denúncia [phone number used to register a complaint]. Because the criminal cuts the cables, and goes straight to [retaliate] the person [who made the complaint]. And well, the community is really seeing this. I say it because I have been walking around here my whole life, in every corner of this favela, and I see that experience on both sides. It really is like that. When annoyed people start calling, a gunman suddenly walks by and it starts happening: lines are cut, and the pressure starts. People find some way to ease the tension. The police comes one day and then vanishes, they never show up again. So, that is the point of view we are trying to put forward. [Hesitation]

*Justification of code:* João Ricardo explains in a very simple and practical way why slum's residents are afraid of filing complaints against local criminals. He exposes a tough reality of such people, and what means to live side by side with criminals without a constant protection from the police force. João Ricardo recovers Rosicleide's previous statement. He reinforces the view that slum residents have to live in such way (without making any complaint) or they are threatened by the local criminals. João Ricardo also emphasizes that they do not trust the complaint service. In other words, they do not trust enough the public security services and the police to risk their lives reporting crimes or criminals. Finally, he is also asking the police about how the criminals know who had complained about them. This is a quite delicate question – not fully developed by João Ricardo -, which points out toward the existence of connection between criminals and some members of the police. This is a problem well-known by local residents, which is also supported by research studies.

**Luiz Augusto, community resident (code 1)**

There are two points that have caught my attention. I think the police should not be blamed and is not responsible for the circumstances. We should move to a greater scope that involves the law. I think that if this happens in the community, that's because the laws are weak. Or because the law is not as followed as it should be. For example, if I complain about drug trafficking activities, the law determines a certain time [for reclusion], I don't know how long, as a sentence. The guy stays in jail for 2 years and comes back – and I'll be forced out of my place, because the law was not followed. The PM (police officer) goes back again, arrests the criminal, presents him to the justice and then they let him go free again. I think that if we start to understand both sides – the community's and the police's... This is what I think: I have had contact with the police since I was a kid, I was born and raised at Taquaril. I moved out of there and I live here today. I had this same view, that the police is no good, that the police is aggressive, that

the police is violent. I grew up with this view, until I was 16. Until the day a police officer told me “Look, we have this project here. Do you want to be a part of it?” And then I started working, and my first job opportunity was granted by a police lieutenant. And that is when I started to understand the other side of the coin, looking not just as a community resident, but as a citizen. I think that, when a police officer leaves home, it is not a cop who is leaving the house: it is a human being. A family man who’s leaving his mother, his child, his wife - to take care of the common interests of all and do a job that he has chosen. I think that when the community starts saying “the police is no good, the police is this and that... The police is violent”... I think that in the community, as well, there are residents who are violent and avoidant [*to the police*], and I think that is like a mirror. So, when I’m stopped by a police officer, I raise my hands. Of course I’m aware of my rights and how far they go. I know up to which point I can admit a cop talking loudly to me or not. The other day, I was approached very violently. And I said: “Calm down. First, you have to ask me politely. I am not some outlaw.” I agree with him [*José Pedro*] that no one goes walks around with a star on their foreheads [identifying who are criminals], saying “I’m a criminal” or “I’m just a community resident”. I said to the officer “What do you want? I will put my hands on the wall, and you will question me”. I think that when you have this fear, it’s not because you live in the community. Nobody walks with some identification that says “I’m criminal”, “I’m a worker”. I agree that there are good cops and there are bad cops as well. Just like there are good and bad politicians. I think that when you say “an entire corporation with the bad ones”, as much as it may be one’s personal experience, that doesn’t apply to all. We need to demystify this position according to which cops and the community can’t coexist. I think we have to start working for that to happen. That is my point of view. I think I started to think like that after I had a direct contact with the police, which made me think the opposite of what I used to see before. I had that point of view until that point, then I started interacting [with the police] and thus understanding the other side of the coin.

*Justification of code:* Luiz Augusto is the first community member to strongly defend the police’s side in the discussion. He does not defend the police members’ previous arguments but he does defend the police force from some criticisms. Luiz Augusto enhances the discussion by remembering that Brazilian justice may also be distorted, thus a convicted criminal could return to liberty in very few years and then look for revenge against his whistleblower. Luiz Augusto also recovers José Pedro’s prior example of the difficulty to differentiate “good citizens” from criminals, which justifies some level of caution by police members. Finally, Luiz Augusto reinforces the importance of both sides trying to understand each other. He argues for respectful coexistence and use his own personal experience to show how it can work.

### **Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

Well, I’m going to tell a story here, because at 13 years old I was in the police. That junior police, which you [*all*] probably don’t remember. I was at the State Traffic Department, at João Pinheiro Avenue. Pimentel was the commanding officer at the time. I’m going to tell you something: it is a model of discipline. Every police department has discipline; the force is disciplined, and has a duty to carry out. The problems that happen between the officer and the citizen during the everyday routines are often trivial, as we are debating here. No one has a star on their foreheads, but when a cop stops a person, he is fulfilling his role and his obligation. If my son tells me today “dad, I’ll join the police”, I will answer “God bless you”. Because, in that moment, I am

sure my son... A uniform changes the person. I told a friend of mine who is in the police: "You've become different". Because he has to know that uniform, which is mandatory, brings responsibility with it. There are the bad cops, the corrupt ones. We saw that in Rio de Janeiro an entire [*police*] battalion was arrested, a terrible thing. But, thankfully we still have high hopes for the Minas Gerais' police. However there are situations in the community which are sad; and they leave us without options. Turning people in is sometimes a sad thing. And we won't make the mistake of turning in people who we know and who know us. We have once put enemy criminal factions face to face with each other, in order to make peace. So you can see what things once came to. Sometimes, someone is approached incorrectly. But there are also commanding officers, on the frontline and they can say "this is too much, you are crossing the line here", right? Because that helps, and we start to trust the police more. That is the truth.

*Justification of code:* Martinho follows Luiz Augusto's lead and supports the police's perspective. He expresses his personal good experience with the police and how he became aware of their discipline – something he came to admire. He expresses his appreciation for both the military discipline and the good things a uniform means (being able to change a person, in his point of view). Nevertheless, Martinho also agrees with a community resident's statement that it is hard to turn in someone who lives next door. As Ivanilde and João Ricardo, Martinho points out several problems associated to making complaints of criminals and how dangerous this practice can be for slum residents because of criminals' reprisals.

#### **Goeldi, Police Officer (code 1)**

We do that. When abuses go unreported, he [the commanding officer] answers along with the others.

*Justification of code:* Goeldi only clarifies something raised up by Martinho, stating that commanding officer may also be charged in case of omission. Thus he does not interrupt the flux of deliberation.

#### **Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

We have a very interesting case about a man here in the community. His name is José dos Passos, and he is a state justice attorney. One day we were in a bar, and he left his car on the street outside. The police looked at his car and asked someone to open it [*the car*] so they could take a look at it. When they opened it, I don't know what object they saw in there. They forgot the man was in the bar with us - he simply wasn't identified as he should have been. He simply complied with all the requests from the police. He didn't put his hands on the wall, but politely asked the cops for a private conversation, identified himself and that was it. There was no fuzz, no trouble, nothing. Thus, the police's work... This integration between police and community is very important. When the commanding officer was Glauber [*pseudonym*], we would go inside the police station, and discuss social matters of the community. The police went to the community and did some really nice things, like the *sopão* [*distributing free soup to poor people*]. We also know that the discipline and the training of the cops is different between the society and the community [*confuse phrase at original. It seems that he is stating that acting in the community is tougher*]. We are tired of seeing it. You see the elite squad training - jumping in those alleys. But today the community is totally different. Our community has grown. I was once at the city council, and the dean (headmaster) of the

Federal University had the courage to get up and say that the people here were still illiterate [*Indignation*]. As if the people here were still behind [*in terms of education*] from the [*entire*] society. That was when I stood and said “my friend, then you know nothing about our community”. We have 230 law graduates. I said, “You don’t know about what you are talking about, and you are not following the reality of this community”. And considering this situation of violence in the country, I honestly feel safer in my community than in the regular city neighborhood, because in here, everybody knows me. And in the city I don’t know how things are going to be. So, my view of the police from inside our community is this: I would like to see social integration. I think the police has a lot to offer in the way of helping these teenagers out there. That is my opinion.

*Justification of code:* Once again Martinho is acknowledging the importance of the police, and he shares a personal experience to show that police officers may be peaceful and do a good job. Afterwards, Martinho goes off topic, since he starts talking about education and how some politicians are not aware of slums’ true situation. He shows indignation about community residents’ misrepresentation by society at large. He states that he feels safer in his community than in other neighborhoods in the city, thus he is actually bringing back the discussion about prejudice against the slums. Overcoming this prejudice is seen as important for bringing together the two groups and building the culture of peace. Therefore, this is not a complete off topic, and his speech does not interrupt the flux of discussion.

**Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

I think it was incredibly important this discussion to start with individual experiences. It brings an idea of humanizing. In my viewpoint, I think to improve the relationship we need more than just opening our minds and hearts. Opening our hearts to the others and to ourselves. I had a whole bunch of things that I wanted to share about my personal experiences, but I think that now I prefer to make concrete suggestions. First, I want call the attention of the community about a few things. Whenever an international project comes here - for example, when the MIT [*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*] came to carry out some project, to create an application, it was full of people. And we always left the discussion with the foreign university with plans of creating a network, meeting again - it never went beyond that. Likewise, we are here today, discussing, because of proposition from outside. I think that we will advance a lot if we manage to aggregate international studies, in order to study an effective network - an existing network that knows better than to focus only on what sets us apart, a group of people that is concerned with what unites us. And what unites us is the community. João Ricardo makes his art for the community, capoeira exists for the community. Everyone here wants a better community, and that is what unites us. What is each one’s part, each one’s individual activity, can’t be a priority. In that sense, I want to challenge the community. This study proposes two meetings, but I want to provoke us into thinking about an action in which we can meet regularly. Be it once a month, once every two weeks... It would be wonderful if we could do it every week, to think about how we can be a permanent network, formulating collective actions for the community. So, which practical recommendations, which practical and effective actions should be done so there can be some humanization - not only a humanization of the police, but also of the community, of the view they have of each other. So, with a very open heart, I also had a nice experience with the police during my childhood. It was when they made a global action at the 22<sup>nd</sup> [*battalion*]. I left wishing to go back to the 22<sup>nd</sup>, for more actions,



but it happened only once. I think the police lost opportunities to really work with the community, in a humanitarian way. Even for filing complaints. I once had a situation in my house: I denounced an officer and I suffered retaliation. I was pursued, and could not go leave my house at night. I was stalked by cops. They broke into my house with those black masks. These personal experiences are important for preventing us to repeat the same mistakes. Both from our side and from yours, since you said you also suffer [prejudice], as Patrick has put it. I keep thinking about ways to help us move toward something more effective, more humane. Because, if we want to humanize ourselves, we then need to open our hearts. If we keep exchanging insults, we won't be able to humanize the police, the society, the community and ourselves. When I said that people think everyone in the favela is a criminal, I wasn't referring to the police, but to the society as a whole. I have friends who live in front of the community [in a wealthy neighborhood], who ask me if there are robberies in here. Just based on the what they see in the media. So there are some initiatives that I think would be interesting... At Casa do Beco [a cultural establishment], we are always working with childhood-related things. I think the police could go to schools, do workshops at schools, at all schools.

*Justification of code:* Pedro Paulo again steps up as a deliberative leader. First, he emphasizes the importance of sharing personal experiences to better understand and address the problems from both sides. In this way, he implicitly contest what Hanna had said before. Secondly, he also proposes that the participants move towards practical ideas to improve the relationship between the police and the community, as Hanna had suggested. He shares his personal bad experience of reporting a police officer's misbehavior. However he advocates that both sides need humanization, to value human dignity and treat each other respectfully. In his mind, the whole society has a prejudicial and a distorted view of the slums. In this sense, Pedro Paulo implicitly states that he is willing to 'forgive' the police as an institution, because he understand that the police has an important role in building a culture of peace. In a practical sense, he suggests that police should start to go local schools and interact with kids as a starting point.

### **Goeldi, Police Officer (code 1)**

The police does that. We do it every day.

*Justification of code:* Goeldi's affirmation, although being a simple one, reinforces his previous points regarding the police force's interest in getting closer to people living in slums. This utterance apparently has a tone of blow off steam. It seems that Goeldi is telling that the police already do a good job in their routine ('every day'), but this effort is clearly not enough to build a culture of peace.

### **Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

Then that's it. So I'll suggest something else: creating more than one activity in the 22nd battalion - such as soup distribution, which attends only to a very specific group -, to think about other collective actions that could take place in the 22nd battalion, like that action during my youth. I don't know, maybe a capoeira baptism [initiation ceremony for capoeira players] inside the 22nd battalion.

*Justification of code:* Pedro Paulo also reinforces his previous point. He wants to move the discussion towards practical actions. As the debate will reveal later on, Pedro Paulo is very hopeful that the group discussion represents an initiative that may truly unleash a

culture of peace. In his mind, the best way of starting it is to promote events for community, which could take place inside the police battalions.

### **Goeldi, Police Officer (code 1)**

But has this been taken to the command? Because if you do I'm sure the commanding officer will hear you. I don't know if he will authorize it.

*Justification of code:* Goeldi does not seem to be truly excited by Pedro Paulo's idea, but he is polite enough to suggest that Pedro Paulo's suggestion could be brought to his superior commander; he emphasizes that the suggestion will at least be heard and considered.

### **Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

But I think this proposition is less bureaucratic. It's more about building things together. I won't come here with (suggestion for) a Casa do Beco activity. I could suggest: "look, let us take a Casa do Beco presentation into the 22nd battalion." But we can build this together. It's interesting for the community and for you [*the police*]. More than taking the show there, it's important that the initiative that are being set up here, are built by us with you, in order be a joint, a collective proposal. [*people talking simultaneously*]. Guys, I'm still talking. Since we are doing a list for people speaking here, and I haven't interrupted anyone, let me finish my line of thought and I will let you speak. [*Authority*]. One time we were in the human rights commission, and we did some specific activities in the community. There would be a poetry recital, and anyone who picked the microphone could start reciting. At another spot there would be a singing show and at another [*spot*] a man talking on politics... Maybe we could think of some initiative in this direction. I know, for instance, that the police has a band. Isn't the band playing down through the community an interesting idea? Aren't we supposed to talk about humanization? I remember once, when we were in a meeting similar to that one, and the GEPAR officers who play percussion commented that they were being made fun of in the police station by some of the more aggressive cops. They said "the meek cops have arrived". And we heard that kind of remarks during one of the meetings we organized. But more important than giving up to this kind of violent pressure, it is to give in to the demand for a more peaceful community and cops. Isn't there any cop who's into Umbanda [*Brazilian-African religion*], into painting, [*who could*] do [*for instance*] something with João Ricardo's students, or maybe an actor cop? I saw an internet video once of a cop dancing capoeira [*a Brazilian-African martial art that combines elements of dance, acrobatics and music*] with his uniform on. That demystifies so much. Some people commented: "well, that one will surely be punished for that wearing uniform in a capoeira circle". That provides us with a different view. In 2003 we debuted a show that had criminality in the slum as the main theme, and was called "Bendita a Voz Entre as Mulheres" [*Blessed Voice Among Women*]. We made a survey among the women of the community. The place was a den of criminality, violence and drug traffic, and we had an actor from Galpão group [*famous acting group in the city*] directing us. We managed to bring great artists from Minas Gerais into the slum to watch our play. We got a lot of media cover, because there was an actor from Galpão directing a group in the favela. I remember we called the police, not as an invitation to the show, because we viewed the police as more as a threat than as a protection. It was a threat to the community residents, but the people coming from outside needed protection because we were in a violent space. So we submitted a request for the police to just patrol the area. Like that the boys from the traffic would back away. It was a very nice experience because the

police, instead of just patrolling, entered the place to watch. And from then on they had a different outlook, they were touched by the play enacted by the community. And we said: let us take this into the 22nd battalion, because the police needs a different view of the community. So I think that, in a very assertive way, the debate on individual experiences was good, so I could start writing and thinking of practical actions. Beyond the cops coming to protect the audience of our play, how can this officer come as a partner? The New Year's parties for example, have been come to an end. Because, in 10 years, there was one murder. In 10 years there was one murder, so they managed to get a judge to ban any kind of public event. The events that happen in town nowadays (not only here) use fences to keep the good citizen - and I don't like that expression - caged, because there is an external threat. Maybe, we need to reconstruct this kind of use of the public space. There is no prescription, but I think that - if we build a space of permanent dialogue (and not diminishing the importance of the study at all). But since we started this dialogue, why not make it a systematic thing, permanent, to humanize and build practical actions together, that can humanize and invert our views, your prejudiced views and for us to change the community widely? More than just thinking that the violence is going to end, we will change people.

*Justification of code:* Even though he's telling people to shut up, Pedro Paulo keeps trying to be a deliberative leader. He is convinced of the importance of practical activities that may put police officers and community members in the same space and he believes that the best way to build a culture of peace is precisely building joint activities. For that, Pedro Paulo offers good examples from the past by telling stories to show people that another relationship is possible. He also uses several rational arguments to explain why it was good and why these activities should restart. Therefore in this line, Pedro Paulo can be considered a deliberative leader for both sides. His ideas and propositions take into considerations the problems and needs from both the police and from community members. Finally, by suggesting practical activities, Pedro Paulo aims to advance the idea of how is possible to build peace between the two parts.

### **Goeldi, Police Officer (code 1)**

Pedro Paulo has introduced a series of suggestions and activities to integrate the police and the community. I am part of a group of officers who do this kind of activity. It has been happening. There is the "PROERD" [*a Brazilian version of the U.S program "Drug Abuse Resistance Education"*] the Bom de Bola" [*a soccer program*], "Transitolândia" ("traffiland"), the "kennel", the music band. If the community organized itself to formulate an application request or send a leader, for example a video like this, the commanding officer will try to advance it and make the cops available.

*Justification of code:* At this moment, Goeldi seems more convinced by Pedro Paulo's ideas. He finally reveals to be a police officer involved in these activities addressed to the citizens; and he explains that the police department already promotes several different programs in this sense. Still, he seems now more excited about the possibility of developing joint activities with local communities.

### **Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

But more than sending formal requests, the responsible people must be asked for the cops to participate together in this project.

*Justification of code:* For the second time, Pedro Paulo claims that he is not so worried about the formal requirements or the bureaucracy. He affirms that people need to get personally involved; and he hopes the cops would be willing to participate in such activities. Thus he does not want to write and submit a project to be analyzed by the commanding officer. Instead, he hopes that cops would willingly come to the meetings to plan these activities together.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

Pedro Paulo, let me tell you. The 22nd, if someone is in the 22nd, he has done all of what you have mentioned. Maybe you didn't take part at the time and didn't know about it. The *Sopão [the free soap project]* ended because they started serving and couldn't find people to distribute it. The Institute conducting the project started to pay a community member to distribute it; it didn't work out and then it ended. The "*Bom de Bola na Escola*" [*School Soccer Program*] ended because the interest of kids in participating in the program shrank. It was a project that had tutoring, football, painting and graffiti activities, several things, and kids stopped coming, and there was no support. There was a jiu-jitsu project that was success; the boys started winning medals in the state championship. This one was unfortunately cut by a commanding officer. The boy's mothers went there to complain, but unfortunately there was no support and it ended. So, several initiatives, like the ones you mentioned, have been carried out, [but] they just need support. All of what you said has been done by the 22<sup>nd</sup> [battalion], but there was no interest from the community. The Dona Lucinha institute opened several [*job training*] classes, and I participated in a barbecue making class. They opened sewing and cooking classes. But there was no advertising, and no one was interested. Those who did take an interest are now working. So, all of what you said has been done by the 22<sup>nd</sup> Battalion. The institute moved to Antônio Carlos, because there was no interest from the community here. They started setting up banners, I don't know if any of you has seen it, many banners advertising these classes were put on, but there was no interest. It didn't happen, and it also came to an end. It is like he said, we have the PROERD, and we have several projects. Afro reggae started off here at the 22nd. It is just like you said, at first the community was fearful, but then it turned into an international success. It started here, and moved to Cabana, because there was no interest from the community.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro seems less excited than Goeldi about Pedro Paulo's propositions, because he claims that such projects were implemented in the past and the community members abandoned all of them. José Pedro does not present only his opinion, but gives some general information on each project, how good they were and how they were all left aside by the community. So he implies that the problem does not lie in the police department, but in the community itself that cannot trust the police; and somewhat community residents were not interested enough. This statement will later be contested by other participants, since it's a statement intended to exempt the police from any responsibility.

**Maria Augusta, community resident (code 1)**

It is impossible to talk about the police without bringing about personal matters. For instance, I don't interact much with my neighbors. But yesterday I watched something, and two other situations happened in my house. Once, the police mistakenly searched my street, and instead of offering me protection, they said I could leave the slum if I was hiding the criminal. Then they went after the criminal, and he jumped over the wall

into my house - my completely locked house. I had just arrived, and he started climbing down the wall outside my daughter's room. The police knocked on my door and asked to come in. They said he [the bandit] was armed and started shooting. The officer came in, saying there could be a gun hidden in my yard; and he found a kilogram of cocaine. He told me I could be held responsible for it. How? How can he say I can be held responsible for that, when he watched the criminal jumping into my yard himself? You can't understand something like that. I would like peace between the community and the police. But, if the police officer could tell he was inside my house, how can he say I could be blamed for that? So many times I had the urge to fill an anonymous complaint, but I had no courage. Just like yesterday. You can see when the police are taking someone in the street, and the actual wrongdoers stay behind. Not the silly teenagers. There are people who say that the cops deserve to be shot in the face. I do not agree with that. I prefer peace to exist, but they are taking one into custody and leaving the main culprit in the middle of the street. *[Displeasure]*

*Justification of code:* Maria Augusta waited a long time to speak. She was probably building courage to do it. Still, when she does, she goes off topic. The discussion was focused on projects that may decrease the gap between the police and the society, but Maria Augusta shares a personal story of why she does not trust the police. In this sense, Maria Augusta's speech may be considered off topic, but it doesn't disrupt the deliberation as the next statement shows. Also her personal story reinforces previous important points of how the police officers can misbehave while doing their job, a subject that will emerge later on again.

**Patrício, community resident (code 1)**

I am young too, I live in the Aglomerado [Santa Lúcia]. Because of work, I get tired and rarely stay outside my house. During my childhood I took part in the “*Bom de Bola, Bom de Escola*” project. There was tutoring. In the project, as I recall, we had people coming from outside to teach. There was a specific Physical Education teacher, but not one that could show us the direct contact with the police. When we got into the battalion, the police and the kids were kept apart. There was no such interaction.

*Justification of code:* Patrício shares a personal testimony to claim that he has participated in one project offered by the police. However, Patrício states that the main objective of such a project – to diminish the gap between police and community members – was not reached, because external teachers were hired and no interaction between the kids and the police officers was encouraged. Thus, using his personal story, Patrício shows that the simple existence of these activities may not be effective to build a culture of peace.

**Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

Considering the fear of the community, we were afraid of interfering and making the boys' mind for not attending *[these courses]*.

*Justification of code:* Pedro Paulo starts an important new line of argumentation. Since the community members fear the police (both the institution and their officers), they did not encourage their kids to participate in such programs and activities. In Pedro Paulo's opinion, the best they could do was not to interfere and let the kids decide by themselves.

**Patrício, community resident (code 1)**

There could be some methods, but there is something else: the community lacks a leader to advertise the actions, a better quality of life and a better coexistence. For instance, I can mention the music percussion project in the schools that have the highest crime rate. Today, we lack this [*kind of projects*] a lot in our reality. Today, regarding violence, we are a thousand times better than ten years ago. I was victim of a stray bullet when I was 6; and this happened in time when several social projects and events in 2002. There were country-dances, New Year parties, funk parties, samba, all of that and some theatres in the slum. All of that during the most violent period here. Today, we don't have these violence rates anymore. Around 20 people died every month, today only one or no one dies during a month. And we don't have the participation of the police anymore, like in the "Bom de Bola" case. There is the PROERD [*a current project in primary schools for drug prevention*], which is great. And that is it, that's exactly it, we need to humanize the community as well as the cops. And regarding the police contacts: in all my life, of the 10 times I was approached, there was a recent one. The officer came in the community while patrolling - all the ones that stopped me were clear, firm and really assured of their approach. But always with a little more... They approached me politely, but they always did it with an overall pressure. An action I saw - I don't know if you have been to the 22<sup>nd</sup> [*Battalion*], but they have pictures of the individuals. Every cop who interacts with the community will know beforehand who he is interacting with; they have daily photos and videos. A friend of mine, who works at the Oiapoque mall [*popular shopping center*], likes to wear those neck chains, to dress in that "bro" style associated with the community. The cop did not approach him or anything, but said "what the fuck are you looking at, you son of a bitch, I'm going to kick your head". Did you understand? He exerted some pressure. So, we need more of a stimulus, especially from a community leader, so we can be watchful, and make the complaints, and make requests. So the joint actions between the police and community can happen - So people and cops can show the children, who are the future of Brazil, that cops are not what we see. Remove this prejudice from both sides. I don't know if I was able to explain properly, but that is it.

*Justification of code:* Patrício suggests a slightly different solution from the others previously presented. First, he expresses the idea to create spaces for integration through sports, music and other activities. Patrício argues that the level of violence was high even when these spaces existed in the past. He suggests that community leaders can play an important role in monitoring abuses and reporting the police misbehavior. Patrício explains that both sides should eliminate prejudice and work together to build a culture of peace. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Moderator**

We have four people waiting to talking, we are almost done. We have Patrick, Otacílio, Hanna and Laércio. Then, we'll have a snack that's been prepared for you. So we keep on this sequence. And let us reinforce once again the question: our objective is to think of ways of building peace culture between the police and the community.

**Patrick, community resident (code 1)**

I will take a little from each one who spoke, as it is easier to understand. I have lived here for forty-seven years. We went through many good and bad moments, with police violence or not. I wish there were more cops on the street, however. I am among those who think that the police is there to protect and to help. But a lot of times, in our

community, we do not see it happening- very little police officers act this way in our community, and this is from my own experience. The community is growing more violent, yet the police are the ones trying to stop it. The resident wants to help, but there is not much for them to do, most of the times. This problem has always existed but no complaint was ever made by the residents. They keep saying: "oh, you know, that's the way a cop works," the officer works that way, asking us "Do you know who that is?" Isn't the police supposed to investigate or do I have to do their job? The police is there to investigate, to work, to come back in the community as many times as needed. The officer goes in that place, he is making money, and he works with it and he has the needed experience. He needs some experience to deal both with bad guys and the community as a whole. I think there are few who are prepared to work in places like that. So we see that things are the same and they will not change. This relationship between the community and the police exists on every slum, everywhere. The police goes in there in a bad way and the community receives the police in a bad way. I think it can only end when the police change their approaching method so the community can see that the police is there to protect them. They are not there to hit anyone or to beat anyone. The police is doing their job and that's what we expect. We also expect, in their preparation, some social projects. In the past, there were some social projects, but they were few and far between in our community. I was once the coordinator of the health center for about four or five years. We avoided building the local gym inside the battalion. How are you supposed to put a gym in there? Imagine when some kid gets beaten by the police and his mother is inside the gym. I took part on the meetings inside the battalion when that project started. How could you participate in a meeting there while living here? Like he said, it's not safe for you, for anybody ... who here would do this? Also, in the same way that a citizen does not know who is a cop, the police do not know who is and who is not a bad person. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish this. Looking at his [the cop] way of approaching the people, the way he will approach us, approach you, approach me, that we will know if he is a cop who respects human beings. Now, that [happens when] he can't deal with the community. It is not everyone though. There are better-trained cops, but when their commander is changed, the police officers are also changed. Our battalion, the twenty-second, has police officers coming from everywhere. I think we need more social actions, a better relationship between the community and the police to stop the violence. Filing complaints [on drug dealers] is difficult and I do not dare it either. I think the police has to do this because they know who they are, and we do not know it any better than them, because they are trained for it. Everyone should know this, the police do help, we have to respect them and we need more cops on the community. I think, from those cops, there will not be [*conflicts with us*] because they know how to work. There needs to be more integration between us. We have tried it several times. I think our community, thank God, is fine, but we have already been through a very difficult period of violence. But on these cases, to improve this situation and to bring peace, it can be done by improving the social leaders, pursuing social actions. These NGOs working within the community, evangelical churches... Leaders, pastors ... Unite with the twentieth-second battalion because if they want to take care of the community they have to listen to everyone. I am part of the church and we try. "Oh, it is the people that do not respect the police, and think that the boy [*from the community*] is wrong" I think everything needs more conversation, a broader discussion to bring peace to this relationship between the police and the community.

*Justification of code:* Patrick presents key issues for the discussion – better training for the police, local leaders’ surveillance of the police unlawful behavior, and initiatives carried out by NGOs, Church members in order to bring the community closer to the police. These topics will be further developed during the discussion. Taking into consideration that the conflict between the community and the police was often denied or even made invisible by some participants, Patrick’s remarks are relevant to reassure the problem at stake. Patrick recalls what previous speakers have mentioned: brutal approaches, the police’s violence and aggression. Thus, the discussion remains at a high level of deliberation. Whereas Patrick keeps the problem in the negotiating table, he also recognizes the importance of the police and offers some solutions to build a culture of peace between these groups.

**Otacílio, community resident (code 1)**

I think that, worse than dealing with the delinquents, is dealing with the bad police officer because he is there representing the state and we realize that a lot of times the police’s approaches in the slums and in ordinary neighborhoods are completely different. Their approach here in the community and their approach in São Bento, in Santo Antônio [*upper class neighborhoods*], are not the same thing. But what I also see is a lack of public policy because we are lacking infrastructure, poor education, poor sanitation, lack of entertainment. A lot of times the state, the police officer has to make a decision that will have consequences for the rest of his life. If he answers in a wrong way, he will respond to that on the military court or in syndication. So he ends up suffering too. Or if he acts he may be liable while if he does not act and he might also be liable. So I see the police is on a knife edge because they have to go in a region of conflict. When we have a problem, where do we go? We go to the police, as we will not rely on a neighbor to solve these conflicts, because they always remain inside their houses. The police, as I see it, is important, is necessary, but we need to be careful because the police is the authority there. When an officer acts in an erroneous way, you no longer have anyone to turn to, because the state is violating your right.

*Justification of code:* Otacílio, just as Patrick, also points out that there is a harsh conflict between the community and the police. Otacílio brings back the issue of different approaches by the police in poor neighborhoods and rich neighborhoods. He is sensitive enough to point out the police’s distress, the hardships of punishment when they make a mistake and other harms suffered by the police. He is able to put himself in the police’s place to argue in their favor. Moreover, Otacílio stresses that the police officers represent the State within the community, they have the duty to protect citizens and use force in a legitimate way. Yet, if the policemen violate their obligations, Otacílio says that poor community residents are too vulnerable to make a complaint. So, Otacílio argues rationally about the citizenship equal treatment and rights to be protected against the police abuse – he maintains deliberation at a high level.

**Hanna, Police Officer (code 1)**

I thought we were going to have a debate at the broad, general, level because I’m not from the community, I do not know the community and cannot discuss any statement regarding the military activity. I don’t even know the region. I could speak of the place where I live and work. There are many social activities in my battalion – the eighteenth - we can even exchange ideas. So, most of problems that you had with the police, we only know from rumors. These problems are part of our daily lives. If we were only to approach you on the street..., there is a need for police intervention in all kinds of work,



to the hardest and to the mildest. So, there is a need for *[the police]*, to maintain public order. Who is the barrier between crime and society? Like it or not, there is a need for a different sort of officers for *[dealing with]* all kinds of people. Because we live in a society and we carry all her ills. Society is there, embracing us and hurting us.

*[Consternation]*

*Justification of code:* Hanna, who has shown traces of authority in her prior statements, presents reasonable arguments about the “necessity” of the police work to ensure social safety. She defends the police’s work and challenges the community residents’ criticisms. She claims that each police officer knows the neighborhood where they work. She corroborates the view that the police is responsible for enforcing the law and keeping the order. While acknowledging that police officers’ have great responsibilities, she emphasizes that the police corporation have different pattern of treatment for different types of citizens’ behavior? So she keeps the level high in the deliberation through rational argumentation.

### **Laércio, community resident (code 1)**

I think the talks were good, regardless of people here having lived or not in the slums. But I want to get more information about the eighteenth battalion to see how their situation is, to see how the relationship between community and police is. *[Hesitation]*

*Justification of code:* Laércio maintains the topic of discussion, by interacting with Hanna’s speech. He disagrees with her, and contends that he did like the talks based on personal experiences which she criticized. He argues that those talks were good and relevant regardless if they were vocalized by slum residents or not. In addition, Laércio invites Hanna to talk about her experience in other poor neighborhoods so group participants could learn about the police’s interactions and actions in other places. Laércio maintains deliberation at a high level.

### **Hanna, Police Officer (code 1)**

We can exchange numbers.

*Justification of code:* Hanna, in a dry tone, agrees with Laércio’s request to learn about the social projects carried by the police in Nova Contagem region. Yet, Hanna neither provides new information nor demonstrates interest in engaging in a real communicative exchange.

### **Laércio, community resident (code 1)**

There are some issues that worried me a bit. I worry about the people living in the favela, black people, and poor people and “favelados” *[slum residents]*. When my friend says that the police has no “star” *[an identification or tag]* on their forehead, it is an absurd to me. No, I do not have a star on my forehead. I’m a capoeirista, I work a lot for *[gaining]* my money and this was my choice. It is not only the police has no star on their forehead. Nobody has a star on their forehead. This doesn’t exist to me. The fact that I have no star on my forehead does not justify I being mistreated. It is a matter of respect, politeness, treating people well. When we see a representative of the state, *[who]* must have such a training that was mentioned, they are trained to treat people as people, regardless of this identification being there or not. I don’t buy it. When my friend, Patrick, said that the police officers are human beings, who are leaving their houses, it is obvious they are human leaving their houses. So are the people who are

approached by them. And what will the connecting point to justify this treatment? In my opinion, when I talk of humanization, social actions do not really help. I also do not accept the blame to be put on the community. Why would I - with all my experience of twenty years or so, having being slapped in the face by cops - support my child entering the battalion to take music classes? This is unreal. It is contradictory and impossible for anyone to do. That's why, the "Bom de Bola" social program ended, that's why nobody accepted the "Sopão", because there is no respectful dialogue. So it will not happen. Social actions, in my opinion, have to come from the top down. This training has to be changed, because people in the street cannot stand the police. Sometimes we also suffer retaliations, and we have to find a middle ground to reach. This humanization has to come from the top down. They have to change the [police] training. Why current training does not work? Because the community is not satisfied. So when I say that humanization has to come from top down, I do not accept the blame to be put on the actions that do not work. I am sure it has to come above. The police preparation, it has to change, because it does not work. Definitely does not work and we are seeing it here, clearly, that it does not work. [Indignation]

*Justification of code:* Laércio retakes the topic of some previous talks; and he forcefully argues that the problem lies in the police's treatment of poor community residents. He challenges aforementioned recommendations to build a culture of peace made by participants from the community (Pedro Paulo) as well as from the police (José Pedro). Laércio shows righteous indignation with the police' brutal and disrespectful behavior - that violates his sense of human dignity. So, he suggests that any attempt humanize their relationship should start with respectful treatment in their daily life, rather than with social projects. Indeed, he contends that those social projects would be unsuccessful if basic respect was not built first ("I am sure it has to come from above"). So the speaker mixes highly reflective arguments, personal experiences and recommendations for problem resolution. He reframes the debate, by suggesting that a number of previous arguments were not considering an important fact: a whole history of humiliation and violations that would need to be overcome. Since the speaker was able to summarize several aspects of the debate, he acted again as a deliberative leader.

#### **Luiz Augusto, community resident (code 1)**

I think that the experience you had with police was bad and you still defend it today. That is your perception. I am also "favelado" (*slum resident*). I lived in the favela since I was born. I went through bad experiences. So, when I say that the officer who is leaving his house is also human being, he is a human being, he is providing a service to the state, but regardless of that, he is prone to committing mistakes, just like both you and I are. If I only see the bad attitude of the police officer, I'll carry it [*the injury*] for life, but I chose to look on the bright side. That's why I can say that the cop is a human being rather than just a uniform.

*Justification of code:* Luiz Augusto stays on discussion's topic, by arguing against Laércio's remarks. Laércio had accused the police of being violent and disrespectful. Luiz Augusto defends the police; and invites Laércio to consider that his negative experience should not be the basis of his opinion on the police as a whole. Luiz Augusto seeks to reframe the debate through a reciprocal regard "the police officer is human before being uniformed."

#### **Laércio, Police Officer (code 1)**

But it's just like me, like you. He chose to be a cop. Nobody forced him to be a police officer. So it does not justify it. You say he is a human being, [*which also*] does not justify because we are human too. [*Indignation*]

*Justification of code:* Laércio does maintain the topic, through a rejoinder on the issue. Laércio is clearly frustrated with this line of argumentation, but shows a little more empathy in his remarks. Whereas admitting that the cops are human beings, he insists that this fact does not justify their violation of slum resident's human dignity.

**Luiz Augusto, community resident (code 1)**

I, for example, unlike you, take my son into the battalion.

*Justification of code:* Luiz Augusto, in a brief remark, contests Laércio's allegation that the police's social actions did not work because people are resentful with the police. Luiz Augusto did not give any reason to challenge Laércio. Yet, by simply saying that he would let his son to go the battalion, he showed that people have different experiences, values, and judgments. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

I wonder if any of us would like to be called "Oh you are slum dweller, you live on the slum". Would you like to be called that [slum dweller]? No. I do not think so. I wouldn't either. I think their occupation is each one's own option. We are not taking merit of what you are saying either. We are only saying that the cop is like you, like me. But they have a job to be done. I'm not arguing, I'm saying that these things are like that. Now - in my opinion - if my child talks about going into the police, my dialogue with my son is going to be different. If he follows the discipline of the police, he will have my full support. We all know that the police's hierarchy is different. But, there are cops that, on a day to day basis, on their routine, have personal problems, other problems, and that can happen. [*Indignation*]

*Justification of code:* Martinho dialogues with the previous speech acts; and he attempts to balance issues vocalized against and in favor the police. To be consistent with criticisms previously made, he points out that nobody has to accept humiliation and mistreatment by the police. To reiterate defenses on the police's actions, Martinho says that the police has troubles like everyone else; and they do a crucial job. He further suggests this is an honorable occupation, providing the police officers strictly follow the corporation norms.

**Laércio, community resident (code 1)**

He is a human being. [*Interruption*]

*Justification of code:* Albeit emphasizing major problems in the police's actions, Laércio concedes that the policemen are human beings – and attitude that suggests that he is also able to take the stance from the opposing group members. Yet, this brief comment may also suggest irony, since an abstract view of the police as human being could prevent persons from being accountable for their actions and lack of actions.

**Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

He is a human being, but what I am saying to you is that the ROTAM [*patrolling police*] has a team chief. There is a higher ranking officer and he might be responsible for the lower ranking's attitude. (*Urgency*)

*Justification of code:* Martinho agrees with what Laércio but restructures his argument. To avoid an ingenuous interpretation of abstract human beings, Marinho adds that the police officers act within a hierarchical institution. They are professionally and legally accountable to their superiors.

### **Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

But a lot of people already have an arrogant spirit in relation to the police approach.

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide keeps the discussion on the same topic. She points out that several people react improperly when approached by the police. Thus, the responsibility for conflictive interactions also lies in the community.

### **José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

I understand, but when we talk about the star on the forehead, what I mean is: - like I've mentioned here, there are bad cops, yes there are. There's no way we can control it. Just like there are rude people among the community, and I'm not talking about everyone. I speak with you here, a minority. And, in my opinion, you could change your outlook, change your mind. You've had problems with police. The police is very well trained. That is why the GEPAR was created. It was created to have a better interaction with the community, to find out, to have it's own vision. We cannot know about everything there, but [to] know who is a criminal, who is the offender, and who is the good citizen. That is why the GEPAR was created, and it acts only in slums. For this reason, like you said, the homicide rates were reduced. Many [of the] things [that] have been reduced in the community are because of the work of GEPAR, but there is still a lot to be done. Here, drugs are constantly seized, and what do they do? They pay? Good people store their drugs. But you, I'm sorry, I do not mean to offend you in any way, but you have to change your opinion, change your heart. If you stick with this hardness of heart, with the thought "I do not let my son into the battalions", your child will grow up with the same thinking as you. In the beginning - I joined the police in ninety-five - there were indeed aggressive police officers. I'm sure everyone here has changed, the police started working to change all that. So there are bad cops, unfortunately, but the police's vision today is different. The police wants to walk beside you, but you have to accept us as well. The population does not accept the police because of that mindset: "Oh, the police officer attacked me." A police officer attacked you and you did not report it, you let it pass. But there are cops today working differently, but unfortunately there are some that still make mistakes. But the police [as a whole] is changing.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro, in this speech act reflectively argues towards reciprocal understanding between the divided groups. He acts as a leader. As a police officer, José Pedro holds himself discursively accountable; he answers to other participants' criticism and keeps the conversation on. While accepting complaints made by the community residents, he seeks to connect multiple arguments to give a complex picture of the problems at stake. For example, in the aforementioned talk, José Pedro used four arguments to support his position: the police training has improved over the years; a police agency specialized for interacting the community members (GEPAR) was created; the police has been concerned to stand alongside the local residents who

are pressured by criminals and drug dealers; and finally, he suggests that some errors are isolated facts.

**Laércio, community resident (code 1)**

José Pedro, my heart is open, and I'm sure my son's is also [Sarcasm]. I chose to make him study, so the first thing I did was give him a lot of articles for him to know about Mandela. So in fact, it is a contradiction again. You even said that the community does not accept the police. And I mean the community in general, not just the slum. "What is lacking is that the community accepts the police", that was what you said. [Sarcasm]

*Justification of code:* Laércio previously mentioned that he would not take his son into a police space for taking part in any kind of activity. He has been one of the most critical speakers, and he has raised a number of problems associated with the police. José Pedro previously said that Laércio keeps "rancor and bitterness in his heart"; he suggested that he should change his mind, because otherwise his son would be educated in the same way. In response to remarks that clearly injured him, Laércio responds sarcastically saying that his heart is, indeed, open. He completed he has educated his son with writings of Mandela, a political leader who has forgiven his assaulters. In this way, deliberation stays at a high level.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

It is not the entire community [Interruption]

*Justification of code:* Laércio pointed out that José Pedro contradicted himself by defending the police, while admitting that the community does not accept the police. Laércio reinforces the whole society does not accept the police, and not just slum residents, José Pedro suggests that there are people who defend the police. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Hanna, Police Officer (code 1)**

But they are referring to this community here, because I've never heard about this in my community. [Interruption]

*Justification of code:* Hanna, a police officer, who had already mentioned that the place where she works is peaceful, reiterates that the conflict between the police and the community. It is not a general problem involving all favelas. Since the topic under discussion is maintained, code 1 was applied here.

**Moderator**

People, there's only one thing: I think this discussion is great, and we can keep going. I want to ask to people who are tight on schedule to fill the questionnaire, and then you will be free to go.

**Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

Brazil has just recently left a military dictatorship. The dictatorship in the slums – not only in this slum, but on the community as a whole... - we see it on "Fantástico" [weekly TV Show], even though I do not think "Fantástico" is the best reference. But if it's shown explicitly on "Fantástico" - we can see there is still a military dictatorship positioning [inside the slum]. That is not the proper way, it's not the way to establish a

peace culture. I argued that the debate that dealt with personal experiences came to a better outcome. The police represents the state within the community, within the city, within society. We've had situations that ambulances would not go inside the slums, and the cops conducted childbirth. This is not a myth, I saw it. So in places where we lack health services, education, basic social services, the police is present and sometimes they need to perform health service function, or whatever other function. Then thinking about it: the police and the state's presence in the community. If we were debating here with the health department staff, the education department, with the department of culture, the debate would be the state not being present. I'm making a reflection here. In this case their presence can be good. One thing I think we should make clear is that it is inevitable we have a space for discussion like this [and] not wanting to have them – perhaps because of culture or our subconscious – [to] reverse the citizen's role, which was pushed on the wall and put the cops on the wall. It is inevitable not to establish such a relationship. Okay, we did, and now how can we rebuild it? When she says that we "lack representative leaders in the community", I have a great desire to understand why - was it only failure to advertise that the theater owner closed [*the theater*], and other things that closed too, was it only that? Does it have nothing to do with what he is talking about? I think we need more meaningful things. Why don't we make a presentation in Contagem? Perhaps we could bring the young people you work with there, inside the school here to show a different form of dialogue. I have, inside my mind, a relationship with the police, that in my childhood, in my youth, was not good. I won't forget it, but from now on I can think of it differently. Since the police is the presence of the state and I have a different relationship with the department of culture, with the secretary of education, with the transport department and [etc.]. Why can't I rebuild this relationship? At other times we would not even consider the idea of the police's presence in a meeting like this, sitting in a circle and talking as equals. If we are at this level of debate, I think that it is possible we reconstruct this history of military dictatorship, which still exists in many communities in Brazil. And [also] take the group discussions that are being made, and [that] are successful, and try to replicate. The experiments that did not work, [we] must try to understand the real reason why they did not work. It is [like] the father who is afraid to put the boy in there [Battalion], being that when he goes buy ice cream with a one hundred Reais bill, he is seen as a criminal. I'm becoming anxious - as the time is passing, and the time will end and people are eager to go away – that we leave here having done nothing useful. Leave here saying "Oh, I discuss as an equal with Sergeant Hanna", "I was disrespected by the police." You know, it bothers me to think that we discussed here for almost three hours and we will leave the same way as we entered. It bothers me. We cannot change the past, but it is possible to build a different relationship from now on.

*Justification of code:* The discussion evolved around the issue whether or not the community accepts the police. Pedro Paulo, then, presents a series of reasoned arguments and opens the discussion to other possibilities; he seeks solutions and survey roots of the problems. The major issue is the fact that the state does provide base infrastructure for many slums. So, he plays the role of a deliberative leader. He points out the remnants of military dictatorship in the performance of the police in the favelas. This issue is a concern among sociologists and political scientists in Brazil. Moreover, Pedro Paulo reproduces the words of Otacílio and Hanna about the need to collectively search for solutions.

**Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

The community here - I am the fourth generation of this community, so you can see it is almost sixty years. The community's image at a time was so shaken that people came here with fear already. When you said "I live in the Morro do Papagaio", you were rejected. People were afraid to talk with us. Think about it?! The other day I witnessed two guys talking on the bus, saying that he lived on the Morro do Papagaio, and he was certain that, [living there] gave him a [free] bus ticket. Because the community here was divided by beatings. Excuse my language. No one dares go up the slum hill. Who went up the Papagaio hill was screwed and if someone came down from up there, they wouldn't go back to tell the story. Things here were ugly. That was even a time when we were [short] on water, very difficult times, so you can see how this community grew. And today, I can say to you, I am proud to say community, because the favela name has been forgotten, thank God, and that makes me proud. This is now a very advanced neighborhood. I was proud to see Laércio on Globo [TV] who has been doing those community services. This brought the people together. The community has grown so much that I feel proud to live here, because we have graduated students, young men with a law degree, Marcia who has a degree in Journalism, Pedro Paulo in Theater Arts, Laércio's. So how many people here today have the authority to say that this is a community? This here is a neighborhood, it is over calling it a slum. Now, there is also the misinformation about our community and those unfamiliar with it, who criticize it. But they don't know it. This is what I fight for on the government meetings. For that footbridge to be built, we had to almost invade Pimentel's office [*governor's office*]. We almost had to invade, and stop everything and make a big mess. But our request was met. The footbridge is there. I feel that the community has evolved a lot. It is a matter of the people's point of view. There are people out there who do not know the people [here], and talk nonsense. They have no knowledge of our relationship. So people judge the community in a bad way. It's great that you are here taking part for you to see how the community works. It has its ups and downs and I feel happy and proud to live here. [Intensity]

*Justification of code:* In this talk, Martinho deviates a bit from the police matter. Yet, argues in favor of community development and contests prejudices against slum residents and the community's achievements. He tells a key story about a riot to the conquest of a walkway demanding it from the former mayor Fernando Pimentel. Regarding the development of the neighborhood, he cites an episode when another participant, Laércio, appeared in the main Brazilian television channel and how proud the entire community became. Although tangential to the topic of discussion, this speech act does not drop the level of deliberation because it stimulates the development of reasons and storytelling.

### **Laércio, community resident (code 1)**

When I talk about humanization, I think it's actually the peace policy. José Pedro's said "the community does not accept approaching the police" and that is a fact. And that is dangerous. The community had to be working with the police. It has to happen. If it does not happen, there is something wrong. [When] I say something is wrong it is in a high hierarchy. Journalists, for example - most are worthless. We know what they do. But there are also great journalists. But it is generally. So, in my opinion, to make a book out of it, in short, I think there's something wrong. It is something much bigger than us, because everyone knows that the community is not close to the police. If this does not happen, this culture of peace will not exist. Do you understand what I'm

saying? Like, it has to be, if it has not happened it is because there is a problem, but where does it comes from? I know there are good cops.

*Justification of code:* Laércio follows up the discussion. He argues that the community should be close to the police and it is not. In this view, fact this evinces that there is something wrong. According to Laércio this suggests there are flaws higher ranks and this is "much higher problem" than the issue under discussion. In a way, Laércio is saying "what should not be said". He is stating that the problem involves high ranked people that may be inside politics, the police force and even media outlets. As a sensitive (and even risky) subject, Laércio is trying to get to the "real thing" by doing so.

**Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

Our raising here Laércio, our raising on the slum here - for you who came afterwards and the many people who were born here in the formed neighborhood – we have never been approached like we are now, sitting with police. *[Interruption]*

*Justification of code:* Martinho argues with Laércio suggesting that the situation of closeness to police is better now than in any other time. That is, Martinho sees improvements and reinforces that Laércio may not be able to realize it, because he is still a young adult. Thus, Martinho is using his own age and personal experience to support his point of view.

**Laércio, community resident (code 1)**

No, but there is one detail, they are not from here, because if they were cops from here...

*Justification of code:* Laércio argues against what Martinho said about the improvement in closeness to police. As Martinho used as argument the discussion itself, Laércio says that police officers who are there are not from their neighborhood or their slum, and, therefore, the discussion should not be an argument to prove improvement. It is noteworthy that, at this point, Laércio demonstrates finding that officers who are in the discussion are from other places. However, later on, it is clear that there are police officers from the region of Morro do Papagaio. This may have interfered to generate a fear in residents, taking into account that the police officers from other places makes discussion easier in Laércio's opinion.

**Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

We had actually had, Laércio, we have had meetings in the barracks, with Captain Caetano. It changes from captain to captain, I think. Everything you said here, Captain Caetano did – His way of working involved the community. [But] when one is good, comes in another one who has a different thinking, a different way of working. And then, when they command, you know what happens.

*Justification of code:* Martinho argues that the discussions are not only possible because the police are from other places. He mentions that there have been meetings with the police officers in the past. He supports the idea that approximation depends on who is in the police in command. Here, Martinho implicitly argues in a similar way as Laércio. They are both concerned with the fact that the commands made by high ranked police officers may change the whole situation.



**Laércio, community resident (code 1)**

That's what I mean, there is something, what I think is...

*Justification of code:* Laércio was probably going to follow his line of thought about the importance of the high ranked police officers' command, but he is interrupted by João Ricardo.

**João Ricardo, community resident (code 1)**

We keep going back to the same point. We are looking for an objective. We keep going back and forth on the same thing, discussing the same thing, what's good and what's bad.

[Interruption]

*Justification of code:* The discussion was evolving around the problem between the police and the community. João Ricardo interrupts the flux of conversation in order to change the subject. He complains that the discussion is "going back and forth on the same thing." He says participants are "looking for a goal" to the discussion. He is introducing a different topic. However, we consider João Ricardo's remarks as a positive one. After this intervention, discussion participants focus on the main topic proposed for discussion.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

The main objective is to create an alternative... A connection to change this situation.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro defends the previous discussion; and he reinforces that they were searching for problem resolution n alternate, that is, a way of generating this culture of peace, and thus improving the actual situation.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

This problem has already been discussed, now let's move on to the solution.

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide also engages with João Ricardo's speech act. She proposes to move towards the discussion of solutions to problems, because "the problem has already been spoken." It demonstrates how different participants were assessing the group discussion and the discussion as something important that could actually reach a solution or at least good proposals for the conflict at stake.

**Moderator**

I just wanted to make it clear...

**Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

Before you make it [something] clear, I think the first step would be to get to know the project you have been doing in Nova Contagem [Hanna]. Doing a field trip, [so] the people interested can get to know it. See what works and what doesn't. [And] with that experience, try to apply it here, since we want to create bonds, since we mean to deconstruct the military dictatorship and establish a relationship, what I think it's important. My dream is to have a police that serves the community as well as it serves the São Bento [wealth neighborhood]. But we need to create this bond. If the project is nice, we already have a reference, [which] is the predecessor to a peace culture. Why?

Because when we need the 22nd battalion, we can show them how it works on the eighteenth. How can we work like that? Rosicleide said: “I miss the community’s representatives... But no, the representatives are ourselves.

*Justification of code:* Pedro Paulo crafts complex justifications again. He claims that the discussion should be focused on the main topic. Rosicleide previously suggested that the focus should be on solutions. Pedro Paulo then presents an argumentative construction about the possibilities of what should be done; he takes into consideration other talks, such as police officer Hanna’s one, to build a comprehensive set of measures to improve the relationship between the community residents and the police. Then, Pedro Paulo once again explains the difference in treatment between poor neighborhoods and rich neighborhoods. Nonetheless, he wants to emphasize that if Hanna is saying the truth, maybe there is a way to go. Thus, they should look at her community’s battalion actions and see how they work and how to bring those proposals to their own community. Finally, Pedro Paulo is stating that each one there could be a community leader and he cites Rosicleide as an example of that.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

No, it’s not.

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide does not use arguments and does not develop her speech act, but makes explicit her opinion.

**Pedro Paulo, community resident (code 1)**

You have your beauty salon, you can help to spread it.

*Justification of code:* Pedro Paulo argued that the ordinary people living in the community should be their own leaders. In other words, they should act towards self-development and improvement. Rosicleide disagrees, but she does not provide any arguments. Then, Pedro Paulo illustrates that she could actually be a leader in her own work place (a beauty salon), where several people go every day.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

Guys, it’s not simple to make it available. No, I disagree. [*Conclusive*]

*Justification of code:* Pedro Paulo argued that Rosicleide could use her salon to do something for the community. Rosicleide continues now being as emphatic as before (when she said she disagreed with Pedro Paulo's statement saying that everyone can be a leader and a representative). However, she now presents a reason, although without further explanation. Implicitly, she is saying that it may be risky to do so. Maybe she will lose some clients or attracts the attention of local criminals or even bad police officers. Thus, she strongly disagrees with Pedro Paulo’s statement.

**Marinho, community resident (code 1)**

We have two societies inside the community. We call them the internal and external society. The internal society is where the leaders are chosen to represent those people. Laércio for example was chosen to represent a community, and we know the community needs him. He will be an internal representative of our community in meetings. Laércio was chosen, we elected him for the city council, and we gave him this term so he can represent our community. But having a leader here, is also difficult.

Gathering these people here is no easy task. It's great that people are discussing here, what is the meaning of peace. When it is necessary to discuss other things related to the community, you go to the health center and do you know how many people attend the meeting? Three or four. Representing thirty thousand people is hard. What happens a lot, in my opinion, when I represent the community, I always make my best. Many times I can't speak about everything, many people live here. So that's the reality.

*Justification of code:* Marinho, who is a community leader, engages in the discussion between Pedro Paulo and Rosicleide, by arguing that it's difficult to be a community leader. He points out several hurdles, such as the number of people living in the community; and apathy since just few of them engage themselves into thinking about community problems. Thus, Marinho is discussing the issues of representation itself, in particular the type of non-elected representation, and the need to consider the aspirations of concerned people.

**Patrício, community resident (code 1)**

Guys, I talked with Marcia about elections, and independently on who is being elected for presidency, we are fucked [as original]. We depend on the minority. The community is [looking for] a spokesman, a community leader and we could have a meeting to choose a city councilman as an representative in all communities – even though there are some city councilman in other communities – and we can elect one.

*Justification of code:* Patrício also engages in the issue of community political representation. He presents rational arguments and two good stories. He attempts to explain two ideas: (i) their situation get not improved, regardless who is elected as President of the country; and (ii) it is possible to elect a councilman if the community residents come together.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

We really can. *[Interruption]*

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide interrupts Patrício to endorse his point of view: the community can really elect a councilman if it makes an effort in that direction.

**Patrício (continuation)**

Having a spokesman would bring us more support. And that's how we will start a revolution. Like in that saying: "Might makes right", we have no power. The [politician] that comes from the outside is like that. Each one in here – we are a few, fifty thousand inhabitants and the vast majority doesn't care, the youth doesn't care. I have some friends that, if talk about politics, [give a] speech about peace with the police, I would be [taken as] a fool, a dumbass. Excuse my language. But that's it; we need to have people – the youth – become more alert too. The majority of adults – Ok, you have to put yourself in someone else's shoes, but to make improvements, they have to be [through] better education. We need to turn to the foundations [of education]. Ten years ago I was in the "Semeandos" project, and as a kid I always worried about this, but we never had the proper structure from the government, to get in charge and solve many problems. I had an example from inside the school, talking about recycling, trash, rivers and we didn't have the same opinion. There are no more trash collectors, I don't know what happened. There is none here. There is garbage everywhere. There is no construction going on. That's basically it. I have a coworker, and I think he participates

on the meetings that happen in FAFICH [Humanity Faculty of the Federal University of Minas Gerais]. He says that every construction that take place here on Morro do Papagaio, in the community, happens like this: There is a very strong influence from outside, many people are in their board, and on ours, and a few are in our favor. He assumed his other colleague was favoring the people from outside and said to him: "Vote in favor of the community people, because we have already won". In other words, some charity. They had already won because they were set. Ours was more important and couldn't happen first because they wanted to reduce our strength, we didn't have everything planned. This acquaintance of ours, he lives downtown. We have very few people that can represent us. I think what we need is leadership, to bring that information to the community, and to make improvements too. To bring your project and see if that is the solution. We would see how you helped the kids, the people from other units, and make it different here, all we need is for the people here to adhere to this cause.

*Justification of code:* Patrício reflexively develops the idea previously presented (the possibility of electing a political representative). Furthermore, he brings a new subject into the table: many times the slums are represented by outside people, such as researchers and councilmen, who do not truly understand their perspectives and needs. Therefore, Patrício, like Marinho's claims that they need internal representatives who may both advance their interest in legislative bodies, decision-making and public policies and turn people from the community to that goal.

#### **Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

Patrício, I'm protestant and I think one of the biggest problems- and would also be the solution – would be to introduce pastors, the protestant leaders in this situation. Why? The protestant churches are the majority here. There is a lot of Protestants. When we get together for big meetings, there are a lot of people, and there is a tremendous strength. But the pastors don't unite for one community objective. I dare you say there is a single meeting on the association. But they say, "Guys, [you cannot] miss the cult"

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide is now presenting another proposal. Since she disagrees that everyone could be a community leader, she suggests involving the religious leaders in these matters. Even changing the subject, Rosicleide is trying to present new solutions to the problem at stake; and she keeps the level of deliberation high. Still, this triggers a major off-topic in the whole discussion.

#### **João Ricardo, community resident (code 1)**

What do they want? Each one wants their one church.

*Justification of code:* Although trying to follow Rosicleide's suggestion, João Ricardo goes off-topic by just focusing on what protestant religious leaders want.

#### **Rosicleide, community resident (code 3)**

I mean, it can't be on a cult day.

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide is still insisting in her idea, but on such simple level that it remains off-topic.

#### **João Ricardo, community resident (code 3)**

People have their own different religion.

*Justification of code:* João Ricardo emphasizes that the idea would not work, since there are different religions in the community, but once again there is no connection with any previous discussion.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 3)**

Everyone is being selfish. So that is a suggestion, to gather these community leaders to...

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide affirms that these religious leaders are maybe too selfish to be useful for her previous proposal, but she does not argue how, keeping the off-topic.

**Patrício, community resident (code 3)**

It's [their] influence, right?

*Justification of code:* Patrício joins the off-topic discussion. By now, one can clearly see that they are not discussing the peace culture solutions at all.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 3)**

It's a big influence.

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide maintains the off-topic. Although realizing that her original idea may not be the best one to support the culture of peace; she neither try to change the subject nor present new ideas, not even defend her original statement.

**Patrício, community resident (code 4)**

Like when you are a teacher, you have a heavy influence. He, who is self employed, working as a painter, many people know him, but nobody will respect us, or follow our opinion. You are a hairdresser. But as a pastor, he is the leader. You are a colleague, you are providing your services to someone else.

*Justification of code:* Patrício finally explains why the religious leader could be a good choice after all. He uses other professions as example of how one can meet and know many people, but not be respected for such a job. He contends that a pastor is usually well respected and could act as a community leader.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

Yes, he needs to be a leader, exactly.

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide agrees with Patrício's last explanation. That was exactly what she meant before. Pastors are natural leaders among people and they could act more actively in these political matters.

**Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

I had wanted to ask them, the five [*police officers present in the discussion*], what has been said here that can be of any use. I would like to hear from you too, to know if what we said here can be of any use. [To know] your opinion on this, [know] if this will reach the more qualified agency, I don't know.

*Justification of code:* Martinho suddenly changes the whole discussion from political representation to focus once again on the issue of the police officers. Probably Martinho realizes that there is not much time left for discussion and he wants to reassure if they have good ideas and whether police officers think they could be applied or not. Still Martinho is being responsive to the other side, asking them to join the discussion and leave their final conclusions.

**Goeldi, Police Officer (code 1)**

I understand the positioning of everyone that is present here. I've been through everything you said. I have an identical life story, but my vision is different from yours, but I respect it a lot. Everything you all have said is a valid point. Hanna, has presented an interesting project that can work here too. I invite you gentleman to research not only on the 18th battalion, but on other battalion's projects, where the community has really embraced the police. We have this here in Minas Gerais. On the shack I was raised – even though it's been a long time since I last went there but – I imagine the local GEPAR is doing an excellent work.

*Justification of code:* Goeldi admits that he has not changed his mind somehow after hearing the other side, but he comes to the point of admitting the different opinions shared in the experience are important and he actually understand why they think in this way. Goeldi uses his personal story both to claim why he understands them and the reasons he does not agree with them, he had good experiences with the police and he himself works in police projects aimed to decrease the gap with the community.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

I also respect everyone's opinion. I agree with a lot of things, but I can see that a few things, - that are experiences that you gentleman have been through, and in some cases you were left disturbed because of these experiences and you weren't having freedom to accept trying to change. It's not every case though. There's no opportunity for you to know the new police, because there was, indeed, a change in the police. I repeat: unfortunately, there are bad cops, just as there are bad professionals on every job. Now, it's the population's duty – like you said, it's something you are doing and that we should also be doing it. Everyone has to do it, and I expect it at my house: give my children proper education, family principles, be it catholic or protestant, but we need this. Nowadays, kids are growing up surrounded with crime. They grow up seeing that the people involved with crime are showing off many things, and they become envious with that. So, I think we have to make an attempt to change. Do as Laércio does: educate your children, *[show them]* their rights, their duties and responsibilities. That's how we begin to change the whole situation going on here. You have the right to protest, learn to file complaints, and don't let cops... I say to you – like you said here – If there is a cop being accomplice to criminals and drug dealers on the slum, file a complaint. I am a cop and I'm taking risks too.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro follows Goeldi's lead. He says he respects the different opinions previously presented. Also as Goeldi, he does seem to have changed his mind after the deliberation process. He rather reinforces his previous statements and opinions, by affirming that the police has changed over time and the local population needs to give the corporation a new chance. Nowadays, José Pedro attests, they just pay attention

to the bad cops' actions. Finally, José Pedro calls the population to help to fight against crimes and to report the bad cop's actions.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

I can't, José Pedro. *[Interruption; agitated]*

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide makes a brief statement, a confession. She implicitly is saying "I want to help, but I can't", what asks for a new discussion, keeping the high level of deliberation.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

We can't let it happen. Look – 181 ...

*Justification of code:* José Pedro tries to emphasize again the importance of anonymous report, what in his mind is enough for them to make report while still proceed from different offenders.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

Our motto is "to be friend of the police and friend of criminals".

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide finally confess the hard truth. When one lives in a violent place, where the states does manage to control entirely, such as slums, an ordinary citizen needs to build solidarity with the police officers and the criminals alike. She admits that they need to be "friends" (i.e. loyal) to both sides, even when it seems to be impossible.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

Guys, look. 181. *[Simulating a telephone call]* "A certain police car is being accessory to traffic". It doesn't identify you or anything. Because I don't want a dirty cop working besides me. Do you think I want a dirty cop working with me? I'm taking a life risk. *[Intensity; generalized talking]* The 190 *[regular police phone number]* needs *[identification]* because there are many prank calls. The 181 doesn't require you to identify yourself, and they give a protocol number so you can track the *[complaint]* progress. You can be from *[Ribeirão das]* Neves or any other place. You don't need to say where you are from. You only need to say where it is happening.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro insists that the anonymous report system may be a solution for those cases. Thereby he ignores the important "confession" or "disclosure of the problem" made by Rosicleide; and he continues to focus only on bad cops. Still he presents important information that may be helpful for those participants in future situations, keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Rosicleide (code 2)**

So the 190 needs *[identification]* and the 181 doesn't?

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide goes again off topic, since she is just asking about the difference between the regular police phone number and this for reports, what results in more off topic messages next.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 3)**

The 190 is different. 190 is meant to filter the incidents, and the 181 is *[for]* complaints.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro explains the difference between the numbers, but does not make any link to the previous discussion, keeping it off topic.

**Patrício, community resident (code 3)**

[On 190] most are prank calls right?

*Justification of code:* Patrício just make a general statement about prank calls to the police and keeps the off topic on.

**Júnior, Police Officer (code 4)**

Yes, unfortunately most are prank calls. About the calls, I have worked at the 190 and 181 services. A lot of attention is given to details. Details are the most important. It's of any use someone calling saying: "My neighbor here is trafficking drugs". Only that doesn't help. "My neighbor, is "blue", is "green", has long hair, he is approximately a certain age, he keeps his stash in a certain place, lives on a certain street, certain number, his name is.. Really detailed information, saying where he lives, where he hides [drugs], what he hides, [etc]. Everything you know. The more details you give, the most valuable the information is.

*Justification of code:* Finally, Júnior brings the original topic. Although not discussing the building of the culture of peace itself, Júnior complements José Pedro's information and suggestions. He explains how a citizen should report a crime or a problem nearby. This will initiate several explanations from police officers about the importance of making complaints. This measure is seen as relevant for producing accurate data on crime reports.

**Hanna, Police Officer (code 1)**

That is so the police won't need you when they get there. You tell us everything you know, so you don't need to be identified, so you don't need to testify, [testify] what you saw. I don't know (incomprehensible).

*Justification of code:* Hanna reinforces that by doing an anonymous complaint, the police officer will not need any local assistance to do his or her job. As a consequence, she affirms that citizens, who make a complaint, will not be identified or become involved in the process.

**Júnior, Police Officer (code 1)**

Nowadays I work with statistics and the information that is well-detailed usually leads to something very good. Imprisoning, apprehensions. They lead to a very good result. Somebody said the police's duty is to investigate. Okay, it's (our) duty to investigate, but it's a lot faster when the society is with us. We are the society too. I, Júnior, am from the society. I work and live on a house, I have neighbors which I am friendly to, and I am friendly to everyone. I talk to everyone on the same manner. The same manner. So we to all work together. The police works for a common welfare, for the society welfare. We need the society's help to work better.

*Justification of code:* Júnior uses his own job to reinforce the relevance of producing accurate statistics of crime reports and general complaints for the police's job. He



readdresses previous statements from community members, such as ‘the police job is to investigate the crime’, and tries to show how this may not be entirely true. Thus, Júnior brings the issue of building of a culture of peace back to the discussion. He believes this may happen when society and police forces work together against crime. He even claims that the police is not necessarily a part of the state, but a part of society. He backs up this claim with the argument that police officers are human being exactly like community members.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

Actually, Júnior, the community needs an internal culture, because of the former cops, that were more aggressive. That’s the image that has stuck. We need a few psychologists actually. *[Laughter]*

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide agrees with the police officers who talked before that there is still prejudice against the police. She suggests a cultural transformation of such a distorted image. Then, she finalizes her intervention with a joke about a need for few psychologists to overcome this trauma.

**Júnior, Police Officer (code 1)**

It’s all truth; there is prejudice from both parties.

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide’s joke was well accepted by Júnior, who also sees the problem in the police’s side. Thus, he claims that is a general problem since both sides still have prejudice against the other.

**Patrício, community resident (code 1)**

It’s what I said. The social actions that happened before were in violent times [that] doesn’t happen today, [as] there isn’t such a high violence rate [now], and there is no more actions to change this view over the community.

*Justification of code:* Patrício reaffirms that maybe the problem is that police’s social program that were abandoned over time. In this sense, he is standing for a need of continuous actions to change the view of community members about the police. He admits this is tough problem, one that can only be solved over time.

**Júnior, Police Officer (code 1)**

I think we are lacking more meetings like this so everyone can speak openly, individually.

*Justification of code:* Júnior agrees with Patrício and he corroborates the importance of the group discussion itself. He suggests that similar meetings should happen over time. Thereby he also believes this matter takes long time and a lot of efforts to get improved.

**José Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

Now, these meetings can’t happen only for the book account. We have to get the authorities to know them. They have to know what is happening. Besides this, we need to have power – on my neighborhood too and on every place. We have means to make requests, but it is not efficient, which are the elections. We are not sure if the people we choose will do their job. But when we begin to become more conscious, when they feel we are conscious and changing our actions, maybe, they will change their attitude.

*Justification of code:* José Pedro closes his participation by taking the questions to the next level. He affirms that those kinds of meetings are not enough if they are not truly empowered or at least recognized by the state. He briefly talks about how people could use the elections to keep the politicians accountable. In conclusion, he states that the meeting is not useless though, since it helps to build the conscience over these different issues. He suggests that if enough people become more conscious and changes the way of acting, this may improve the relationship between the police and community residents. Therefore, José Pedro is asking for both more state actions and change in behavior from those living in poor neighborhoods to build a culture of peace.

**Rosicleide, community resident (code 1)**

Truth is we are accessory to it. We all are. [*Generalized talking*]

*Justification of code:* Rosicleide agrees with previous statements, even those used against her before. She recognizes that both sides are still too stagnant, that people do not act to build a culture of peace that would benefit all of them.

**Martinho, community resident (code 1)**

When this community started out, it was all filled with mud, when you went down, you had to put your shoes inside a plastic bag, to take the bus down there. This community was [full of] life. The people here would gather to help on the construction, to bring up these lamp posts you are seeing over there. We would drag them up the hill. The community was growing more and more, and expanding, getting better, but the people began to lose their interest. That is the truth. This girl said a right thing: We have meetings on the entity I attend. We called most pastors... What I'm saying is, in this entity I attend, where we prepare the citizens who are alcoholics so that he can have and chose a life goal. When we talk about alcoholism, anonymous alcoholics... We made a meeting opened to the public. I was ashamed, there were more people from outside the community than from the inside. One priest and one pastor participated. One. Amongst so many churches. We went knocking on every church door, and I felt sad with it. I was the coordinator of the [health] post and we had meetings to discuss things related to the health post, and you had to go to the health agency, knock on the health agency door. Things there got ugly. We were discussing with the secretary face to face. It's where everyone meets, and sometimes when you get there, there are just a couple people from the community. The participative budget – one of the things we are losing, the participative budget, just because of that [lack of interest].

*Justification of code:* Martinho closes the discussion using his own past experiences in the community to reinforce his point of view. While the community went through several important improvements, local people started losing interest in helping to improved it. Therefore, he emphasizes that it is neither violence nor the lack of infrastructure that hinders participation, but the lack of interest itself. He also says that he agrees with Rosicleide on the importance of religious leaders, but according to his own experience, if they are not interested, they will not advance in their cause.

**Moderator**

Let's close the discussion with one word from each participant.

**Laércio**

Suspension points

**Maria Augusta**

We need ideas and projects to improve the relationship between the police and the community.

**José Pedro**

The 22nd battalion doors are opened to everybody. We really need to strengthen this relationship. We have here the twentieth second and there is your local unit, the hundred and twenty fourth. And I think the changes, we can't expect them from anyone. They start with us. We need to begin these changes. We will not expect it from anyone, because no one is going to do it. We need to run after it.

**Pedro Paulo**

[You] are not saying just one word, huh.

**Martinho**

I hope everything was said here today, will be of good use. You should each think about it, and God will help us. Nice work from each one.

**Pedro Paulo**

Collective building.

**Rosicleide**

Socialization

**João Ricardo**

Legitimacy

**Otacílio**

Dialogue

**Luiz Augusto**

Getting closer

**Apoena**

Partnerships

**Goeldi**

Empathy

**Hanna**

I've already said, right? Positivity.

**Júnior**

Details

**Patrick**

Union between both groups. May the police do more this kind of thing? It is about working together with the community.

## **Group 2 of Brazilian police officers and community residents**

### **Participants**

**Otávio**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, incomplete higher education

**Stefani**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, higher education

**José**, Police Officer, 40 to 59 years old, high school education

**Alberto**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, incomplete higher education

**Daniel**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, incomplete higher education

**André**, community resident, 35 years old, high school education

**Robson**, community resident, 32 years old, incomplete high school education

**Clarissa**, community resident, 52 years old, middle school education

**Manuela**, FVivo personnel, 26 years old, incomplete higher education

**João**, FVivo personnel, 24 years old, postgraduate education

**Suelen**, FVivo personnel, 32 years old, higher education

**Layse**, teenager, 14 years old, incomplete middle school education

**Samantha**, teenager, 15 years old, incomplete high school education

**Orlando**, teenager, 17 years old, incomplete middle school education

**Cláudio**, teenager, 16 years old, incomplete high school education

**Ingridy**, teenager, 13 years old, incomplete middle school education

**César**, teenager, 12 years old, incomplete middle school education

### **Moderator**

The main thing we would like to talk about it is how we can build a culture of peace between the community and the police.

### **Robson, community resident (code 1)**

Maybe it's too late to start, but I think anyone who was born in the suburbs and who is a police officer has big problems. First, social problems, the lack of education (*unintelligible...*) I guess... I guess this is a good time for me to bring it up. Many years ago, when the problem you are talking about started, we did not solve it here in this country, this country has no justice. In the United States, if you do it [*commit a crime*] at twelve [*years old*], there are laws there, there's justice, and we don't have it. It has to be one thing at a time, but I think - I think it's a good time to do it. But in the suburbs, young people - I'm thirty six years old now and I have never been to a police station, I have never been arrested, I never had a criminal record, but I was beaten by police officers several times. The problem is... maybe, if they could take off the bad [*officers*], but maybe they are unable to do it... Before, the police work was so broad and so extensive, that it was so far away from their eyes, so we couldn't have a good reference to go there and make a complaint. That happened a lot. I worked in many states of Brazil, but it was with an NGO... the English community reference. When we arrived in Recife [*the capital of Pernambuco, a state in the Northeast of the country*] – Belo Horizonte is very calm [*if compared to Recife*], in Recife there's a lot of violence - they ended up shutting our mouths. It was really oppressive and we couldn't do anything in the end. They [*the English organization*] stayed there for six years, but there was no investment from the government, so they decided to leave. Twenty young people worked with us, nineteen died and one of them is disappeared. So today is easier, in Belo Horizonte is easier, do you understand? But we have to do things straight, because

the government can't just throw everything on the shoulders of the police, they just can't. It will never solve the problem. They have to know how to separate areas like education, infrastructure... If you do not have food on the table, if your dad doesn't work, your mother doesn't work, how will you live? How can you go to school, right?

*Justification of code:* The talk digresses about the construction of a peace culture between the police and the community. The speaker expresses his point of view about the police work, the Brazilian society problems and what he thinks is the community's point of view about that. Robson puts the issue within a broader context, one that includes poverty and unemployment – that's why he tries to differentiate between Belo Horizonte and Recife -, but also tells about a lack of preparation of the police to deal with poor communities. It becomes clear in his speech act that he expected the government to work in partnership with an organized civil society to deal with the problems associated with violence. According to Robson, the police cannot be the only solution and the only form of public intervention in poor communities. By presenting this point of view, the participant stays within the topic and offers a good starting point for the conversation.

### **Alberto, Police Officer (code 1)**

Actually, I think the work that the police has to offer to society today... it needs better integration ... to work as a partner, as an ally, not to work against it. It's clear that the media... it disturbs the dialogue between the population and the police. They make the police look like a monster, so the police must be armed like a monster, right? So, that is, at the same time that the media attacks a certain person ... off course it's not everyone, it's the vast majority who are experiencing problems in their community and see the police as a means to improve their lives... while, at the same time, that police officer sometimes assaults, arrests, and abuse of their power or act with brutality.... We are very professional in general, so, these people, they bring a form of negativity themselves, and they expose it in public... because we observe that living in slums leads to a much closer interaction, not only because the houses are close to one another, but because everyone is closer to each other than in a regular neighborhood. In a regular neighborhood, I know my neighbors above, below and on the side. But in the slum it is almost impossible not to know the people who are there. So, I think, sometimes, it becomes difficult - sometimes and it is a paradox - like I told you (22'31" *unintelligible*)... a homicide, today, is a problem to the government, a problem to public safety. Like you said, we have to plant the seed there, the tree has to grow and bear fruits. So, in other words, it is twelve years of direct operations in these suburbs and of showing to that society that crimes are decreasing. To be able to talk about public safety we have to talk about many other subjects, not only about the military police; that is, talking about crime, today... we see [*take an example of*] a teenager who goes to school, it's now much safer. He does not have to keep waiting for his father to pick him up there because there is a dealer or... criminal rivals. So, we notice this improvement, looking outside these communities, but we're not there to know what happens.

*Justification of code:* Alberto incorporates the points raised by the former participant and highlights the media influence in the way the public opinion sees the work of the police. He emphasizes the improvement in violence rates in communities today to argue that there has already been a movement towards the creation of a peace culture. This speech act stresses the importance of the understanding the police as a partner of the community, not as an enemy. In this sense, Alberto gets the conversation even closer to

the topic raised by the moderator, directing the discussion into the relation between police and community. Although he shows some hesitation and although his speech act is confusing at some points, he maintains the conversation at a high level of deliberation.

**André, community resident (code 1)**

So... We need to think about proximity between the police and the community. It is to understand that... Many years ago, even within the military police organization, which I don't have enough information to make a judgement, I'm an outsider, but I'm saying as a dweller, and as an active person within communities. We see it's embedded in such a way that we try most of the time not to take it personally, try to see the other side, because talking about the police, for example, they are men in uniforms, but they are men, women, fathers, mothers, they have their feelings as well, and... I don't know... I feel some of this improvement. But, like you said, there were many, many years of aggressiveness. It's been many years since this has been going on. If you put some thought on it, we... well, I have been approached... when you talk about the police, one of the first things to be said is about their approach, to anyone within the community or out of it... when you discuss the police's action you will discuss their approach. The other thing is to understand how this population reacts when the police comes near. Most of the time they are already negative, then they say: "look, the police is entering in the neighborhood, so we will show ourselves in some way". And I know it too, everyone knows, the young people know, that the police must not deliver flowers, that's not what they are supposed to do. But maybe right now a crucial point is trying to understand, and I think it's very difficult, it's the psychological side, which I do not understand at all. The police car is coming in, it's getting inside the community, and the police officer knows that his life is at risk, and that the other part will not relieve at any circumstances, that is, he comes armed in two ways. By the gun and also psychologically, like "if anything happens I'll have to intervene, but first I have to defend myself." And right now when police comes to the community, I think besides the different things that they have to do nowadays; how can a police officer be able to differentiate between people, do you know? Damn, they should! Let's say, there is a patrol operation - and there was a group of young people who do not have nothing to do with them; what we see the most is young people complaining that they were approached violently by the cops. And when the police officers come, at least in the Jardim Leblon [*a poor community in the fringes of the city*], they act violently. What I think is that the police can differentiate a guy by another within the same group, within the same community. Several times, these people will have drugs, weapons and others won't. Why am I saying this? It's because the community today believes that the person who is in debt and use drugs, they will be treated in a different way just for being addicted. So for example: I know some young people that are drug users, and they traffic, and they... They understand the police job when the police catches them, they'll be treated like that for that kind of behavior. But what the community may not understand is when young dwellers have nothing to do with anything [*any crimes*], sometimes they get caught in the wrong place at the wrong time and receive a certain type of treatment. Perhaps this is where one of our biggest problems begins, and that needs to be studied. I do not know if the police has this behavior, at least in general, as you said, I think it is fantastic when the police has certain [*respectful*] approaches within the community. It is not the relationship like "come to the bakery and have some coffee with me"... "Come here at my door" ... that's not it, it is only a relation based on trust. We are fighting today to prevent something that has been here for many years, the

impression that the police officers are bad. The police officers are not bad. We need the police and everyone agrees with that, everyone agrees. I think, today, we need to have a ... for example, inside a car, a cop who suddenly bursts for something, for some reason. And then he does something that was wrong in the eyes of the community, and that generates some discomfort, creates a bad impression to the community that he is unprepared too, and they start to see only the negative things that the police is doing. From my point of view, I can see some improvement, but it requires more information. I was even talking to the boys, for us, it is the moment I think- correct me if I'm wrong – it became necessary to make a patrol roundup; they have that right. Yeah, I think the police has not found a way to pass this information to the community. The community has to be understood, maybe I'm saying some bullshit here and you can correct me if that's the case. In a raid, if I put my hand in my pocket, I'm taking the risk of getting shot. That is because the life of the police, at that time... it is seen as self-defense. But what I understand is that once the community becomes informed, those good people will be aware of their rights and duties when they are approached and they will automatically see the police a different way. This police that already comes fully armed in two ways: Psychologically the police will have more... they would feel safer in their actions as well, pointing out who should have to pay for their actions and this is indisputable. I do not argue that. I'm discussing the treatment of the communities in relation to these practices, so these are some behaviors... so we see that there are two parts, the police and the community, you know? I do not know, that's my point of view, maybe.

*Justification of code:* The focus of this speech act follows upon the police approach, pointing out to a possible controversy between the safety of the police and the way they treat the slum dwellers. André makes an appeal to group participants to take each other's perspectives. He shows displeasure when a police officer disrespects and humiliates poor citizens - aggressive behavior is wrong and unacceptable. Yet, he states that the policemen are not just “men in uniform”, but human beings, “fathers and mothers”, who risk their lives in their work routines. In this sense, he maintains the conversation within the topic proposed in this study. André critically dialogues with the other interventions, analyses the points of views previously presented, and also brings new arguments related to his personal experience as a dweller and a community leader. At the same time he disagrees with the statement according to which the police only react to a stressful situation. He brings information not yet considered, such as the lack of openness from the part of the police to the dwellers complaints. Deliberation stays at a high level.

### **Alberto, Police Officer (code 2)**

Some years ago there was a discipline that was called (32'15 " *unintelligible*)... when we talk about aggression, on both sides, sometimes we can notice what generated all of that, so there was a wick that was lit. It's the relation between the one who's approaching and the one who's been approached, a relationship between rights and duties. So, sometimes, people are not doing certain things, and meeting certain standards, and on the other hand there's people willing to... let's say..., perform an action and the other person does not have enough education to understand. So, that is, sometimes the police are used, more than once, as a negative target.

*Justification of code:* This is a good example of a speech act capable of lowering the level of the conversation. Alberto has a hard time expressing his view. He seems to try

to elaborate a story to illustrate his argument, but he ends up moving away from the topic. In the short example presented, he tries to articulate, in an effort to please both sides, the police and the slum dwellers, but it does not have any link with what is being discussed in this study. The conversation at this point is leading from a high to a low level of deliberation.

### **André, community resident (code 3)**

But you can understand that we need to have studies about these communities... And it has to be discussed too... we have to say: let's work! Unfortunately, there are some difficulties to organize that type of discussion, I don't know the hell why! Maybe in another sphere, GEPAR has more contact with FicaVivo! So it's like that... but let's think about GEPAR in a more solid way, more... Back to the discussion, the training, the work of informing these communities, somehow, brings improvement. I think it improves a lot this way. It also indicates that professionals also need to be trained because you can say that it is a requirement for this kind of work. However, there are some cops, for example, that in the heat of the moment, when he is... on that dynamic of the approach, the action of the police changes, the police officer loses control, and then he acts somewhat differently from the way he is supposed to. So that's it, and it has been causing a lot of issues.

*Justification of code:* Although André brings back the topic of the police approach into conversation, he does so without reestablishing any connection between the topic and the peace culture. When he affirms there are some barriers to promote discussions about poor communities, we expect him to at least give us some examples about the origins of such obstacles. But, he just says he has no idea which these obstacles are. André gives some tips that could raise the level of the conversation, by mentioning the importance of studies, dialogue and of training. However, he does not develop these topics, and then conversation remains at a low deliberative level.

### **Alberto, Police officer (code 3)**

I was talking to another police officer a while ago, and he said that most of the penalties, when we are convicted, internally or externally speaking, by the military justice... We are convicted, most of the time no one knows that the officer was actually trying to solve the problem. So the society as a whole, - I was talking about it the other day - and I realized that we drive ourselves into trouble. Whenever there's a gunshot ... Whenever there's a social problem, he [*the police officer*] drives himself to that problem. And, generally, even those people who requested the presence of police officer pull themselves out. Sometimes a person who is a victim, who is asking for assistance because he was threatened by a drug dealer (*unintelligible*)... which happens a lot... well I don't know if it's that much anymore... that is, the same person who already reported several police officers and that on that time when he is more affected... and even that professional who has a certain adversity with the cops, he will fulfill his duty with the state. When we leave the headquarters, or when we leave our house to go to work, we already have all this in mind. What will we have to face on our work day? Who will I call? The government? The teacher? So, that is, sometimes what is missing in society is a better understanding that if we support each other everyone wins. We don't have to keep repeating what the police did or what it didn't do... That is very personal... the action... that the cop performed... let's say... the contradiction in which the police officer goes into is very personal. A battalion has six hundred cops. Then you take what one, two, three, four have done and you determine the behavior of the other five hundred and



ninety men? I mean... everything goes down the toilet because of how one cop behaved. So when society talks a lot, and it can even be through that "mouth-to-mouth media"... "oh, those slums are too complicated, those other people are more easy going"... Sometimes it was on that exact day and on that exact hour that the police officer had to be rude to avoid problems... he was rude because ... you, who are studying psychology, can explain us why ... he was rude on that moment but he was able to take three, four out of the crime... and people come and that cops are too angry, so I should better work or study. We have in our minds that sometimes it's possible to talk and some other times it's important to use a stronger tone of voices, and even some force to inhibit two, three, and four who are just starting to get involved with crimes. And so that's done, and it's done this way. Only those who are on the other side as listeners will think that the police was very... (37'58 " *unintelligible*) for certain children of eleven, twelve, they don't realize that the cop was preventing that child to become involved with criminals.

*Justification of code:* In this statement, the police officer insists in giving priority to his group's point of view, making an effort to justify the use of force on their approach inside the community. Except for one sentence, in which he affirms that "what is missing in society is a better understanding that if we support each other everyone wins", Alberto does not present a single opinion about how to create a culture of peace between police and slum dwellers. Most of this speech act is directed towards showing that the police, in fulfilling their job thoroughly, preventing children to become involved with crimes, but there is no concern whatsoever to link it with the establishment of a peaceful environment.

### **Moderator**

Let's wait a moment, there are more people who want to talk.

### **Orlando, teenager (code 3)**

Like you said, in several opportunities when military police go up in the slums, in the Jardim Leblon community I've seen it a bunch of times, I was stopped three times and we were hit, my friends and I, for no reason. Sometimes my friends ran and were hit again. Because when you see the same police officer who hit you the day before going up the hill again, you look that person and you say, like "no, that officer has beaten me and he will do it again. I better run". A lot of times the police aggression that occurs with us, we do not want it to happen again and we end up running from the police so they won't catch us. Sometimes we don't want to stay home, we want to go out. One day, when I was going to capoeira, we were going to make a presentation... We were walking, two colleagues and I, and we were approached by a cop. We had nothing on us and the police started beating one of my friends. Now he is angry with the police. He is angry and it can happen that one day he sees the same police officer who hit him, and he can be shot. So it was not his fault, it was because the police beat him when he did nothing wrong. A lot of times the people in the slum, just because we live in the slum, we are taken as thieves. Yesterday a friend of mine was going up the hill cycling and a police officer stopped him out of nowhere and began asking him "do you use drugs?"; he said "no" .. and the officer came back and said "You look like a drug addict"! Just because we live in the slum we are taken as drug addicts. That's what happens ... The mistake of some police officers, not all of them.

*Justification of code:* Orlando, a 17 years old adolescent, follows the lead of the last participant and gives his version, as a teenager living in a poor community, of the

controversy at stake. At this point the conversation seems to be stuck in a struggle between two different perspectives, each one associated with its own group, with no possible area of agreement. While the police tries to justify the use of force, the slum dwellers try to show that they are wrong, that most of the time the use of force is unnecessary. In this type of discussion, we are always at risk of watching an escalation of the conflict. Even though Orlando told his story in a respectful manner, it may encourage other participants to tell their stories too, since most of the teenagers participating probably have similar examples to bring to the table.

### **Moderator**

César is waiting for his turn.

### **César, teenager (code 3)**

The large community problem is that they do not see the police - when the police will make an approach, they see it as if they wanted to act that way. But that's their work, and the biggest problem of some police officers is that most of the time they use a lot of violence. Of course, like he said before, they cannot approach us offering flowers, they have to use the some force, but they often exaggerate.

*Justification of code:* The teenager recognizes the police's point of view, but argues, in the same way as the former participant, that their reaction is, most of the time, unjustified. In this sense, his intervention does not add much to the deliberative level of the conversation.

### **André, community resident (code 3)**

(40'39" *unintelligible*) Once we had to take a cop out of there because there were some complaints about how he was acting. So he went back to the headquarters, he was expelled, but now he's back again. I do not know if he went through the recycling classes. He is very ignorant, very arrogant. One day he broke into a house, like when you get in without knocking the door. "There's no law in here", he said. He did a lot of bad things in the community. I know it's hard, but we have to improve the work [of the police]. It seems that they send the worst to our community, at least in theory, right? In practice, it's really awful. The boys are growing too, and they are watching this. For me, as I'm already thirty-six and I have no criminal record... so then we end up not knowing which path to follow. The guy that was expelled by a petition, but now he is already back. I do not know what happened, if he became more prepared, if he got worse, if he will act the same way, you see?

*Justification of code:* The conversation follows the same line established since Alberto justified the way the police approach slum dwellers. With small variations of tone and broad variation of opinion, it continues in a respectful disagreement. Until now, we couldn't notice an affirmative effort to return to the issue proposed by the moderator. If we were in a different style of study, the moderator would probably have intervened in order to get the discussion back to the topic. In not being the case here, the conversation remains in a low level of deliberation. It should be noticed nevertheless that group participants seek to provide information about different types of harm and tell their personal stories in order to establish a shared ground for defining the problems that need solution to build a culture of peace.

### **João, FVivo personnel (code 4)**

I wanted to make a point related to what Rose brings up in the subject of the establishment of a culture of peace between the police and the community. So André argued that what we need is information, the community needs to be informed and the police needs to know that community. So I think that beyond the information, what we need is communication. The police needs to communicate in a more peaceful manner with the community and the community has to learn to live with the police more peacefully. Talking about communication there must be a way for the community to communicate with the institutions that will monitor the police action. A police officer who, like he said, takes the door down with no authorization whatsoever. There's no law in here? Yes, there's law in there. And the community should not be afraid. Today we are afraid, but we shouldn't. We should have this communication channel with the police. And another thing that the community sometimes has to forget is that some individuals must be treated in an aggressive manner. You do not have criminal records, you weren't carrying anything and so they shouldn't beat you. But then if the guy has something [*drugs, guns etc*], if this is the case... I don't know if it was something or he really have criminal record, yet he does not have to be disrespected because of that. He is also a citizen who also has to enjoy their rights and duties. He'll have to be arrested, penalized and conducted correctly, but there's nothing that say in our civil code, no statute, that says that part of the penalty is to get beaten or to be humiliated by the police. There's nothing that says that. So it's clear that the person has indeed to be arrested, and the community does not have to help him not to get arrested, but then also the police cannot act in a way... I will not say aggressive... - (*interrupted speech*) – illegal.

*Justification of code:* The participant redirects the conversation back to the main question. Expressing a gentle form of leadership, João incorporates some of the opinions expressed before and reorganizes the conversation, avoiding from getting even farther from the original topic. Linking the idea of information mentioned by one of the former participants with the more demanding concept of communication, the FVivo personnel addresses several issues that were raised in the beginning of the conversation and were dropped of in the last talks. Right from the start, the participant states that his contribution was meant to deal with the theme proposed by the moderator. As we can see, he did not lose time within the controversy of the former interventions: right in the second sentence he goes straight to the argument he will develop in his speech act and points one of the problems for the building of a peace between the police and the community: "...the community needs to be informed and the police need to know that community. So I think that beyond the information needs, what we need is communication. The police needs to communicate in a more peaceful manner with the community and the community has to learn to live with the police peacefully". This is a straightforward argument towards answering the question raised by the moderator.

### **Otávio, Police Officer (code 2)**

We recently saw a symposium here at UFMG promoted by the Medical School about the drug abuse prevention, which is a complex problem to which we usually seek simple answers, so we will eventually be wrong. This is a complex problem that has no simple answers; agencies, governments, they must be part of the community, everyone has to get involved, but I am convinced this goes through education, it is not so simple, the discussion has no point until the authorities realize that and decide to heavily invest on education, which is not something with short-term results. That's what I think about the solution of the problem. Besides that, one interesting thing, for example, is that most of

the time... for me as I work with drug abuse prevention... most of the time in my daily routine, the military uniform and the gun are not the main part. It makes no difference and it shows that the police needs to be more professional. So the cops... our main weapon today is not uniform, nor the gun. It has to be the dialogue with the communitarian police, the police based on human rights, legality... Illegal acts are no longer admitted. Another thing, in the slum of Leblon there is a cop friend of mine who also lives there, so there is no such segregation between the police and the community. I have many friends that go through our admission test and tomorrow become police officers. There is no segregation of cops and slum communities. I'm from the Santa Amelia neighborhood and I spent my entire childhood in Leblon and maybe tomorrow I'll be a cop or something else there. So there is no segregation of the slum community. (*interrupted: I can't agree with that*) For me it's like that.

*Justification of code:* The participant returns to the old controversy about the relationship between the police and the community. Differently from the other speech acts, however, his main concern is to show that, behind the uniform, police officers are also human beings, who have their lives and sometimes even live in the same community where they work – or other similarly poor areas. His disagreement is related to an impression that there's already a culture of peace established in most of the communities. Since the police main weapon nowadays is neither the gun nor the uniform, the creation of a culture of peace is not an issue. So, he lowers the level of the conversation once more by discrediting the perspective of the community leaders and even the opinion expressed by the Fica Vivo technician.

**Robson, community resident (code 3)**

But the opinion of who lives there is not the same, I'm sorry.

*Justification of code:* Following the biased opinion of the former participant, Robson expresses a strong disagreement. We can notice a clear aversion about what was said by the police officer, especially because it disregards the point of view of the group represented by Robson. At this point we dangerously move away from the main issue and go back to a situation in which an agreement seems quite unlikely.

**Manuela, FVivo personnel (code 3)**

The way the cops approach the middle-class youth who are drug-users is different.

*Justification of code:* Manuela gives support to the former participant and challenges the cop's opinion that there is no difference in the way the police treats middle-class and poor teenagers. The conversation keeps flowing contrary to the path of mutual understanding. We can see that the intervention of the police officer was a clear turning point in a discussion that seemed to be heading back to an exchange of opinions regarding the constitution of a culture of peace. The struggle now is to reestablish the culture of peace as a subject worth discussing.

(*Many interruptions*)

**Otávio, Police Officer (code 3)**

But it depends of the drug used. For example, I use drugs, I drink alcohol once in a while.

*Justification of code:* At this point of the discussion we have a very sharp distinction between two groups: on the one side, the policemen, on the other, the slum dwellers and the FVivo personnel. Otávio stakes his position in this battlefield and tries to relativize the distinction in the treatment between poor and middle-class teenagers. His speech act does not help to put the conversation back on track, so the discussion gets stuck in a low level of deliberation.

**Manuela, FVivo personnel (code 3)**

I'm talking about the middle-class drug users and the other users... I'm saying the approach with the middle-class youth and the slums youth is different. We know that.

*Justification of code:* The disagreement is definitely at stake here. We are now watching a fast exchange of strong and distinct opinions about the police approach. Manuela almost exactly repeats her last statement. And she wraps it up with a very short sentence that does not open space for disagreement: "We know that".

**Otávio, Police Officer (code 3)**

But how will I know who is from the slum and who is from the middle-class until I get a complaint that someone is carrying drugs here? My approach as a police officer will be the same for everyone. It's possible to happen a different approach, but don't generalize it.

*Justification of code:* The strategy of the police does not change: "some cops really act in an aggressive way, but let's not generalize". Moreover, Otávio argues that even if they wanted, the officers could not have a different approach once they don't know in advance who is a slum dweller and who is a middle-class individual. The participant maintains that the police always follows a procedure, which is the same for everyone. He dismisses the other group's opinion and reaffirms his group's point of view, thus leaving the conversation level untouched.

**Manuela, Fica Vivo personnel (code 3)**

No, I'm not generalizing.

*Justification of code:* The participant holds her opinion on the matter with a short statement. It is not about generalizing, she argues. The level of the conversation remains in a low level.

**Otávio, Police Officer (code 3)**

The approaches are different. If I go to suburbs, like when I went there with the ROTAM, my approach... Are there colleagues who don't do...? Yes.

*Justification of code:* Otávio insists in the same strategy and the conversation does not change. He makes a concession at this point, assuming that some people in the police, especially in groups prepared to deal with risky situations, really do use disproportionate force when approaching people in poor communities. But it does not raise the level of the conversation that is still in a low deliberative level.

**Clarissa, community resident (code 3)**

There must be a new preparation in police training, like how the approach at the favelas should be done. But at Savassi or at the top of Afonso Pena should be another approach.

*Justification of code:* The flow of the conversation is the same since the intervention that lowered its level. Clarissa, a community leader, responds with sarcasm to the provocation of the cop who disagreed with the argument of “procedure” to maintain the idea that there is no difference in the approach in the slums and in rich areas. Sarcasm, in a quarrelsome context, does not raise the level of the conversation.

(49'50” unintelligible)

### **Moderator**

Guys, just a moment because Ingridy has been waiting to speak for a long time.

### **Ingridy, teenager (code 4)**

They treat totally different people of middle-class, now people like, the lower class, they already want to deal with ignorance, cursing. This has happened to me several times. They stopped me walking in Savassi all tidy, but treated me like trash. The newspapers very often shows what the police do with young people today, even though the person did nothing wrong, they will beat them like they are their father's. Many times, a female cop asks us to put our hands up, and asks us to open our legs, so we do it, they know that men officers can't put a hand on teenage woman, but many times they abuse the power they have and they already have beaten me. And they abuse the power they have and I don't think it's right, because if they have problems in their houses, they have to figure it out there, not with people they meet on the streets, not with someone he approaches on a corner, thinks they have drugs and decides to arrest. That's why I think this is wrong. When we fight and call the police, they say: “I have more important things to do, I'm not paid for it”. A lot of times this happens with school fights. Is this happening? So I am forced to come here and do it, and it's not ok to be rude with people. A lot of times they are rude with people. That even if they find a person with marijuana, if they want to arrest them, even if the cigarette is in the end, they describe them as if they were carrying five grams of marijuana, thirty grams of cocaine, twelve crack stones, only to have reason to arrest the person.

*Justification of code:* Ingridy argues that the difference in treatment extrapolates the way the police approaches people. According to her statement, the police not only approaches slum dwellers with more asperity but also disregard their complaints as less valuable. The teenager's argument appeals to a notion of citizenship. She wants to be treated with equal respect both when she is stopped by an officer and when she needs them to protect her. Jenifer based her arguments on very representative personal stories, directly related to the issue on topic. It is worth to mention that the author is only thirteen years old, thus, the impact of her testimony. At this point, the deliberation rises to a high level of deliberation.

### **Daniel, Police Officer (code 2)**

A large amount of drugs or a few amount of drugs is a crime anyway.

*Justification of code:* The police officer disqualifies the testimony using a simple and technical argument. In his first intervention in this conversation, Daniel sarcastically disregards Jenifer's opinions, lowering the conversation deliberative level again. It is important to notice that the degree of tension has been raising for the past ten speech acts.

**Ingridy, teenager (code 3)**

No! When you're with a marijuana cigarette, it's completely different from a drug dealer.

*Justification of code:* The teenager strongly challenges the police officer statement, surprising the participants of the group. Her reaction increases even more the intensity of the conflict. The groups seem more and more divided. Conversation, at this point, does not help to find shared terms of cooperation to create a culture of peace.

**Daniel, Police Officer (code 3)**

If there's a bad professor, it doesn't mean all the professors are bad. If there's a bad driver, it's a bad driver, which is different than saying that all bus drivers are bad, it's just that one. But when you have a bad cop, who disturbs, it means all cops are like that. Look, when there are determined occurrences, husband and wife are fighting, someone stole a chicken, who will attend these occurrences, of the people who live in the community or in the other well-off neighborhoods, it's not the GEPAR or the ROTAM... it's people who are from that place.

*Justification of code:* We can see once again that the police officer stands against the argument of generalization. What they want to stress out is that when some cops mistreat people from the community it is not the same as saying that the police acts with violence when they are dealing with poor people. The conversation is still stopped at the same controversy. We can't see, from where we are, any attempt to formulate strategies to create a peaceful context.

**Alberto, Police Officer (code 3)**

The usual community treatment.

*Justification of code:* Alberto complements his colleague opinion, reinforcing the group's argument against the other group call for equal treatment. Once again, the controversy is whether the development of a peaceful culture is an issue worth discussing or not.

**Layse, teenager (code 4)**

I think in Brazil there are also problems with drugs, but we have more problems. I think there are many people worrying too much about drug dealing, but there are many thieves, many rapists, and many families who harm children indoors. Where I live (54'22 " *unintelligible*)... we hear stories of people who have been abused inside their houses and the police were there when it happened, but they were much more concerned with the drug dealer who was there in the alley than with the child being beaten inside his house. I think it also has other ways of gaining respect. I think a person can gain more respect, instead of frightening people (...). Show the community, the people both in the slum and in Savassi that they are police officers and that they care about them. Fear and respect are two completely different things.

*Justification of code:* At this point it seems the conversation is unlikely to get back into the issue proposed in the beginning. The talks are more and more polarized, and the participants have completely lost interest in discussing shared alternatives to improve their relationship. While one side maintains that the relationship is already fair, the other

side keeps recurring to brief personal stories to maintain their opinion that the relationship is unequal. This speech act surprisingly broadens the scope of the conversation that was restricted to the groups within the study to the Brazilian society as a whole. Layse, a 14 years old teenager, calls the attention of the participants to the fact that the state is more concerned with drug users than with other types of violence, especially when they are related to the poor people.

### **Orlando, teenager (code 1)**

Even if it's a thousand dollars and even if it's a lot of drugs, the police approach should never be like that... being people, being brutal. I think it is not meant to be this way. This is illegal. It can be a truck of drugs, the approach should not be that one. You have to go there and identify what type of situation is that, be respectful. This is the way.

*Justification of code:* Orlando presents a variation of the same argument presented by the former teenager. His speech act also shows a surprising maturity and awareness, identifying the equal treatment issue with a human rights question, something to which everyone is entitled to. The level of the conversation is still high.

### **João, FVivo personnel (code 1)**

I find it very interesting what I do. I am in the last semester of Law School, and I had to go to an audience to prepare a report. There was a sergeant in the audience, he is well known, and he was solving a problem about the occurrence on trial. It was about a drug dealer, that dealer was caught with a lot of drugs, and the judge repeatedly asked him: "Have you been threatened, embarrassed by the police?". Then he said "Look, I have never been so well treated. This police officer arrived at my house, asked me if he could come in, approached me at my house and we really found a lot of drugs. One part of the drugs is mine and the other part is for personal use, and he only handcuffed me after we stepped out of my house". Now I'll tell you one thing: you realize that listening only to one side... but I always listened to his speech act, that's the thing... one of the issues... Complex problems are not accessible from just one point... you know... it's related to education, health, job opportunity... isn't it? With information! That's the thing: we have a history, we have a society that in terms of fundamental rights is starting to walk to historical levels. Our constitution is from eighty-eight [1988], our institutions, they are changing their performance. The military police has never made so many actions on issues of human rights. The professionals, the first thing they learn there is respect for human dignity. But I say this: there is a prejudice, a prejudice against the police. What is a prejudice when we are judging other people? It's to hold a concept concerning some other police officer. To be effective perhaps he had to act according to his time, or even more. That's what we mostly need to see today... how the society is seeing the police and how the police is seeing society. It would be interesting to let the police explain how the society treats him: "wow, I get there, and he thinks I'm invading his space when I asked him to put his hand on his head. He thinks that because he is black, poor, right?" We got into an interesting discussion about opening this conversation, as sometimes happens.

*Justification of code:* João once again assumes the role of deliberative leader, organizing the arguments presented so far and trying to give them some coherence. The speaker articulates social and political information, such as the Constitution of 1988, with a personal story regarding an episode in court. His effort represents a middle ground between the biased opinions of most of the police officers and a part of the



teenagers and the community leaders. This type of speech act helps to assure the participants will not lose track of the topic. Furthermore, it gives voice to the groups represented in the study, without giving priority to one of them. We can now expect the discussion to flow in a high level of deliberation, encouraging both groups to engage in a cooperative effort to find shared solution for the problem of creating a culture of peace.

*(Interruptions) part 2*

**Alberto, Police Officer (code 1)**

But the approach needs to change a little bit.

*Justification of code:* A brief interruption to disagree with part of João's speech act. Although Alberto interrupts the former speaker, his line is so short that it is not capable of disrupting the flow of conversation – which would be the case if he had interrupted to make a long statement disregarding João's intervention and the topic at large. It is not added new information or argument, but even other interruptions do not break the high level of deliberation, which stays in an interactive way.

**João, FVivo personnel (code 1)**

Just to conclude we are in an impasse and we will not solve public security from one day to the other. First thing for a culture of peace is to avoid this culture of the prejudice against the police officer. I assure you that we are prepared for it today. He said "oh, on this is a matter of procedure ... " any legal question today is calculated and it is found that any question of irregularity within the police regularly, within the standards that the law has determined it is sanctioned. There is no such question why we want the professionals- I am married and have children, a police officer will hold my son too, do you understand? I need it to be a professional that attends my son, you, that attends all circumstances, it is being worked on. As the society - the spaces we are discussing the issues and there are things we have to look in the rearview mirror as they are talking to see the errors and walk forward and... have this dialogue again to make the police talk, but at the same time as police - I have to get back inside my gym, within my battalion and talk "people, I had such a situation there and maybe I think that we can have this procedure", but you as a citizen, was that really prejudice, unlike many people he does not want the law to prevent the dealer because the dealer gives them a cooking gas canister and a few joints of marijuana and that citizen will decide in other ways. Then the state has to play his role on the legality of the measure. We have to open our eyes to see what is this gym is and see what curriculum and how the curriculum is being made. Will I solve it tomorrow? You know I won't ... what will happen? Things are being implemented to reach this. And even I who work in this administrative matter in slums. I worked for many years with the communication with the unprotected, I could only make this approach within the unprotected involving the police and community. In meetings they say, "Oh, we'll, try this, we have problems and everyone could find a solution," but what do we have to do? Look forward, see our mistakes and don't be prejudicial.

*Justification of code:* The speaker maintains the conversation at a high level in this complement. João stresses once again the question of communication and its importance for building a culture of peace. Furthermore, in this statement he goes back to the controversy raised before regarding the way the police approaches people in the

communities. In a quite realistic view, he insists that the situation will not change immediately. The first thing to be done is to acknowledge that there is a problem, and then to find ways to deal with it, to transform the relationship between groups in a divided society. Both the police and the slum dweller, however, must change their behavior and avoid act based on prejudicial concepts about each other.

### **Otávio, Police Officer (code 2)**

The police study, study, study society in which they are inserted. But does the society is studying, studying, studying the police that is working for them?

*Justification of code:* Otávio resists to accept João's arguments. For him, the police is being harmed in this situation, once they offer more to society than it acknowledges and more than it is offering the police. While the police is constantly training to improve their action and to understand society, the latter refuses to do the same. According to this statement, the police works for society, but the citizens who are being served by those men and women do not respect their work. With such a reaction, it interrupts the flow of communication, blocking the discussion about the establishment of a culture of peace.

### **César, Teenager (code 3)**

It's like what he said about the psychological thinking of the police, the police often thinks... Under the uniform of a police officer there is a human being like any other community resident... then he comes and stays there... Often he enters the community with the gun in his hand, so he can... well, he thinks, "if someone points a gun at me, I'll shoot them in defense".

*Justification of code:* The teenager accepts the arguments presented by the police and seems to agree that they have to be especially prepared when they get into a slum. The former statement by Otávio indeed disrupted the conversation and took it out of the topic proposed in the study. Now it's not about the creation of a peaceful environment, it's about the police behavior towards slum dwellers.

### **André, community resident (code 4)**

Watching this [*conversation*], I find interesting the question that begins to emerge, especially regarding the capoeira workshops. When I started working there - it's been a couple years there was a booklet that is about the rights and duties of the military police in an approach, not only for the military police, but for us as possible objects of an approach by the police. I started orienting these young people for a possible approach because I realized that if they understood how it was, it could prevent several problems that can happen in an approach... I was approached several times, over and over again, and I started to learn that the way it starts tells how it will end. The beginning of this approach, from the time I was approached for the first time, the first line of the police, as he says the police will adopt the same procedure for everyone... but come on! I, as the person being approached... my first line addressed to the police group will determine much of how it'll go for me. So, when they are questioning, through the questions the police is asking me, if I make fun... I'll get nervous. There is ... To think about this study, we also have to think about how this approach is for us, normal civilians, and how we are being approached. What Ingridy said about a girl who was caught with - I don't know how many pounds ... We have to understand that we have to be responsible for our actions and not blame others for our mistakes. So if I get caught, for instance...

when I got into the university and saw people drinking... I found it ridiculous, I found it a tremendous absurd. When the boys started talking to me about it, I thought it was ridiculous. For me, who consider myself an opinion leader, to me that's inconceivable, was it a party? It doesn't matter! I don't care if it is party... along with it other things will come, there will be rapes, there will be beating inside the campus. But what I mean is that I shouldn't be treated differently because I have an ounce of marijuana, with a *buchinha* [little amount of weed], or if I have twenty pounds... Of course there are the responsibilities through the ego. Maybe that's what generates certain problems...and the drug dealer puts it on the hand of minors and the minors say "no problem, there won't be a problem for me". This is one of the great risks and this is a point that we, young people, have to think. Let's not pass this problem to someone else. So, I want to smoke at my house, I do it. Now if I'm caught on the street I have to be held responsible for what I did. On the other hand, in parallel, the position of the police... it's what I'm saying... the approach, that moment when he is often nervous, because the dynamics of that community, of that police group... the police knows it's tense... there's not agreement in some issues between the police and the community. But I still want to say something about the information. The formation of these people may get in the community... to say "guys, your rights as citizens when you are approached are these". The citizens will know when the police is acting outside of those norms and they will say "you have no right to do this to me". I find it very cool, because when he says that the boy is his friend and the boy is my student... and it's a boy extremely safe in relation to drugs. He got so scared of the police that he got confused in the use of words... so the police took his finger and bent and he wept. And it's a boy that I guarantee that it's free from drugs.

*Justification of code:* André brings the issue of the culture peace back into the table. Although the police approach is his main concern in this speech act, he articulates it with the problem at stake. That's what differentiates his line from the former two participants. The personal stories he brings are somehow connected to the argument he is trying to defend. So it illustrates his opinion and makes it easier for the other group to understand. Looking to both sides of the matter, acknowledging the questions that concern the police but also trying to find a good way of avoiding their aggressiveness towards slum dwellers, especially teenagers, André gives important tips to be used for building a culture of peace. In this sense, he closes the conversation in a high level.

### **Group 3 of Brazilian police officers and community residents**

#### **Participants**

**Guilherme**, Police Officer, 40 to 59 years old, higher education

**Pedro**, Police Officer, 40 to 59 years old, higher education

**William**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, high school education

**Miguel**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, high school education

**Yan**, Police Officer, 40 to 59 years old, high school education

**Kaique**, community resident, 55 years old, incomplete higher education

**Rachel**, community resident, 55 years old, incomplete high school education

**Rubem**, community resident, 29 years old, incomplete higher education

**Rafael**, community resident, 30 years old, incomplete high school education

**Fátima**, community resident, 34 years old, postgraduate education

**Inácio**, community resident, 54 years old, high school education

**Moderator**

Well, guys, my name is Márcia. I've put a pen and a paper because of my background as journalist and now also researcher and writing is my everyday routine. I think I write daily since I was twelve, when I started a diary, and I guess I write every day since then. Has everyone introduced themselves? Everyone introduced, right ... So, folks, the dynamic is free, is open, everyone can put a position, the way you see fit. We just asked not try to talk together, do not talk at the same time. Then, initially, the question is: How and what steps we can take or how we can build a culture of peace between community and the police.

**Kaique, community resident (code 1)**

I will... I have... I was a community leader, a neighborhood association leader. Today I am the head of a nursery here inside the community and that... (*Silence in a reflexive way, like thinking, trying to find memories*) When I first said on my presentation that it is a fight that won't come to an end, it's because I already participated in several situations and discussions, sometimes at the worst moments for the community, when we had clashes within the own community, the relationship with the police officer was a very distant relationship - and it's still not the ideal relationship - but it had several, several, several pillars built and I had the opportunity to participate in many of these constructions. And since I first got here I've been thinking that... I don't know if it's me getting behind or if things are getting ahead, but this dialogue I think it doesn't exist anymore. What exists... The Police Officer Institution, unfortunately, from a few years now... the governments successively getting elected are making this Institution come to an end. There's still some relationship between the community and the police officer, sometimes, when people... Because of the man who's inside the uniform, because of the police officer who sometimes operates here, but lives close - inside this or at another community - and lives the everyday life. And I don't know... Sometimes I get myself thinking... Every time I participate in these discussions I feel the freedom, either with the lieutenant colonel or with the commanding general... My speech is always the same. To be clear, open, and to say that it's an institution that unfortunately is being dissolved. That's a political issue, it's a question that we can't dwell on too much, but it also has a nice thing about it. The Police Officer cares in participating, in reaching the community. We already had several moments of great intensity here in the community, of discussion, sitting together... And at that time, I remember Colonel Carlos, who was really severe in his statements. We organized many demonstrations because we had a very distant relationship with the police and have done many projects together and today, for example, one of the things I condemn is the police officer who doesn't sit down with the community to talk about projects. It's "*entered into a line*" urging to find the project already designed and deployed and it doesn't work anymore. And the community itself is also to blame because society reached a certain point... in our case, for example, people don't sit to discuss anymore. There are only a few neighborhood associations, and even the entities themselves. Because each one's only worrying about themselves, about their own safety, about their environment, about the association they lead, and they don't want to discuss anymore with society as a whole. Then the community itself is to blame too. I remember that... I was born and raised here in the community and there's something that I always say in the meetings we have. The creation of the 22nd Police Department (PD) for us here... We've been having the police here for our whole lives, within the community, and before the police department –

around the 1970s - we had a police station inside the community, it was the worst time for us, where everything increased, and the violence was triplicated... There was no dialogue between the police and community, it was a terrible thing. And while they were installing the PD, for ten years it was all the same. Those were the worst ten years for the community. The battalion came to be installed here, but no one knows how it was decided. It was a personal decree of Governor Garcia. It was a police department that came to antagonize, totally against our community. Because it was a police group created, at the time, I don't know if I can say this, to work as a blow-off to the police officer. Those officers, those people who didn't have a nice reputation within the police, were thrown here, here in 22nd PD. And allocating them over here and then designating them to work towards the community, we had the worse ten years for the community. (*Displeasure tone*) So the community looked inside and said "this can't go on, because it will reach a point where the community will have to rebel and lock itself or we'll have to get that police group out of here". But neither was a solution. It's to sit down and talk, which includes: it was a matter of approach, was a matter of failing to respect human rights, civil rights, a matter of the very own community sometimes not respecting the police officer who was there at that time. And in these ten years we had several partnerships, and one with UFMG [*Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil*] itself, which has helped a lot, with PUC [*private and Catholic University in Brazil*] with the very own... What's it called? The priest... Archdiocese, the archdiocese itself. So the community decided that they had to come together and find a solution, and thought talking was the worst one. And several events that we've done - I organized myself some events, I've done several events here inside the community; we've made one in the 90s... In 2000... In 1999, there was the Telemig [*a large, but extinct telephone company*] culture benchmark... We managed to bring inside the community, bring an arena of culture for ten days. And at the worst time of the community, where there was war, drugs, shots, many types of situations within the community. Then from that point we realized we could have a dialogue with them, we could sit together and make it happen. So that's going slowly, I don't know how it is now, because I don't participate much. But I think that's the way to do it, to sit and talk. Because the dialogue must always exist, under whatever circumstances. So, we've been through situations here in which many times our own personal safety is threatened. When you want to fight for an ideal, a goal, and know things will happen based on what the law allows, based on what needs to happen on a day-to-day routine, we get very satisfied with the changes, but it's still much to build about this situation.

*Justification of code:* The speaker establishes in his speech act some of the basis of what he thinks that can contribute for a culture of peace. Kaique makes a brief statement that many police officers have the same cultural and economic background as people who lives in slums, so they somewhat share "the same reality". He signals that there are some similarities as well as harsh differences between these two groups. In an attempt to define the conflict between them, he recalls the recent Brazilian past – the dictatorship period in the 70's – to recall "the worst period" of the conflict, "the terrible time" of "war, drugs, shots" within the community. He also recalls several initiatives from slums residents, in a joint effort with university organizations, churches and civil entities to mitigate the conflict during the re-democratization period. Kaique emphasizes the violations in the way the police treat the slum residents; and he sees this moral aspect as the first obstacle to overcome - "it is a matter of treatment" "a matter of failing to respect human rights, civil rights". He contends that slums residents should change their behavior too – "a matter of the community itself sometimes not respecting the

police officer”. Kaique demonstrates mixed feelings. On the one hand, he seems frustrated with the interruptions of those initiatives and other present-day huddles, such as the decrease of neighborhood associations and people’s lack of civic engagement (“each one’s only worrying about himself, about your own safety, about their reality”). On the other hand, he shows hope for constructing dialogical cooperation to find joint solutions for the strife – “It’s [a matter] to sit down and talk”. By acknowledging some improvements as well as “still much to build about this situation”, Kaique closes his talk with an optimistic and deliberative remark: “Because the dialogue must always exist, under any circumstances”. Although Kaique talk is a bit long and sometimes also repetitive, he stays in the topic proposed for discussion and tries to articulate actions that could be taken together by the community and the police. The idea that discussion may help to create a better environment for the relationship between groups in divided communities is exactly what this study is all about.

### **Moderator**

How to build, then, that culture of peace, between community and police?

### **Kaique, community resident (code 1)**

Yeah, that’s a good question, right?

*Justification of the code:* In this sentence, the participant does not interrupt the flow of conversation and helps to encourage other participants to engage in the conversation. It seems that he strongly believes that discussing forms of creating a culture of peace is crucial for building this kind of relationship between police and slum dwellers.

### **Pedro, Police Officer (code 1)**

Look, I see that is through what is going on here, through dialogue, through listening both sides as Mr. Kaique said, that we’ll build this relationship. I don’t know today because this is not my reality, I’m from Ibirité [another poor area in the fringes of the city of Belo Horizonte]. But I work in this area since 2010, and I lead the community base there and we have access to the community. And then the question is: The Police Officer institution, encourages that dialogue, so much that a lot of us are here, we are from different units, joining the conversation and it has never happened before and today the Police looks towards it. But there’s the man behind the uniform, so there, in the department, there are commanders who are more open, who created the CONCEPE [*Community Council of Public Security, a council created in 90s to improve the relation between citizens and the police, but nowadays is often considerate inefficient*], having that thing with the community. But there are other commanders with a more operational perspective, because despite the government advertises it is encouraging prevention, it’s a lie. [*Displeasure tone associated with the government*] The government demands from the commander a certain amount of seized weapons, if the number of robberies were reduced. And the work in a community is a long-term project. The governor doesn’t want long-term answers. He wants it now. Why? Because he wants to launch his political campaign. I say it because I lived this situation. In 2012 I’ve leaded thirty soldiers. Today I only have two (*Pause; ironic laugh*). Because we can’t fail to maintain the basic car to go to a certain occurrence, we need to have the GEPAR which is specialized in areas of risk, and also community policing. But, in my area, there’s no way they can do community work because they are always occupied with repression. Because they arrest today and unfortunately you only find minors in possession of drugs, you don’t see the adults. You find the minors and take them there, but the next

day they're doing the same thing once again. So they're [*the police in his area*] engaged in repression all the time. They can't work with the community. When they work with the community, criminals go there and threaten the community. They don't let the community have a relationship with the police. Sometimes we go and take that criminal who's acting there and arrest him. We get there with this approach and when they start to get cooler, they loosen up and start threatening all over again. And for us it's complicated. People say "arrest him, Sergeant Pedro". But for me to arrest him I need to catch him on the act. I've got to have facts to arrest him, I can't arrest... I might know he has killed a person, but if I have no proof, I can't arrest him. For me to arrest him, he must have committed a crime at that moment. The community also, it's a two-way street, you know, because I also understand the dwellers' side, I understand that sometimes it's complicated to report anything to us, but sometimes I need a witness, an anonymous tip, to give me a base for me to arrest that person. The complaints are very important because if I hold a boy in possession of drugs here and I have several anonymous complaints I can use them as a base, I can put those anonymous complaints attached to the REDS [*register of social defense events*] and forward it to the law agent and the he soon makes contact with the public prosecutor to drive there to take that person off the area. But most of the time we don't have it... when we get an anonymous report it's unfounded, it is a neighbor who wants to harm another, and not about the guy who's acting there. And another thing that Kaique has already said, the police today, we are experiencing shortage of police officers. So it is difficult even to come here. Take me as an example: I should be working today from eight in the morning to eighteen o'clock, they had to put someone as a substitute so I could come to this meeting. Not that the meeting isn't important, that's not what I'm saying. In my point of view that's very important and it's the base of a relationship between police and the community. For us to understand the relationship with the community - I at least try to understand the resident's reactions there, the risks they are exposed to, the situations they get through, the threatening they get through, how far they trust on the power holders, how long the arrested offender will be really locked in, because we know that today it is not guaranteed. So there's a commander who thinks: "Oh, let's not worry about this meeting, I need people on the streets so crimes won't happen". Because if there's a crime he is the one who will be held responsible. So we bump into a situation where the police officer are faced with a huge demand and with little personnel to cover it. The governor says to encourage one thing, but in fact he encourages another because it's a matter of government, I am not talking about the current governor, it's a matter of politics. Because we all know, for example, we work with the PROERD [*the Brazilian version of Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program*], everyone thinks wonders about PROERD, right, that is the police who teach lessons to students, to encourage students not get involved with drugs. But when will that produce the result? In ten, fifteen years. So maybe in ten, fifteen years, the governor or ruler is more... So today there in my battalion, we must have a ... Only in my company we have more than sixty schools, for a police officer to teach everybody... One police officer to teach everybody! Sometimes they send a car to a school and get there only two police officers and several students are disturbing the school. So we end up ... because we do not have much support from the law. Same thing I was telling her, I think the problem of our country is that ... I do not agree to decrease the penal age, no. If you talk to a sixteen years old, is he aware of what you he is doing? He does not have a clue! I think the means, the re-education of minors, has to be more efficient and not the way it is. There are situations in which you find the minor disturbing ... In my reality, we got nowhere to take the minors. I take them to his father, and make sure that his father receives him... in the next moment he is

making wrong things in the street again. And so what? (*Speech act frequently voiced in very displeasure tone*)

*Justification of the code:* The conversation stays at a high level in this intervention. Pedro engages both with the question proposed by the moderator and with the speech act of the last participant to talk. He considers the importance of conversation to construct a better context for the relationship in this divided community. Moreover, Pedro inserts more information into the discussion, especially information related to his experience as a police officer and a police sergeant, who is responsible for coordinating groups of police officer and special operations. He points out some critical issues related to politics that the police have to face and which also affects the communities. He recognizes the other group as citizens who deserve equal treatment by the government and by public institution. He appeals for a better understanding of the poor community experiences “the risks they are exposed to, the situations they get through, the threatening they get through, how far they trust on the power holders, how long the arrested offender will be really locked in”. He list several initiatives carried out by the government and the police institutions, but appraises both advances and flaws in these projects from a critical stance. In this sense, Pedro brings up some questions that can be dealt with by the community.

### **Moderator**

We want to deal with this issue as well, in a minute (*laughs*)

### **Guilherme, Police Officer (code 2)**

Good morning everyone again. And Marcia, I ask everyone, in relation to that first question, for us to correctly define what we are discussing. Are we discussing the police efficiency in the community or are we discussing ways to reach a culture of peace with the police. Because we need to see if there is a real problem regarding the culture of peace with the police. And we could check that in another way, for example, in the complaints that are made in relation to the misguided actions of the police. In this type of relationship, what kind of relationship do we have today between the Police officer and the dwellers, so we can define it correctly. Because otherwise, we will be discussing... Kaique, efficiency is one thing, but the culture of peace and the type of work that the military, the police do in the community... if it is effective or not, we are discussing one thing, but if it is peaceful or not ... it's very different. Then I'll take that point, if you allow me, about the culture of peace with the police officer. Honestly, I work within the community for twelve years and I know the community very well. The police's end, the police's beginning, it is in the community. Because otherwise the police would not exist, if it's not for the community. You see, some writers say - and few people write about the police, where the police came from, and I'll just say something about it – some writers say that the old police was a police paid by the individual to take care of their freedoms. Ok? So there was no public police. The police, paid with public money, is a modern institution. So we are living a time of the police of the modern State, public police paid with public money and we are living this social transformation together. We are living it together. There is now significant change related to the Constitution of 1988, we are all learning to live with the police and to understand differently the police departing from that moment. And the social processes are slow. There is no change in society that lasts less than fifty years. It's slow. But see, you have said ten years, you know, when the battalion was created, and from that time until now, I'm sure: the relationship with the police has changed a lot! It changed so much! If you



could, Kaique, check the matter of the complaints, the form of action of GEPAR, for example, who is present directly inside the community, it's a different action. The government, the state, thinking about it along with the police officer, took this project, along the UFMG, and created the GEPAR along with the Fica Vivo, in the area of operation of Fica Vivo - which has the crime prevention center - it is identical to GEPAR's working area. The GEPAR does not make a single and isolated work of crime prevention, prevention, mediation of conflict, work, return... it's not separated. Once the police actions are different on GEPAR, we see that the police officer understands that this change of behavior also involves a change in the type of service provided within communities. And GEPAR is the "Expert Police Group for Risky Areas" because policing risky areas needs prepared people, prepared police officers who can talk to you and be rigid, enforcing the law with those breaking the law. That is the function of GEPAR. So when we talk about a culture of peace with the police today, Marcia, honestly, I feel myself in a peaceful environment with the community. Commanding a group of GEPAR, I feel myself in a peaceful environment along with the community. It is by saying a good morning, by knowing where Rachel (*looks at the participant named Rachel*) works, what is her role within the community. I feel myself in a peaceful environment. And I'm not sure, despite the situation here in Morro do Papagaio, and constantly we have some reflexes, some conflicts between the police and authors of infractions, but the community is preserved. This relationship with the community is preserved. If I tell you here, "Oh, no, we have no problems between the police and the community", I'd be lying. Because the work of GEPAR is different. You can, Rubem, differentiate GEPAR's approach working within the community, from the staff from another unit that sometimes do not even know the community. But why, Marcia? Because the police also understands that way, that you need a different work within the community. I personally participate in a lot of community meetings. We had a meeting in Alto Vera Cruz, and this is documented, with more than one hundred and twenty residents, led by Mr. Paulo Lamac, president of the Urban Mobility Committee of the Assembly, to talk about urban mobility in Alto Vera Cruz. You see, our problem in this case is not violence, Marcia... This is citizenship growing, sprouting. And look how things are. We, the police, can do our work discussing mobility and not discussing violence and not discussing the police action. To discuss mobility. And the police officer was together with them, because we also are the community. And the interesting thing is that the demand of the community was for us to supervise the car traffic because it was preventing them of walking. There had to be order in that place. And demanding the police what we could do through an agreement, which is to apply the traffic fines, and also demanding BHTrans [traffic enforcement agency] to reeducate people [about their behavior in traffic]. You see, then, it is a breakthrough of this community that has a very strong sense of community. The history of the formation of Alto Vera Cruz is different from Taquaril, as is different from Morro do Papagaio. And that, in the communication process, the way the community grew, makes a big difference. Then I ask, Rubem: what's the story of Morro do Papagaio? How was it built? Where did these people come from? For example, in Taquaril it was a joint effort, Marcia, people built houses together. Then, there is that type of feeling. In Alto Vera Cruz people who had occupied an area that was belonging to INSS (*Social Security National Institution*)... and then they succeeded [*in having the right to stay there*], a land that was called the "Ore Hill", and now is called "Alto Vera Cruz". There is a history and that history is going to tell us where that community is going nowadays. In Alto Vera Cruz I consider that today, Kaique, that this meeting pointed out to a call and a request for citizenship. That we could act more firmly talking about traffic fines, sometimes questioned by

those who were being fined, but the answer was: the community is demanding a firmer stance on the road. This is community. What was fought for and what was raised by the community in a meeting with a very large representation - because one hundred and twenty people is not a few people in a community meeting - was put in place because we understood this was required at that time, ok? So when we talk about peace, just for us to determine the focus of discussion, because I cannot, honestly, within the community, I cannot see the problem of peace with the police to be exactly a problem. Maybe if we sit here, Rachel, and discuss what is really the problem of Morro do Papagaio, we might be surprised. By the way, this was the agenda of a course taught together with UFMG and the community in Alto Vera Cruz about solution of problems, and we were surprised with the issues that the community really has, and has not passed through police. *(The speaker is very theatrical; he addresses other participants not as conversation partners but as members of an audience. He makes long digressions about a number of topics and assumes a professorial attitude to provide information and explain issues. He shows pride in relation to the Police)*

*Justification of the code:* The conversation drops from a high level to a low level of deliberation. In another very long speech, Guilherme tries to drive conversation to a more refined degree, distinguishing between questions related to the construction of a culture of peace and questions associated with the effectiveness of the police officer in their action in the communities. He provides an example of a meeting that was taken up in the community where he works: more than a hundred residents engaged in the meeting to provide the public holders, the police among them, with information regarding the problems they face in their day-to-day lives. Surprisingly, violence was not the main issue. Furthermore, Guilherme mentioned that the creation of the special group GEPAR, mentioned by the first participant, Kaique, was a great advance in the relationship between the police and the member of the community, since the people working in the GEPAR were especially prepared to deal with poor communities. Most of them, because they have been working for quite a long time inside these slums, have personal relationships with the dwellers, which is another point he believes helps to build a culture of peace.” However, it’s worth mentioning that Guilherme was not talking “with” others, but “to” others. We expressed his opinions in a respectful way, he provided information about himself and the issues at stake, but he did not leave any open space to interact through what he said. So conversation here was not a shared activity. By assuming a professorial attitude, Guilherme apparently was not expecting responsiveness and reactions to what he said. He was not trying to find common ground about controversial issues, but just lecturing others.

### **Moderator**

Guys, I just wanted to make another agreement, for us to try to conduct our speech around four, five minutes. Can we?

### **Guilherme, Police Officer (code 3)**

Yes.

*Justification of the code:* The participant agrees to limit his talk to five minutes. In this case, he recognizes that the conversation has to be structured in a way to allow other members of the groups to engage in the discussion.

### **Rubem, community resident (code 3)**

Can I make a few appointments? Many years ago when we used to come here, and sometimes were at a bar and were approached, it was rare to see a cop coming up and saying "good morning, excuse me, I'm doing my job." Today, in the community; I leave at five thirty in the morning and I come back eleven o'clock at night; despite of the moment, yes, I can notice a difference. However, it's like I'm always thinking, the police, it has intelligence in the background, right? They know who are the suspects. Of course it's not written on my forehead "I am" or "I'm not," but the police knows, the police is here in the community every day, they know who we are. So sometimes ... Just like I think, I respect ... The uniform, whoever looks at it, knows that there is an authority dressed with it. My mother is an authority for me and I know how I have to respect her. I think the community, people like myself, I've never disrespected a cop and many people never disrespected an officer. So sometimes, I've heard from my friend who's a cop, I don't know what happens ... (*Hesitation, trying to find words*) I know you are human beings, you wake up in the morning and are grumpy and things like that ... So I've heard that many times, because of that, they might be temperamental with the people who live here... although sometimes they don't even want to do that. Sometimes they punch someone or slap someone. (*Nervous silence*) And I think that that kind of approach, that kind is long gone, today I don't see it anymore. At least there's a long time since I saw it. It's like you said, there're people from inside and from outside, I don't know, it's like I said, I'm not here much anymore, so I do not know, don't know about this approach because I'm not here a lot, I'm usually outside the community. So there's this difference. Now I don't know if it's still that way or not.

*Justification of the code:* Rubem seems not to be sure what his point is. His speech demonstrates a high degree of confusion and does not present an opinion about the issue on topic. At first, it seems he was going to keep the conversation within the subjects raised by the other participants, but in the end he affirms that he can't give a very precise opinion because he does not stay in the community much anymore. Although at some point he explicitly recognizes the police officer as human beings who "wake up in the morning and are grumpy...", this assumption is not developed during his speech. He attempts to articulate harms caused by the police, but he seems quite unsure how to say that. "So I've heard that many times they come and they take it out on the people who live here... although sometimes they don't even want to do that. Sometimes they come and punch someone or slap someone" The silent moments and the hesitation clearly demonstrate that this speech takes the conversation to a lower level. The long speech praising the police previously delivered by Guilherme may have created a context hostile to criticisms to the police.

### **Guilherme, Police Officer (code 3)**

Just so..., Just not to let you speak out of nowhere. There is a discipline today in the police officer which is taught on SUS (the public health system) called 'how to deal with people', Rubem, because we understand - not only as civilians or as you, who are here and are from the community - that we should treat them well because we are civil servants above all. We must treat them well, not only you, but everyone inside the headquarters as well. Just to clarify that there's a discipline in the police academy curriculum.

*Justification of the code:* Guilherme accepts the move on the topic caused by the last speech and tries to explain a part of what the last participant was saying. He nevertheless fails to bring the discussion back to the issue of the culture of peace. As we

can see above, the conversation does not appear to be coming back to where it was before Guilherme's previous long intervention. The officer is careful not to offend the other participants, but leaves the discussion at the same low level. Again, Guilherme leaves no space for other participant to determine what to do. His brief comments seem to reassert that there is not really any problem to be discussed by other participants.

#### **Kaique, community resident (code 4)**

Regarding what you said about Alto Vera Cruz, Taquaril, our history here is not different. And I think it is even simpler than that because our community was created by people coming from the countryside. Simple people, people who came here to get a job, to provide their children with good study opportunities, to grow. That happened several years ago. And today that's not true anymore; there is no long the "let me borrow some coffee powder", today. That doesn't happen anymore. There is no more collective effort. The word collective effort today, if you will put it within the community, it exists if neighbor Rubem, if I know he's hitting a slab there with me in the morning. Often from my balcony, I see people working and I don't go there to help them. But if I'm aware that I'm part of a system that I've helped to build, I will be there to help them. When you also say, one thing that we ask for too much here in the community ... The community police, it exists ... specifically the GEPAR here ... But we get to know the police officer from other neighborhoods, right? From São Bento [*another nearby neighborhood*], the neighborhood association from Lourdes [*another nearby neighborhood*] ... and one thing that we ask for a lot here, for example, and there's been some public hearings about that, for the police to try to interfere on that, the high command of the police officer, that's the question regarding the police to discuss about.... the Vera Cruz, Serra, Morro do Papagaio, BH communities, being villages and slums, they have no history like for example Rio de Janeiro, where Morro do Alemão, Rocinha, [*slums in Rio de Janeiro*] even with all the infrastructure the police has there now, with all those units being put inside they are still received with gun shots by the community. So, for example, one of the things we always condemned here: why does the car at the time it leaves here ... go down to the road, why does the officer take down the weapon from outside the window, put it back inside, put it back and close to his body? They've tried to convince us that, "oh, it's different...". We don't accept that anymore. We will not accept. (*"We will not accept this anymore" - phrase said slowly and very emphatically*) I'll explain you why. It might happen ... the streets here are all irregular, something might happen, by an unfortunate, the police might accidentally put their finger on the trigger and the gun can fire. We know. The first thing that will be said is that the police was received with gun shots. I'm not talking about the police, it's in general. That's the first conclusion to be made. The police will never allow an investigation, a well-made survey, it'll never admit it was an accident, that the shot came from the cop's weapon. So the first thing we ask for is this. One of the things that sometimes makes us angry is the different treatment, when we pay taxes just like everyone else, sometimes we don't pay property tax, but we pay taxes in products and services, we also participate. When you say you have to treat society well, I fully agree, do you understand? Except that there are different realities [*inside and outside the poor communities*].

*Justification of the code:* Kaique brings the conversation back on track by moving the emphasis away from the police perspective to the shared point of view, to the relation between police and community. Although he presents a strong opinion and makes it clear that the community won't accept to be treated differently from the well off part of

the society, he justifies it with good arguments. His point is grounded on a principle of equal treatment – a point that cannot be dismissed without further consideration by the other participants. Moreover, he brings the example of poor communities outside of Belo Horizonte, in which the relationship with the police is extremely conflictual, to support his opinion that the police, in using the force more often in their neighborhood, is not reacting to events, but only to an idea that poor people is potentially more violent than their richer co-citizens. Kaique makes a great effort to dilute Guilherme's authority and reject his implicit proposition that there is no conflict between the police and slum residents. He thus seeks to alter the conversation context and re-open interactive exchange.

### **Moderator**

Only to strengthen it: So, Kaique is pointing a police's different treatment with the community and with other parts of the city...

### **Guilherme, Police Officer (code 2)**

*(INTERRUPT)* Marcia, just ... Sorry to interrupt, but I cannot see the difference in treatment he is pointing out. I want to reaffirm it. Because it is not a differentiated treatment ... but a procedure. One type of agency. So you have to be careful, Kaique, to define things correctly, for us not to depart from a wrong thought. Not is a difference in treatment, but a difference in behavior. If it's right or wrong, we can discuss it, ok. But I want us to discuss from that point of view. The proper is: the technical and tactical behavior is different, all right, then we'll agree, but treatment is not. Because there was no question of unequal treatment. Just to make that clear.

*Justification of the code:* In this case we see how a person who starts with good reasoning and provision of stories can take the flux of conversation from a high to a low level of deliberation. Guilherme interrupts the moderator to challenge Kaique's argument by presenting a technical definition of what is treatment and what is behavior. Although he does not stay completely out of topic, he takes one small part of the former speech, probably not the most important, and put it in the forefront of the debate. This is not just a strategy to escape from an uncomfortable situation, one in which the police was confronted by the community. More importantly, Guilherme refuses to accept, even to acknowledge, the problem brought by other participants, including the moderator. Under this circumstance, he is also attempting to obstruct the other participants' autonomy to accept or reject his claims; and there is not possibility to build a bridge between their differences.

### **William, Police Officer (code 3)**

I wanted to ask you sr. something. Do you have a car, do you drive?

*Justification of the code:* William seems to be using Guilherme's tip to get the conversation deeper in the conceptual difference between treatment and behavior. With the question presented by this participant, the conversation stays at a low level of deliberation, moving farther and farther away from the topic presented in this study. So, although he explicitly drives a question to a participant from the other group represented in the study, it is still hard to figure out where this will leave us within the discussion about the culture of peace.

### **Kaique, community resident (code 3)**

Yes, I drive.

*Justification of the code:* Kaique is not able at this point to get the conversation back to a point he presented himself. He engages in the game proposed by the police officer and contribute to leave the conversation at the same low level it was.

**William, Police Officer (code 3)**

When you know the traffic of a city, there are places that are more dangerous. There are some crossings that have no stop sign, so you drive more carefully... you say... "Well, some kind of accident may happen here"...

*Justification of the code:* The police officer is trying to make an analogy between a driver's behavior in the traffic and their patrolling work in the streets. According to this analogy, the slums are compared to a dangerous, poorly signaled street, while the other parts of the city are calm roads where the driver can relax and drive. It's still hard to see how this analogy can contribute to the issue at stake. Moreover, it may be quite offensive for the slum dwellers.

**Kaique, community resident (code 3)**

*(INTERRUPT)* I drive respecting the traffic rules...

*Justification of code:* Kaique interrupts the officer to remember the importance of the traffic rules, accepting the analogy proposed. At this point, the conversation becomes more polarized while the groups don't seem to be reaching an agreement.

**William, Police Officer (code 3)**

No, let's not talk about traffic law. *(Angry tone)* It's about driver's sense. *(Kaique try to say something in the background)* And imagine that there are other places that you know: "here is quieter, this street is quieter, here I can drive more calmly". Doesn't it happen in traffic?

*Justification of the code:* The officer complements his analogy here, insisting, now in a more strong tone of voice, that the slums are naturally more dangerous areas for the police. That would justify holding the gun outside of the vehicle, the fierceness in the approaches and other procedures that can sometimes even violate the norms applied in other areas.

**Kaique, community resident (code 3)**

Yes.

*Justification of the code:* The conversation remains within the issue of unequal treatment. Although it is part of the idea of building a peaceful environment, the argument raised by the cops goes on the direction of refusing the existence of conflicts between the police and the slum dwellers. Or at least to justify the unequal way of dealing with people who live in poor communities.

**William, Police Officer (code 4)**

So this is how Police officer is, too. You said in the beginning, right? Behind the uniform we are humans as well, right? We have family, kids. And the probability of having some kind of conflict with those who are against the laws in the community

sometimes is bigger than in other places. It doesn't mean that the police officer who is holding a gun, which is a competent cop, who is prepared to work with a gun... I work with a gun, and I know how to handle it... it doesn't mean that this police officer with the gun will mistreat the good people who live in poor communities, who wake up at four in the morning. But the probability of getting into a confrontation in that place is higher than in some other areas. It doesn't mean that in São Bento (*a rich neighborhood nearby the poor community where the study took place*) is peaceful, but the probability [of having a confrontation] is higher here, unfortunately, than it is in São Bento. In other words, he [*the cop*] does it for his own safety. Because the confrontation can be immediately, without [*the offender giving*] any notice. Just as you know that in some places is more dangerous and you have to drive more carefully, the police officer as well, in a place that it can have a conflict, it will work with more caution and more preparation than in other places, do you get it? Sometimes it may happen that in another place where he is caught off guard, but his conduct in the community must be different. I work in the community and I work in the downtown area as well. My gun is always ready or in my hand. I've been in a shooting, I've seen my colleagues die and I don't want this neither for me nor for my family. I am a good citizen too and I also pay my taxes. I realize that ninety percent of the problem of the community is not because of the police officer. Sometimes I'm hopeless because I see that the police officer is the only government agency working in the community. And in the community that lacks proper infrastructure, sanitation, transportation, housing... In Vila Pinho, I will use an expression, I apologize in advance, the citizens wake up and there is shit on their doorstep. You have no sanitation. So I understand that if all the State agencies acted effectively, the police officer would simply be one small agency if compared with the magnitude of the whole state. Because our expertise is in operations of specific arrest and prevention. There is no way to change that. But where's the problem? The only state agency that comes inside these communities is the Police. Our job is not to make housing for citizens, our job is not to bring urban mobility, not to build schools, or bring sanitation or transport. Our constitutional duty is to provide qualified retention and prevention. Strong policing. But the police officer is trying to hold it too because it is the first state agency that has the ability to have a conversation like we're having here today.

*Justification of the code:* William manages to explain his point. In this speech, he broadens the scope of the conversation and adds new information to the talk. To create a culture of peace, it's not enough to change the police behavior. The government has to do his job of providing at least a minimum social infrastructure and good public policies to protect everyone. Even though he starts explaining that the communities offer more risk for the police, he ends up showing a good understanding of the precarious situation in which slum dwellers live. By showing that the police duties have a limited reach in improving their lives, he builds a good argument about how to construct a more peaceful environment. So, the speaker contributes to change the level of deliberation from low to high level.

### **Guilherme, Police Officer (code 1)**

I'll just point out something very interesting, there's a modern poet, who's also a rodeo narrator and former police officer, who says... and this is a feeling that's within my heart... that "if we could exchange our weapons for a dictionary we would do it just to make sure we go home". If I were sure, Marcia, that when I told "move your car from here and put it there"... if I were sure that you would do it, I wouldn't work with a single

knife in my hands. We are family men and we value life. We value life. And when we speak about society, Kaique, I'm in this society. When I leave my family's house, I want the same as you for society; I expect the same as you from the police. So, this point of view that puts the police as something above, no, we are men and women and parents and want the same thing as you as a citizen. So I speak, and I speak honestly, if we could leave the house unarmed with the certainty that the uniform would solve the problems we have to deal with, we would work unarmed. So a gun, for us, it's simply an instrument for our defense. It's not something to be pursued. You can say, "Oh, but not everyone thinks so"... it's true. Some guys are yet to grow professionally; and that is what we seek, and that is my role and the sergeant's role, to bring them knowledge, because knowledge is more than information. It is information and practice combined that produce knowledge. And knowledge comes with time. So, we start being more and more careful: "look, this posture is not correct"... We were just talking about it, right Miguel? That's when you need, Kaique... when you need to use this freedom to say to me, "look, Lieutenant, everybody's here working like this and like that." If I think that it's correct I will explain why it's correct and if I think it's wrong I'll explain to you why is it wrong, I'll call and talk to the cops and I will guide them. But I would like to make sure that for you here, as a community, and to researchers: there is in the police officer a desire for peace. A desire for peace. I said so in my speech: "Nobody gives such a priority to peace as those who know the ills of war", and we know it closely. There are some people, Kaique ... I've seen boys whom I know since they were born, when they get to thirteen, fourteen... and died as homicide victims because of traffic. We have people who were growing, and got involved with the traffic, got out of it and now have respect. They say "Mr. Guilherme, I'm good now, I'm doing well". And all that's because he has found another way. For us there's nothing better than that. We have within the community renowned artists born there in the middle of it. Renegado, for example, at Alto Vera Cruz. Renegado is nationally recognized, he was born there and respects us and we respect him too. So my talk, Kaique, is not like "oh we are right," no, that's not it. There are some things that are wrong and we are here to make them right. What is wrong, we have to correct. But what is right I must also explain that it is the right thing, it's a correct posture, is not a bad posture of the police officer against the community. But because there is certain environments within the communities that we cannot escape either. We cannot run away, because there is traffic, there is violence, and there are armed people walking within the community, and when they meet with the police, there will be strong reaction. May be - and usually I actually disagree - but there may be a reaction - and that's why the police sometimes... sorry if I'm talking too much, but because I need to clarify a few things for the community... that is why the police sometimes is holding their guns, to anticipate an action against his life. Basically that's it. But if there is a mistake, Kaique, is good for us to talk. It is talking that we'll make things right. I had the opportunity, Marcia, to approach a citizen on the street, I approached him and he asked me: "do you need to approach me with a gun in your hand?". I understood that he was actually in doubt. I stopped five minutes, I took it [the gun] out and said: "Bro, take your wallet and put it in your hand. Okay. Now place it at your waist. I'm going to approach you, pretend that this is a weapon. Until I take my gun, you would already have shot me. Now I will do differently. My gun is empty, look, there's nothing in here... I will hold it in my hand. Put the wallet at the waist." Honestly, in the middle of the street! "Put your hand in your wallet and try to take it out" By the time he tried to take it I said so "Stop! You see? I anticipated your action". That's what it is, just for me to point this. And sorry for my speeches, but it's because the police need to be very well explained and sometimes we do not have that



time, right, Marcia? Then that's why sometimes my speech extends a little, but it is in this way, you forgive me (*In some parts in reference to peace, says the word slowly and shows emotions*)

*Justification of the code:* Guilherme speaks again for more than 5 minutes.

Incorporating the argument that was brought up by his colleague and reintroduces the justification for the kind of approach practiced by the police in poor communities. In a very calm manner, the officer explains why they must be prepared to defend their lives whenever they are inside a slum. In this speech act, however, he maintains that the community is not to blame for their situation. There are external, collective factors that affect the relationship between the police and the slum dwellers. He seems to finally accept that there's an issue that can and must be dealt with in this relationship. From the perspective of the observer, it seems clear that the former speech act somehow really represented a transformative moment in this conversation. Having established that the problem is not related to a "natural tendency" of poor people to be more dangerous, they recognized the other participating group as deserving equal respect. Moreover, after William last statement, the creation of a peaceful relationship went back to the core of the dialogue. Although Guilherme acted in several opportunities as a deliberative spoiler, we can't say it happened again in this talk.

## **Group 4 of Brazilian police officers and community residents**

### **Participants**

**Michel**, Police Officer, 24 years old, incomplete higher education

**Gustavo**, Police Officer, 41 years old, incomplete high school education

**Cynthia**, Police Officer, 33 years old, high school education

**Thiago**, teenager, 19 years old, incomplete high school education

**Cibele**, teenager, 17 years old, incomplete high school education

**Yago**, teenager, 15 years old, incomplete high school education

**Thaiane**, teenager, 18 years old, high school education

**Nathália**, teenager, 16 years old, incomplete high school education

**Eric**, teenager, 15 years old, incomplete high school education

**Isadora**, community resident, 76 years old, incomplete high school education

**Margarida**, community resident, 47 years old, high school education

**Milena**, community resident, 43 years old, high school education

### **Moderator**

How do you think can be built a culture of peace between police and community? How do you think is the relationship between the police and the community? You were already mentioning some things...

### **Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

I would like to start by saying, I wanted to address this to the community, the police today it's very overloaded, there is an organ called SEFA [*State Treasury Secretariat*], there is IBAMA [*Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources*], there is the 192 [*emergency number*], there is the Human Rights, there is all the organs but anything that happens, the society thinks it is the police who has to solve the problems. I was commenting with this guy here [*pointed to another police officer*] that I was a soldier, it was a good thing that happened in my life but you see, I was a

soldier and was in the Presidente Vargas [*an Avenue*] corner, and then one day, there was a person drowning in Guajar bay [*close to that Avenue*] it was ten o'clock at night ... see, security from a private place, Port guard, taxi drivers and several people were there at the time, guess what they did, they ran up to the Presidente Vargas Avenue to call two police officers who were there, the port and the security guard were watching the person die, so I took my garrison belt and jumped in the Guajara bay at ten o'clock at night. There are some things in our regulation that did me right, I extrapolated my functional duties and then I was promoted because of my act of bravery, right? Today I am sergeant. So society wants a lot from us but in my opinion we haven't been properly recognized by governments yet. But we are very demanded by the community, one thing I wanted to say to you is that there comes a time that the police end up being ignorant unintentionally, and sometimes the society don't understand that, because anything and everything that happens we must know how to deal with it, and is not supposed to be like that. We have to know how to approach people and say "please, what could you do?" Many times our support is not supposed to go there and solve that thing, many times is not even my duty but the person wants me to act, and do everything about it, what society has to understand is that it's not our mission, like, it's hard to see a relative dying, shot, or seriously injured by a car accident but people ask us "takes care of him, help" but it is not our mission, we have to go ahead, call the rescue, make the right business. So what I'm talking to you about is a something that I could go on all night and all afternoon.

*Justification of code:* Before talking about how to build a peace culture, the police officer Gustavo chose to clarify a set of problems surrounding this subject matter. In his opinion, the police officers are in a bad situation because neither the government nor society recognizes their work. He argued that community addresses many demands to police that are another public office duties. Consequently, police officer had a lot to do and sometimes they are not prepared ("I wanted to say to you is that there comes a time that the police end up being ignorant unintentionally, and sometimes the society don't understand that, because anything and everything that happens we have to know how to deal with it, and is not like that"). Then, both police officer and community were unsatisfied. Gustavo presented two personal stories to support his point of view. By offering arguments and stories about the relation between the groups involved in the discussion, Gustavo started the conversation at a high level.

### **Cynthia, Police Officer (code 1)**

I think, you know, that a lot has changed in the relationship between the community and the police, we see that the community understands more than they did before, but some things like the sergeant said, today in the sectional [*police station*] I was doing the incident report, and that's what he said, the police is expected to even solve dog fights and its really written down on the occurrence, they called the police to solve the fight of two dogs they had, the only way is to understand that we're just another institution but near the community, but we can't solve everything. Community sees it that way, I think some police officers need to understand that the police is the closest entity to the community, and that's why they want so much from us. There's this wrong idea that whatever problem the community has, they think we can solve it and we know that we do not have the solution for everything. But I still understand why the society wants this from us, the police, is because it is the closest institution to community and it ends that we get overloaded, right? Anyway it is not our fault, but that's it.

*Justification of code:* Cynthia detailed the point raised by the former participant about the relation between police and community. She also offered a simple story to support the argument that police are called to solve every community problem. However, she appeals to community residents to understand that the police are the closest public service to them. Then, police officer should acknowledge that fact too (“Community sees it that way, I think some police officer need to understand that the police are the closest entity to the community, and that’s why they want so much from us.”). She said everything in a calm and peaceful way and tried to explain that is not all their fault. Code 1 is used here because she develops the topic in discussion and maintained the high level of deliberation.

### **Moderator**

How can a culture of peace be built between the police and community?

### **Cibele, teenager (code 1)**

I think it depends on the formation, the person’s thoughts, as she sees it, I have some friends who think that the police officer is the bad guy, violent, beats teenagers, and a bunch of other things... then I was like, “don’t, stop saying this because the police are there to promote your safety, a good institution”. I wrote an essay once where I explained everything, the community speaks and you end up absorbing without stopping for really thinking, without taking your opinion and see if this opinion is the right one, this comes a lot from what the society throws at you.

*Justification of code:* Cibele, a 17 years old teenager, told a simple story about their friends that corroborate the former participants’ point of view about the police image among the community residents. She expressed her opinion in a personal way; and pointed out that this perception about the role of the police contradicts the common view shared by her friends. She admitted that the police were doing the best work they can. She concluded by mentioning that people should filter common sense information, to avoid making wrong judgments. The conversation remained at a high level because Cibele considered the former participants’ arguments and offered new elements to the discussion. (*Silence*)

### **Moderator**

How can a culture of peace be built between police and community?

### **Margarida, community resident (code 1)**

It has a lot to do with family, the culture of peace. Give a better education to their children, because if a family raises a child not to go to the evil path there is no way for them to follow an evil path because the family is educating their child in a good path. I think it depends on the family as well.

*Justification of code:* Margarida addresses her speech to the family topic, especially to the importance of education. According to her, families have the duty to raise the children in a good path. Although inserting the family topic on the discussion, she considered it almost an individual responsibility and did not consider social aspects. However, she offers new information and the deliberation still remains at high level.

### **Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

As the lady said, the path, the base is equal to building a house, the foundation of a house, because what we want here is education, if you do your part, and the husband does his part in educating the teenager - we do not mean that this teenager it's not going to commit a crime, I don't know because an infraction or a misdemeanor is different, we will embrace a boy like that and say to calm down, this kid here has to be a little more instructed, maybe his parents did not touch on that subject here, maybe he doesn't know what can harm his future, related to job interviews, tests in his school ... I think the first impact on, "Oh you are arrested" that's not it, the police also instructs, we talk to the person, understand? But we also have an arm in guidance, the education has to be taught at home, the police can't teach them. I disagree with that, today, a police officer that hits a person, a bum or a teenager, is lowering his level, will he educate by beating someone? No, or you're stuck, or maybe there is an orientation or it's a FUNCAP [State foundation that assists teenagers who engage in crimes] to better instruct him? That doesn't exist anymore. There is no need for another type of oppression or that kind that people still do today, which parents come to us and ask "look, can you scare my son a little bit?" understood? We cannot do this anymore, I mean, you did not give an education to your son and now I have to scare him? No, I think that society has to be aware if the boy wants to find out what can hurt him, during this time, our experience as a father and mother, we have to be acquainted to go there and say "so here, this can turn into that", give directions, guidelines saying what is right and what is wrong, saying that a dog at the street has more dignity than a guy that is stuck there. There are people that are doing everything and anything out there but they didn't realize it yet, the business in a prison is ugly, the rebellions, there's a lot there that is complicated, that teenagers have to be guided every single day. Today I will talk like, "hey you, you go to school right, so be careful about that, or you're going to work right, watch out for that here," a guidance every day does not cost anything. A friendly word every day.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo developed Margarida's argument about family education in a more general way. He called the responsibility of parents individually, but cited society too. While being sensible to many difficulties faced by parents to educate teenagers, he also shows understanding that the teenagers also experience a number of hurdles growing up. For him, the police officer can also help with guiding the young ones. However he contests the action of violent cops; and takes a strong position against the parent's request for the police officer to scare their sons. At this moment, it is possible to identify Gustavo as a deliberative leader because he suggested a new way to frame problematic issues; he developed the other participant's argument, and illustrated his opinion with meaningful examples to enable the community residents understand his point. Code 1 is applied here because deliberation is still at a high level.

### **Moderator**

What are the situations, I mean about security, that you face here in Guama?

### **Cibele, teenager (code 1)**

Security or insecurity? (*Laughs*) There is constantly a lot of fighting, always the same people who are also involved in the traffic world. I don't want to take out your hard work [talking to the police officer] but on the street has a lot of young people who steal even children who smoke, not wanting to belittle you, I just don't feel that insecure because I live there, because they know me but then they can also say, this girl does this and that at this certain time, or may have other people do their dirty work, so or we stay only at home or we don't know if we are going to come back from where we went.

*Justification of code:* Cibele used humor to introduce her argument. The other participants seemed to agree because they laughed. It means that the question she asked about “security” or “insecurity” in Guama made sense for everyone. This way, she stressed that is impossible to ensure safety in the neighborhood because there are a lot of people involved in traffic. Even though she lives there, it does not mean that criminals (especially children and youth) would not attack her. The speaker referred to the police officer in the room in a respectful way (“I don’t want to take out your hard work”) and code 1 is used here because she introduced a good point from her personal experience to improve the discussion.

**Cynthia, Police Officer (code 1)**

I think it is difficult to speak about the safety issue of the Guamá neighborhood, because I live in another neighborhood, I've been in other neighborhoods, but it's not because I work here, I've lived in other neighborhoods as well, but I see that the policing in Guamá, Terra firme [*near Guamá*], is not a bad one, I see a lot of police cars that are from other districts there, but there is not really a way out yet is very populous, has a lot of social problems. It is very difficult, we see many cars on the street, [we] try to reduce violence at least a little, but we cannot deal with all at once. And when the day that the community understands that comes, that we're doing our job but sometimes it's just too much. Because it's not just the issue of security, there are other factors before that, has the issue of education, housing, unemployment and then we end up having these consequences. The situation of Guama is a difficult one.

*Justification of code:* Cynthia explained, as a police officer, that the police in Guama was doing its duties (“I see that the policing in Guamá, Terra firme [*near Guamá*], is not a bad policing”). For her, the big issue is the huge population that lives in this area, along with various social problems. She clarified, in a rather frustrated voice, that violence was not the only problem there, but also poor education and lack of basic social infrastructure that affect security matters. Cynthia complained about the negative image on the police nurtured by the community residents. She stressed that the police officer are just doing their work, but unfortunately they get overloaded with so much responsibility. She maintains the high level of deliberation and adds a new argument.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Do you want another clear example to make society understand more of what we go through? For example, a high level commander, wanted to do a survey to see if we [*the police*] are arresting more or less in comparison to last year, compared to the same month last year, then I said “but wait, I think there are more”, as I said, because, the police, last year, I arrested people like hell, but how many the court has allowed to go home on mother's Day, Christmas. I mean I'm just working hard here, the police, civil police, other institutions too, "oh because the level of violence does not decrease", why it doesn't get lower? I mean that when it comes mother's day, or the end of the year, the guy who's killing, stealing, has the same rights. They [*the courts*] have released six hundred [*inmates*] to come again to disturb society? And then, if will have a high level at the end of the year, we are the guilty ones. The judge who is signing the release of six hundred inmates around Christmas is not to blame; it is the fault of the police, civil police ... That's right!

*Justification of code:* Gustavo offered another example to show that their work as police officer was not recognized by the population. According to him, the judiciary system

helps to increase this negative representation because the police arrest a lot of people but then when it comes to festive dates and holidays, like mother's day or Christmas, those who committed severe crimes (who killed and raped) have the same right of the ones who has committed mild faults; and then they are released. Gustavo used irony to show a lot of frustration and indignation when he says that: community blames the police because they don't know who else is involved and they are the first institution that they make this connection with. The responsibility of other important institutions to keep social security – like the judiciary system – is not even remembered. He illustrated his opinion and made easier to others in the group understand his point. Code 1 is applied here because the deliberation is still at a high level. (*Silence, participants were doing gestures - nods head*)

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

It is because they know what I'm saying is true. We arrest a lot and they know it.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo understood the nodding as a confirmation of his previous speech act. Because of the way Gustavo led the group, it is reasonable to say that the speech was based on the authority of an experienced police officer. Other police officer in the room seemed to confirm this position. Code 1 is used here because his interventions helped to maintain the conversation flow.

**Milena, community resident (code 1)**

But this is true.

*Justification of code:* Milena agreed with the Gustavo's speech, when he stressed that police do its duties and arrests a lot of criminals, but some judges release them, what contributes to an increase in the rate of crimes. As a consequence, the police's reputation falls. However, she seemed a little bit intimidated by the authority position held by Gustavo. No new information or argument was added. However, this intervention did not break the high level of deliberation, which remains interactive.

**Isadora, community resident (code 2)**

I have a grandson who was arrested during the Círio [*a cultural and religious manifestation during October in Belém*], he was in São Braz [*a neighborhood*] and we do not know what he was doing, it wasn't a good thing, because we couldn't go there at the time. They already got him making some calls, then they transferred him to Marambaia, where he is now. They said "you are his grandmother, you should give the money to bail him out". Just me? I will give my money to get him out and he will do it again, I think I like him more than his mother, his sister said to his mother, "hey but you also don't want to help" and his mother said, "Oh, let him stay over there to learn!", because if he was working with the guys, doing something good, he would not be there.

*Justification of the code:* The participant Isadora switches the level of deliberation and makes it fall when she starts telling the story that was not connected to the main topic. It was only about the relationship between her grandson, who was arrested, and his mother, diverging from the central point of the discussion, which was police vs community. That way, code 2 is applied here.

**Thiago, Police Officer (code 4)**

As the sergeant said, they arrest, and the judge releases them. This is dangerous even for them that are on the street. The criminal are arrested, the judge releases them and they try to get their revenge on the police, is even dangerous to your profession, it is a very risky profession and unfortunately the government does not pay what the profession deserves.

*Justification of code:* Thiago succeed on his attempt to bring back the point of the discussion. This way, he increased conversation level because he restarted the discussion about the impunity of criminals, that was stressed before by Gustavo (D8). Thiago also mentioned his disappointment about the minimum wage offered by the government, which he assumes as too low for the police officer hard work.

### **Cibele, teenager (code 1)**

And they also say that today, many police officers pay with their lives, their own work that they chose for themselves, sometimes, they end up paying with their lives.

*Justification of the code:* Cibele criticized the fact that a lot of police officer suffer or risk their lives in order to keep the community safe. By being interactive with the Thiago's argument, she maintained deliberation at a high level.

### **Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

One thing I wanted to make clear, it seems that we are already advanced, but it seems that it's not out there totally, you don't need to identify, we need the community's support, and how? Reporting, and reporting is not being exposed because we know they are taking the same risks as us when the judge releases them, and when they report directly to us, when they appear because "oh I reported it, and he gets locked down, then two weeks from now, the judge releases them", sometimes, I even understand why people don't cooperate more with us because they know of the impunity. They know that in a month or even less, two or three months, the criminal will be released, but I say it again, we cannot lose hope, there are anonymous reports that you continue to have access to it to collaborate with us. But I can understand people who will not report, roughly, because they no longer trust in the system. They know they can have reprisal. That's not it?

*Justification of code:* Gustavo stated a good argument about the relation of police and community. He stressed that the police needs the community support and also explained what he expect from it: reporting. However, he highlighted that sometimes people feel afraid of doing so because the criminal will be released someday. He claimed for hope and gave the other participants an advice to follow together with the police: "we cannot lose the hope, there are anonymous reports that you continue to have access to it to collaborate with us". He maintained the high level of deliberation.

### **Cynthia, Police Officer (code 1)**

It gets worse with the issue of age because a 12-year-old boy is assaulting a bus and we cannot do anything, we go there and handle the situation, but what will be the sentence of that child? It's really a kid, a 12 year old, but we can't do it, what's the situation that this child has been through. Because he is a child, even armed. We know that this kid [*his situation*] is almost lost. Hardly they have a return [*from the criminal life*], especially because of the social problems.

*Justification of code:* Cynthia started a new topic about the criminal responsibility age, which is related to the core of the discussion. Besides, being afraid of the reduction because she recognized the teen criminality as a result of the social matters, Cynthia stressed that police officer did not know how to handle the involvement of teenagers in crimes. The conversations remained in a high level.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

I'm going to tell you something that you are not expecting, I do not agree with lowering the criminal responsibility age. In the United States, the legal age continues to be legal age and the minors continue to be minors. There they make them learn things; the kids in jail work, in a closed system, in a internal school. So, why I don't agree? Because there are other cases that should be discussed. Just because a 16-year-old boy can do things like an adult, it does not mean he has responsibility for certain acts, understand? I want a 16-year-old to go to army, make the efforts we do in adulthood, this is one thing. But, I do not accept..., I do not want .... If the bill of law for lowering the criminal responsibility age passes, we will have to follow. That's why I do not agree with lowering the responsibility age. So it's not easy, today I catch a minor with a caliber 38 greater than mine, and in the very next day he is released, with the presence of parents, a lot of times because it is his first offense, because he has a permanent job. Anyway, it's very easy.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo has improved Cynthia's argument about the reduction of criminal responsibility age. He claimed his opinion would break other participants' expectation regarding the opinion of the police on that matter. He presented arguments for justifying his position. The conversation level was still high.

**Moderator**

So guys, how can a culture of peace be built between the police and the community?  
(Silence)

**Eric, teenager (code 2)**

Could you ask again?

*Justification of code:* Asking the moderator to repeat the sentence once more interrupted the conversation flow.

**Moderator**

How do you think a culture of peace can be built between the police and the community?

**Eric, teenager (code 4)**

I think more communication, more conversation between the police and the community, because sometimes it's just a lack of conversation, because like... for example, the police gets there out of nowhere; it needs to have that conversation first, "how was it? How did this happen?" I think it's a lack of communication really.

*Justification of code:* Eric, a 15 years old teenager, offered a suggestion for the culture of peace between the police and the community: more communication and dialogue between them. He tried to explain that sometimes the police acts without knowing what really happened; and approach the youth in an aggressive way. He also gave an example



about how this conversation should start (“how was it? How did this happen?”) and contributed to improve the conversation level.

**Moderator**

You all, in general, do you feel protected?

No [*some participants*]

**Moderator**

Why?

**Margarida, community resident (code 1)**

Because the bad guys are all over the place.

*Justification of code:* Although Margarida’s speech act was quite generic, it helped the next participant expose a new argument about the relation between the police and the community, especially teenagers. That’s way code 1 was applied here.

[*Laughter*]

**Eric, teenager (code 1)**

There are too many bad guys for just a small number of police officers, sometimes it happens that you have a kid saying he wants to be a cop, but when they see a police officer being killed they say, “Égua” [*slang*], I don’t want to be a cop anymore because he died there.”

*Justification of code:* Eric interacted with the former participant’s point of view keep coherence in relation to the main topic. He stated that violence is at such a high level, that police personnel are not enough. Code 1 is used here because the conversation level is still high.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Here [*in Guamá*] is the most populous district of Belém, if I’m not mistaken. I think is the most populous of Belém, the community has to invest more in cultural and educational projects, to fight this plague that is growing like the *aparelhagem* party [*traditional party in the suburbs of Belém*], this and that because the teenager has to understand the education issue, because if the teenager is on that side, what will happen? The more confusion, more work for us, the more education, more space for us to live better, because as the young man said here, it will make room for more dialogue because you’ll only have a few infractions, there will be less crime, because the population will be more educated. We have to fill space with culture, and later, in the evening or afternoon, in the classroom, it must have jobs for young people, if not they’ll continue misbehaving on the street.

*Justification of code:* The Guama neighborhood situated in Belem is one of the most populous and dangerous ones. Gustavo affirmed that for a culture of peace the community, especially teenagers, should pay more attention to education instead of parties. With a tone of indignation, he said that the lack of education increases the problem for the police to handle (“The more confusion, more work for us, the more education, more space for us to live better, because as the young man said here, will

make room for more dialogue because you'll only have a few infractions, there will be less crime"). Then, Gustavo connected the discussion about the participation of teenagers in crimes with the main topic and code 1 was applied.

*(Silence)*

**Moderator**

Tell me something. Do you think that skin color makes difference when it comes to the police approach?

**Cynthia, Police Officer (code 1)**

It depends on the police officer, it is not only the skin color, pieces of clothing too; some police officers are influenced by that.

*Justification of code:* Cynthia said that the approach depends on the police officer involved. She added that not only skin color can influence it, but clothing too. She maintains the conversation flowing and code 1 was used.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

No, ask another question, ask if we discriminate.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo asked the moderator to change the question. Since he explicitly asked if the police discriminate he went right to the point. The conversation level is maintained.

*(Moderator said that he was the one who was saying that)*

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

No, but ask me, because I will tell you "we are discriminating".

*Justification of code:* Gustavo again held a position that was unexpected because he recognized that police officer discriminates people. Thus, he helped the former speaker (Cynthia) to specify her point of view. So, code 1 was applied here.

**Cynthia, Police Officer (code 1)**

But can I ask a question, as a cop, to the community? Because I have two brothers who always say "you only approach a specific kind of people". If you're walking down a street, and a person is coming, a boy with a book, a backpack on his back, well dressed, no matter the skin color, and another one is coming with dyed hair, earrings, tattoo, boxer shorts, walking in a strange way we know, which one will you be afraid of in this situation? Which of the two do you think you rob you? To what side of the street will you go to?

*Justification of code:* Cynthia tried to make the community residents understand that everyone discriminates by testing them with a hypothetic situation. Then, she illustrated her opinion and made easier to the other group understand her point. This intervention kept the high level of deliberation, which remained interactive.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

If you see today, it is a bit uncertain to talk about skin color, today it is more important talking about what kind of place you're attending; the skin color does not concern us anymore. A really long time ago I do not think it was right to talk about this, but if you're coming out of a church or a birthday party the probability that I'll approach you is much smaller. If you are leaving a party, a SuperPop [common party on the suburbs of Belém]... you get the idea.... "Oh, but that is discrimination", yes I say it is discrimination, I have to "give to Caesar what is Caesar's".

*Justification of code:* Gustavo agreed with the former speaker that the skin color is not crucial anymore. He offered some examples to illustrate his position on what has most influence in the police approach, and that could be what the teenagers were doing, not their skin color. Since he ended his speech act saying "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's", he suggested that police gave the approach that teenagers deserve. So, it depends not on the skin color, but on the teenager's acts.

**Cynthia, Police Officer (code 1)**

And the community understands.

*Justification of code:* The participant Cynthia agreed with his colleague's previous speech and highlighted that this kind of discrimination is shared between police and society.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

The community expects this from us.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo reinforced what Cynthia said by defending that people usually expect a strong police intervention when they think that a criminal is involved (in the same discriminative basis). The discussion continues interactive.

**Cynthia, Police Officer (code 1)**

If a boy or a girl with a visual characteristic of a thief gets on the bus in our region, people in the bus call the police saying "there is a suspect on the bus". It will not be this person [calling for protection] who will be the suspect; it may even be that person who makes an assault, but he will hardly be suspected.

*Justification of code:* Cynthia offered one more example to make her point clearer, that all society is discriminative too. The conversation remained interactive.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

We have to make less and not more mistakes.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo agreed with Cynthia, but stated that police (and society) should prevent that kind of mistakes based in stereotyped visions.

**Eric, teenager (code 1)**

I think that what they said is true, if a person is walking on the street, looking suspicious and there is another one in a more behaved way, the police will probably approach the boy who is walking in a suspicious way, like with tattoo... I have no tattoos.

*Justification of code:* Eric agreed with Gustavo and Cynthia that people's actions, clothing and behavior are factors that influence how the police identify suspected persons. While this can also be conceived as discrimination, Eric's statement implies that this behavior is more obvious than usually assumed. Then, Eric remains interactive and the conversation level is still high.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Can I give an advice for you, guys? Always carry your ID! Let's say the truth, there is still a lot of aggressive police officers, but do you want to get rid of his ignorance at least in half? I'll speak for myself, in the "against the wall routine approach", - I'm not offending you, but I will be serious, in a tone for you to understand what I want. Oh, you say, "look if you want my identity, it is right here in my pocket", but if you do not handle it to him. Because even when you are approached, you have to know how to be approached. Do not take anything out of your pockets; just say "my ID is in my pocket, do you want me to take it? You will have relaxed me in 50% because I will think, "I should have approached that other one, this one has documents." I'll then let you go because I will want to ask the other person too. Because the person with bad intentions doesn't want to be identified. This is an advice for you to share.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo, even though he is getting out of topic, he started a conversation about an important subject, i.e., gives an advice to the teenagers: use your documents and stay calm if police asks for them. With that advice he gets closer to the teenagers; and he makes a friendly remark.

*(Moderator repeated the main question)*

**Moderator**

How can we build a culture of peace between the police and the community?

**Margarida, community resident (code 1)**

Through education. For example, families that go to parties, and take their child with them, that child will grow up wanting just parties. They're following the father and mother's example. If their parents give him an education that is for him not to follow this path, he won't go, and he won't disturb the community and the police. So I think that through education – it's like he said, there are criminals who are better dressed, but appearances can be deceiving, because nowadays the bad guys dresses better than a good person so the police doesn't think he is a criminal.

*Justification of code:* Margarida states that the teenagers are not guilty of choosing parties over education, because they learned that with their parents. Although the speech is a lit bit confusing, it remained somehow connected to the argument that was being discussed in the group. So, code 1 was used here.

**Milena, community resident (code 1)**

I think they should have more involvement with culture... parents showing their child the cultural side. Because here [in Para state] we have many different cultural events. There is the boi bumbá, quadrilha, forró, carimbó [*traditional dances*], we have it all. I would suggest leaving the *aparelhagem* [*popular party*] behind, because in my opinion these parties are not culture. I think it would decrease violence.

*Justification of code:* The participant presented a suggestion to decrease violence. She pointed out that culture (the “traditional” one) could stimulate the teenagers in a good way. The conversation is still going on a high level.

### **Moderator**

What about the relation between police and community?

### **Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

We even thank you [*the research group*] because we can already see that the community understands some of the difficulties we have, they know that everything can be improved, changed, reaching a better level, through several steps. When I joined the police, not long ago - I have been in the police for five years. But the older ones, who were leaving, [they] could easily join the police. A man could pass in front of the barracks and just say: "hey, come here, do not want to be a cop?". This means to me that society paid a price for that, for many years, even during the dictatorship ... a matter of... a bunch of stuff that today we don't talk anymore. Any police today already have a college degree. If you are analyzing the police, [they] are also doing their part. It is a matter of always trying to be better, but society needs to help us through education. This is the way.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo, in a reflective speech, gave his own impressions about the group results; he expressed he did not realize that people understand some of the police officers' problems. By making a comparison with past situations, he asserted that the relationship between the police and community is improving; and both sides should look for new measures to continue improving the situation. According to Gustavo, the police officers were doing their part in building a peace culture, but the society must also do the same. Code 1 is used here because the discussion remains at a high level.

### **Cynthia, Police Officer (code 1)**

I think it's a matter of both sides understanding that there are difficulties, but still being able to help each other. The community has difficulties, they have social issues and the police has difficulties too, but both sides understand that things will change.

*Justification of code:* Cynthia highlighted the importance of police and society partnership because, this way, each group can understand the other. The conversation remained interactive, so code 1 was applied.

### **Margarida, community resident (code 1)**

The community can also help the police in cases of theft because sometimes our mobile phone gets robbed and the person thinks it's a silly thing, not taking their time to register a BO [*crime registration*]. If we made a BO every time we get robbed, the police would have better chances to find out more about the neighborhood.

*Justification of code:* The discussion remains interactive and Margarida thought again about people's usual attitudes, such as not reporting robbery and others crimes. She realized that not taking this action affects the police work and prevents the community to understand better their context.

### **Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Through the statistics, right, lady? Very good.

*Justification of code:* Gustavo praised Margarida reflection about the importance of crime reporting. However, the way he said “very good” put him in a place of authority, as the one who can confirm the community residents’ perceptions.

**Margarida, community resident (code 1)**

It is because we think it's a small thing and sometimes we do not register a BO [*a complaint report*].

*Justification of code:* Margarida repeated her argument in order to interact with the former speaker.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

No more impunity! We need to report, right?

*Justification of code:* Gustavo tried to encourage others participants to agree with Margarida’s suggestion.

**Milena, community resident (code 1)**

Because many people think it won’t have a solution.

*Justification of code:* Milena explained the factors that prevent crime registration. The discussion keeps very interactive.

**Margarida, community resident (code 1)**

But they are wrong!

*Justification of code:* Margarida confirmed that community residents must report crimes as a way to cooperate with the police. In this sense, she closed the conversation in a high level.

**Group 5 of Brazilian police officers and community residents**

**Participants**

**Ricardo**, Police Officer, 36 years old, higher education

**Roberto**, Police Officer, 30 years old, high school education

**Eduardo**, Police Officer, 31 years old, high school education

**Carolina**, teenager, 14 years old, incomplete high school education

**Larissa**, teenager, 19 years old, incomplete high school education

**Juliana**, teenager, 16 years old, incomplete high school education

**Fábio**, teenager, 15 years old, incomplete high school education

**Lucas**, teenager, 14 years old, incomplete high school education

**Sandra**, community resident, 69 years old, incomplete high school education

**Mônica**, community resident, 64 years old, incomplete high school

**Moderator**

Well, the main question of this moment is: "how to build a culture of peace between the police and the community?"

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

My opinion is... I see that, we talk a lot about education. Of course there has to be education, generally speaking, we are representatives of the state. I always say that the treatment is in accordance with the client. I always say that, so I know to be very polite when people are educated and know also to be more impolite when the person is rude. So I think it needs to have education from all sides, right? But of course there are numerous other actions that should be implemented for us to achieve that peace that is so desired by all.

*Justification of code:* Ricardo, a Police Officer, is the first to speak. He gives an argument linked with the moderator's question about how to build a culture of peace between the police and the community. He argued that education is necessary, but he conceives education as politeness or civility. Initially, he expressed problem in an individualized way ("the treatment is in accordance with the client/ I know to be very polite when people are educated and know also to be more impolite when the person is rude"). He stresses reciprocal respect and calls attention to the importance of personal treatment, maybe as the first step to build a culture of peace. At the end of his remarks, he put the problem in a more collective way and moves towards social and political measures needed ("there are numerous other actions that should be implemented for us to achieve that peace that is so desired by all"). By doing this, he maintained open the possibility of debate. (*Exaltation, silence*)

**Carolina, teenager (code 2)**

Can you repeat the question?

*Justification of code:* The speaker did not understand or remember the question. She's disrupted the flow of the idea. So this code means the decrease of deliberation.

**Moderator**

How can we build a culture of peace between the police and the community?

**Carolina, teenager (code 2)**

We should give our opinion of how this could be done, right?

*Justification of code:* The speaker asked for more information about the question itself.

**Moderator**

Yes.

**Carolina, teenager (code 4)**

Like, the people, the community... they only have bad things to say about the police, which is rude. Society says that but they do not see the sacrifice they make every night, right? I also think the community's communication with the police is missing. When they [*the police*] have their breaks [*interruptions in their work*], each person in the community should come up and say what they think; and communicate with them. Because I think there is a lack of communication between them. Because if you have a better communication, they [*the police*] would become more peaceful to keep security.

*Justification of code:* Besides being a little distracted at the beginning of the discussion, Carolina, a 14 years old teenager, advanced an important argument to build a culture of peace in that context: increase the communication between the police and the community. As she said, “each person in the community should come up and say what they think”. She also recognized the police officers are engaged in a dangerous job; and she challenged negative representations about them. In this way, she created an atmosphere of empathy among the participants and raised a good topic for discussion.

**Roberto, Police Officer (code 1)**

Because it also has the community interaction with the police that’s important to break that barrier, right? The police job is to repress; but we are all human beings, right? We have our feelings and society does not see it, they just see us as the state force, the repression and that creates this barrier, understand? I believe that through this interaction as we are doing now, I see that none of these children here today had such close contact with a Police Officer.

*Justification of code:* Roberto endorsed Carolina’s point of view about the importance of communication and personal interaction between the police and slum residents, to prevent negative images and representations about the police. He highlighted that the police officers are human beings and not only representatives of a state institution. He invited others to see him in this way. He also pointed to the teenagers in the room that they probably never had a previous contact with a police officer. Although his speech was not so argumentative, it contributed to keep the deliberative process at a high level.

**Carolina, teenager (code 1)**

That is true, like the boys arrived saying "Oh, look over there, is a Police officer, oh no, don’t want to do it anymore" (*Shyness*)

*Justification of code:* Carolina revealed that, before the discussion started, the teenagers were concerned over the presence of the police. By doing this, she stayed on topic providing evidence for what Roberto said. In addition, she exposed somewhat personal information and disclosed teenager feelings before the other participants. However she was not comfortable to expand the example into new arguments.

**Larissa, teenager (code 2)**

Who are you afraid of, huh?

*Justification of code:* By using sarcasm, Larissa asked whom they were afraid of. Code 2 is applied here because the speaker did not bring any new points to discussion nor engaged others in the debate.

**Carolina, teenager (code 3)**

What are you afraid of, just ... (*Interruption, shyness*)

*Justification of code:* Carolina was starting to explain the reasons behind their fear, but she was interrupted by the police officer Ricardo. Carolina did not bring any new issues or arguments into the discussion. Code 3 is used here because the intervention maintained the deliberation at a low level.

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 4)**



Most of the times there is a certain rejection, right? Especially because we have this image. We usually work to repel misconduct, but no one likes being repressed. Many times even though they are wrong, they do not like it, and we end up being misunderstood. Let's say that, by doing that - which is our job - we are often misunderstood in that sense. I think that it is not right especially when you have this interaction project going for a while, with the state implementing special programs to improve this relationship between the police and the communities. For example, there is ProPaz integrated unit [*“Pro-peace” - a state security secretariat program that promotes public policies for children and teenagers*], and there are already several units in the state. I am not advocating any political banner, I advocate amelioration for society in general; there are very good projects that aggregates the police, the fire department and the community that is present with courses and work-shops. There's an occupation as Carolina said and taking these young people, these children that are there in a situation of abandonment, of lack of state assistance and all those things.

*Justification of code:* Ricardo uses information from his job to explain the teenagers' fear of them. He expanded the initial perspective shown by the teenagers by adding the argument that the police officers are misunderstood even when they are doing what he considered as their job. He mentioned some government policies, like ProPaz (a state security program that promotes public policies for children and teenagers) to show that there some state initiatives to bring the police closer to the communities. Ricardo was worried to emphasize that he was not talking as a state representative; he rather attempted to build bonds of solidarity and connect himself to other citizens (“I am not advocating any political banner, I advocate society in general”). (*Silence*)

#### **Moderator**

Here in Guamá [*neighborhood*] how is the relationship between police and community?

#### **Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

It is very difficult.

*Justification of code:* Code 1 was used here because she kept the conversation in an interactive way and on topic.

#### **Carolina, teenager (code 1)**

It is not very good...

*Justification of code:* Code 1 was used here because the speaker focused on the topic and stayed interactive with the group. She did not have the opportunity to explain her point because she was interrupted by Larissa.

(*Interruption*)

#### **Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

It is terrible!

*Justification of code:* Code 1 was used here because she kept focused on the topic. Larissa completed Carolina's last speech that was somewhat euphemistic (“It is not very good...”) with a more assertive position (It is terrible!).

**Carolina, teenager (code 1)**

Our community... it's not a 10. If we had to grade it between 0-10, I think it would be just 1. Because it doesn't have much communication with the police...

*Justification of code:* Carolina explained why in her opinion the community deserves such a low grade. She repeated her first argument presented in the beginning of the group discussion. Code 1 is used here because she kept the discussion about the main topic (peace culture between police and slum residents) by mentioning her evaluation of the community.

*(Interruption)*

**Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

I'd give a 0.

*Justification of code:* Although the speaker did not express an argument, code 1 is used here because she maintained the discussion process.

**Juliana, teenager (code 1)**

Because of the communication, right? It is because of the communication. Cause there is still a lot of work to be done... But there is no interaction between the community and the police. I believe we all should have more moments like this between the society and the police, like, how am I going to understand what they want from me and what I want from them without discussions like this?

*Justification of code:* Juliana referred to Carolina's argument about the absence of communication between both sides. She used the group's experience as an example of good conversation, showing it is possible to share perspectives and desires related to the culture of peace between the police officers and slum residents ("to understand what they want from me and what I want from them"). Code 1 is used here because Juliana dialogued with another participant's argument in order to develop it. After she finished her speech, some participants clapped showing that they agree with her .

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

I took over the command of Guamá (*neighborhood*) here in April and we have implemented not just a new service, but statistics proves to us that 98% of the population and the community as well, are good people living in the community who do not commit crimes; they pay their taxes exercising their rights to fulfill their obligations. Only 2% of the population commits crime and we turn 100% of our operating strength against this 2%. We do not care about the other 98% of the community; so there is this lack of assistance, of conversation, sometimes a better explaining. [*Some members of the community*], often commit crimes without knowing that it is a crime. For example, burning trash in the backyard. That bothers your side neighbors. So, that is against the law and it is something that almost nobody knows. Many times people commit crimes by a lack of knowledge, even if the law says that no one can claim they did not know about the existence of such law, after it's already been published and it's been around for a long time, since 1940. So there are all these situations, and this lack of communication really occurs, but we have improved it. I separated my A team of police officers which go to schools; ... they do not know where these young teenagers study, do not know if this car ever been there at their school but they have made visits daily.

Of course, we cannot cover everything because the demand is very high, but we would have police officers on every corner if we could, but unfortunately the reality is different. There is a lack of police personnel; and we have not conditions to deal with. And I like when the community is an extension of our arms, our eyes and our legs and they can help where we cannot, they can work with some measures and they can always improve the security of that place. An example here is Carolina who lives in [*a little street in the slum*], she knows who is the dealer, who are the drug users, who traffics, who explores prostitution, she knows, but we're not there, we do not live there, we don't know this kind of thing. So, she can help a lot with her information; she can help [*to promote*] safety and help a lot of people. People sometimes call 181 [*the police number*] and a complaint is shown on my computer screen and we will investigate this complaint. Right? And we have successfully managed to take drugs, then pick up guns. The community needs to realize that they are important in this process. Because the law says that public security is the duty of the state and the right and responsibility of all; is not only our work that is critical in this process.

*Justification of code:* Ricardo increased the level of discussion about the lack of communication by giving examples. On the one hand, he sustained that a high percentage of Guamá residents are “good persons” but some people commit crimes; and some are of lack of knowledge of the laws. Then, he complemented discussion by exemplifying how the lack of dialogue with the Police officers generate problems that are easy to resolve. On the other hand, he argued that, in a context of low public recourses, communication are essential to solve security problems because some slum residents know better certain problems within the community (“I like when the community is an extension of our arms, our eyes and our legs and they can reach where we cannot, they can work with some instruments and they can always improve the security of that place”). He also gave information about a telephone number in order to be accountable to the community. At the end, he pointed out that citizens too are responsible to public security. It is possible to see a “leader” role here because Ricardo clarified issues about security and provided examples as how to deal with the problem mentioned by Carolina.

(*Silence*)

### **Moderator**

So, how we can build a culture of peace between the police and the community?

(*Silence*)

### **Sandra, community resident (code 1)**

I think that... what I'm going to say is... you need to have a little more respect with working officers because I think that, the officers work a lot and are paid just a little... On the past, we didn't have so many murders. Nowadays from time to time there are murders, because they are the security and at the same time they are not. I have a nephew who works (as Police officer) and he tells me "Aunt, when I work only God is on our side"... They need more safety. They are working people, night and day. I mean, they should have more safety and the security system should look out more for the police, right?

*Justification of code:* Sandra brought knowledge from her personal experience to defend her point of view, which is that violence is increasing nowadays. Because of that, police officers are always at risk in their profession. In addition, she asked for better working conditions for the police and she questioned their very low wages. She also raised the bad way the police members are usually treated by the community. Code 1 is used here because these are relevant topics to the discussion.

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

There is always this question, sometimes some people have this point of view, some people even say that the police doesn't work, right? That is wrong, because we work very hard, I would say that, 95% of our actions are not reported in the press because the press doesn't want to show good things. Rather, the newspaper is filled with death because that's what makes up newspaper selling. But our positive actions do not appear in the news, the good police's side. Look, for example, yesterday a grocery store was robbed here in Mocajás [*a place in the neighborhood*]. They wanted to take 15,000 Reais of the citizen [*considered a large amount of money, about 6 thousand dollars*]. During their escape, they tried to steal a motorcyclist, who was armed, he reacted and shot him on the leg but they still remained on the run and then they stole a vehicle. We arrested them across UFRA area [*Federal University that is in a neighborhood near Guamá*], and took the 15 thousand real back along with one .38 revolver. The two robbers were arrested with 6 cell phones, but no one heard about it. So every day we risk our lives. I say this every morning for the rest of the troop, that we risk our lives for people we do not know, and do not value our work. Sometimes a misconduct of a really small number of police officers, in a group of almost 20,000 men, we all get sacrificed, right? And you have to really need to get to know the work. Here is an opportunity to get to know it, how is our work, and to see that there are not only negative things about it. There are actually much more positive things, almost 100%, and people do not see it. If we get it done right 1000 times, but we end up doing it wrong once, it will all be over. We are expected to be perfect, but we are not perfect because we live in the community, right?! We also feel tired, sleepy, hungry, we cry. We have feelings too but not everyone sees that. We are trained to ignore these feelings as much as we can, but a lot of us can't, we get emotionally involved with the occurrence sometimes, sometimes with the death of a child, but we cannot be touched. We have to be made of steel because the community and society does not accept our mistakes. We always have short-comings even when we make mistakes because our mistakes, generally, our errors endanger the life or the liberty of someone and these are the greatest rights a person has.

*Justification of code:* Ricardo acted as a deliberative leader to the extent that he used good arguments and examples to improve deliberation quality. Such good arguments were related to: (i) community mistakes about the police efficiency that are picked up and stressed by mass media coverage. This is so because the media prefers sad stories and emotional facts instead of good results; (ii) policemen are human beings, with the same needs and vulnerabilities as everybody else but they are expected to be tough, without any feelings. Moreover, many of them also live in the poor neighborhoods: “we need to be perfect, but we are not perfect because we live in the community, right ?!”.

*(Brief silence)*

*(Shy laughs. A woman from community makes a gesture as if she would say something, but regretted)*

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

You can talk. Feel free, don't be afraid and don't worry we will not take it personally, we know that there are many flaws, right? But you can be sure that we do everything we can and a bit more..

*Justification of code:* Ricardo, while apparently trying to encourage the other participant to express herself, might have intimidated her. Since Ricardo is a Police officer, people sometimes feel uncomfortable speaking and talking about mistakes made by the police. However, code 1 is used here because he tried to keep the space open for reasons exchange.

**Mônica, community resident (code 2)**

I feel protected by God, by the Saint Mary and only then I feel protected by the police...

*Justification of code:* Code 2 is used because Mônica stopped the deliberative flow and did not bring anything relevant to contribute to the debate.

*(Interruption)*

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 3)**

We are the angels on Earth.

*Justification of code:* No arguments expressed. Code 3 is used for this reason. Ricardo did not bring anything relevant to the discussion and interrupted the last speech.

**Mônica, community resident (code 3)**

Well... first, God, and then Saint Mary protects us and only then, the police. I always see a police car passing on my street. As much as teenagers don't want to obey their mother and their grandmother, I try to give them advice, I cry, I pray for them too. I pray to God to protect them to move them away from the drugs, which are horrible, right? And you [looking at the police officers] are working, really working, you work a lot risking your lives and everything.

*Justification of code:* The discussion continues in a low level. Mônica mentioned her experience with teenagers ("I try to give them advice, I cry, I pray for them too"). She also said that the police always works hard, but she was not able to bring relevant topics to discussion.

**Carolina, teenager (code 1)**

I think that it's not our problem if we do not feel safe. I think things are not all up to you [police], I think we need more people in patrol; people say bad things about you because you are only a few [responsible for security], right? You cannot be everywhere at the same time because the police [force] is very scarce here in the [state of] Pará, right? They have to understand that you are only one. You are people, not robots. The elections are now coming up and we are going to see what will be the next government's corruption..., what robbery is going to happen... I do not know. So, I think if a person reaches out and asks the police and the police reacts aggressively towards you, it's wrong.

*Justification of code:* Carolina was concerned about the way the police officers are usually treated by the community. In her opinion, the lack of public security is a State matter. However, there is corruption and public money abuse. , According to Carolina these factors explain why there are not enough police officers in the streets (“You cannot be everywhere at the same time because the police [*force*] is very scarce here in the [*state of*] Pará, right?”). The speaker shows concerned with these facts because they contribute to a negative impact on the police’s image and representation. Although the speaker did not develop very well her argument, code 1 is used here because she raised an important point in the discussion.

*(Interruption)*

**Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

It is because there are many ignorant police officers. A number of times, I saw it on television, police officers beating someone just because the person assaulted someone; and I don’t think this is right.

*Justification of code:* Larissa contested the last speaker’s (Carolina) defense of the police. She stated that there are “many ignorant police officers” in order to refute Carolina’s statement (i.e, “people say bad things about the police because they are very few to ensure safety for all citizens”). It is relevant to mention that although Larissa lives in a violent area, she saw the police “aggressiveness” and “brutal behavior” only on TV and used this as an evidence to support her statement. Code 1 is used here because the participant remains interactive.

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

This subject she’s touched now, I think it would be interesting if the press was here now, don’t you think? That is to see the police’s interaction with the community, but unfortunately this never happens, but if a police officer beats someone as she said ... we’d be filmed for sure. We have this barrier, the society does not trust us, you know ?!

*Justification of code:* Ricardo developed Larissa’s point to say that the problem is not the Police officer but the mass media, which creates a “barrier” between them and society. At this moment in discussion, it is clear that both sides agreed on the importance of dialogue/communication for building a peace culture. Having achieved this mutual understanding, participants then start pointing out problems that hinders the construction of a peace culture. Ricardo remains interactive with the topic in discussion and that is why code 1 is used.

**Carolina, teenager (code 2)**

Is he recording? It’s just because I’m talking about that more.

*Justification of code:* Carolina asked to moderator about the recording. At this time of the discussion she seems to be afraid of that, because she was speaking freely.

*(The moderator explained her that the audio recording is only for research purposes)*

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 3)**

What if it is shown later in *Metendo Bronca?* (A local TV program that favors news about violence)

*Justification of code:* Ricardo made a joke suggesting that what they were talking could appear in a TV program. This humorous remark helped to relax the climate in the room. Still, some teenagers remained silent, probably as Carolina said before, because they feared the police.

(Cold moment, laughs)

(Moderator said that it will not happen)

#### **Carolina, teenager (code 4)**

In relation to what he said about the police who harms others... they are defending themselves from the persons who are rude to them and sometimes they lose patience. Sometimes these people attack and the police officers have to defend themselves; and people record it [*the Police officer's aggression*] as their way to defend themselves. One day a relative of mine, who's a cop - I will not reveal his name of course - was going to approach a boy who was inhaling solvents, and then the boy wanted to hit him; He was defending himself and then another boy recorded it [*the episode*]. He was only defending himself and that created a big problem for him; after all, it was resolved. But I think that the important part of it [*the conflict*] is that the officers lose patience because they [*drugs addicted teenagers*] are so energetic and want to really attack them; they do not respect us. I talk a lot...

*Justification of code:* Carolina explained her critical perception about these recording, since recorded material can have more than one interpretation and be used for different purposes. Nowadays it is common practice to monitor the police officer's behavior; to hold them accountable. She illustrated her opinion through a simple story that enabled the group understand the issue. Carolina added new information (a simple story) and helped to increase the level of deliberation. At the end, Carolina questioned her own position in the group saying "I talk a lot". Whereas she was willing to give reasons and tell stories to engage in the discussion, she was insecure about her speech.

#### **Larissa, teenager (code 2)**

I feel more or less protected, more or less. But I feel more or less protected. For some things I feel safe and for others not. These two are talking so much I think they want to say something... [*pointing at two teenagers that were afraid of talking*]

*Justification of code:* Larissa was not able to develop her arguments or increase deliberation. In the debate process, she acted mostly as a deliberative spoiler, by interrupting the flow of communication very often. She neither explained her ambiguous point of view nor added new information. Her comments contributed to lowering the level of the conversation.

#### **Moderator**

How to build a culture of peace between the police and society?

#### **Larissa, teenager (code 4)**

With better education and more communication.

*Justification of code:* Although she did not explain her position, Larissa answered in accordance to the topic in discussion and summarized the essential points previously presented by others, by police officers and by community residents alike. That's why code 4 is applied here. However, Larissa did not succeed in opening space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

(Silence)

### **Moderator**

I have a question for you and I want you to be sincere. Do you think that skin color makes a difference in the police approach? I mean, the way a Police officer approaches a black person or a white person, or the way a person is dressed, does it make a difference in the police approach?

### **Eduardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

I'll speak for myself; the person's attitude causes us to have this suspicion. I am black, I consider myself black and I was never discriminated, not even once. When I wasn't a cop I liked rock music, I used to wear black all the time and I was never approached by a police officer for liking rock and for being dressed like a rocker.

*Justification of code:* Eduardo tried to justify his argument that a person's attitudes are more decisive to the police approaching than the skin color or clothing. He adopted a personal stance ("I'll speak for myself"). He also pointed out that he considered himself a black person. Race is a very complex issue. In Brazil, demographic surveys request people to freely identify their race or their skin color. In the Amazon Region, where State of Pará is located, there is the predominance of "cabocla" population, which is the result of miscegenation between Europeans (mainly Portuguese) and indigenous people. There is high rate of black people too because of black slavery in the past. However, the slavery was not as widespread as in other regions of Brazil. Eduardo like many other people born in that region does consider himself neither black nor white. It seems important to make this remark because the speaker's statement "I am black" very often becomes an excuse for denying any racist accusation. However, it is not possible to conclude if this is the case here. Eduardo explicitly defended an unbiased position; and he mentioned that before becoming a Police officer he used to wear dark clothes and like rock music (simple personal story). Even though, his argument was not very well elaborated, code 1 is used because he kept the conversation focused on the issue at stake and he was interactive with other participants.

### **Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

I think it has a lot to do with the person's character. The way one dresses... but it's because these boys... many times it's because of their tattoos. I've seen a situation that they only approached the boy because he had tattoos, and think this person is a thief just because of it, and the way of dressing disorderly but he's not.

*Justification of code:* Larissa was somehow disagreeing with Eduardo when she reported a situation in which personal appearance was decisive to the police's approach. However the idea she was trying to defend ("it's because these boys many times [have] tattoos") became confusing when she created herself an idea about a "way thieves dresses". The conversation at this point continues at a high level of deliberation.



**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Then she [Larissa] creates the idea that the person dresses like thief, you see?! Each one of us dresses like we feel better, but society has this thought that the person dresses like a thief; it is not only the police [*that thinks like that*] but her also, a girl who already has this thought...

*Justification of code:* Ricardo referred to Larissa's idea that there is a particular way of dressing like thieves. He argued that this kind of representation is not exclusive from the police, but rather spread in society. Indeed, these images are so deep that a “young girl” shares it. Code 1 is used here because the speaker’s argumentation helps to highlight the problem and kept a high level of deliberation.

**Moderator**

Does it make difference in the police approach?

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 2)**

Not for me... Many of the cops working on the street every day... The police already knows many of the offenders who act in a certain place. For example there is a boy in [*the name of little street*], that I will not name him for ethical principles and all, but he used to assault Joao de Deus all the time and he is only 15 years old. We arrested him twice; he went to the police station; and then he was lead to DATA [*Police Department for the Protection of Children and teenagers*]. We handle it, then he goes back home, and he starts stealing again. We realize, I would say around 80% of young people who commit crimes have some [*identifiable*] features. Most of the times, they have no identification as those we are talking about. They assault with a “bare face”; they rob without a knife, without a gun because the victim is so afraid and give them their belongings. So we know he commits crimes, but we approach him and he has nothing with him. We cannot arrest him because he has no weapon. At that moment, he might be already looking for another victim, but there is nothing we can do. It is not a crime to think of stealing. We have to catch them on the act. There is impunity; because he [*the teenage offender*] knows that he will still get out if he is caught. And people are afraid with good reason.

*Justification of code:* The speaker changes the subject and start talking about the participation of teenagers in crimes; he criticizes the Brazilian politics for protecting them. He argues that teenager commit illegal acts because they know they will not be punished. The conversation moves to a low level of deliberation.

**Sandra, community resident (code 3)**

My nephew who works [*as a cop*] said that this he is talking about always happens.

*Justification of code:* Sandra agreed, by reporting a simple story, with Ricardo’s perspective about the participation of teenagers in crimes. Code 3 is used here because deliberation stays at a low level.

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 4)**

Have any of you been a victim of crime?

*Justification of code:* He asks if someone has been victim of crime to reinforce his argument; he might be willing to share the responsibility about the impunity with the community. Ricardo assumes that the role of moderator by asking questions to other group participants. Code 4 is used here because he moves the discussion towards a more interactive exchange.

**Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

I have almost been.

*Justification of code:* She answered the question and continues the interactive process. That's way code 1 was used.

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Have you ever been? Did you report the offender? Did they catch the offender? Did you have to recognize someone? Generally people do not want, they prefer to get their belongings back when we regain them. The cell phone [for example], when we retrieve one the victim usually says "I do not want to make a formal complaint. I just want my phone back." That was a crime that did not come to statistical [rates]; then the thief is released and will be stealing again and the other time people will not catch him and so that's a snowball effect, this occurs daily.

*Justification of code:* Ricardo presents his argument in a more sophisticated way. He says that community residents do not help the police to catch criminals, since they do not report abuses and crimes ("Generally people do not want, they prefer to get their belongings back"). He suggests that for individualist reasons or some kind of neglect ("I just want my phone", for example), community fails to combat and prevent violence. Because Ricardo's statement has a strong connection with the main topic (how to build a culture of peace between police and community residents), code 1 was applied.

**Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

Once I was almost robbed in a park and there was a Police Officer there alone, I had nothing, neither my friend, then we left and the police did nothing as well.

*Justification of code:* Although it is a simple story, it is about the same topic that Ricardo introduced. This brief comment suggests that the police officers also are negligent when they see illegal acts. Thus, it also challenged previous argument by saying that the Police officer in the park did not help the teenagers. So, the problem is the police too.

**Roberto, Police Officer (code 1)**

Did he notice the situation?

*Justification of code:* The Police Officer asks for clarification about the situation referred by the teenager. He attempted to better understand what happened in the story. He neither added new information nor new arguments, but also he did not break the high level of deliberation.

**Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

He did.

*Justification of code:* She answered the last question made by the Police officer Roberto. Then, the conversation continues interactive.

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Did you call the police?

*Justification of code:* The Police officer kept asking more details to better understand the situation described by the teenager.

**Larissa, teenager (code 2)**

No, he [*the Police officer*] did nothing, there was only one officer, he did nothing so I left.

*Justification of code:* Larissa stayed open to clarify the situation. She demonstrated responsiveness to the police officer request. In her short answer, however, she still did not provide any new information or more satisfactory explanation of what happened. She was then interrupted by Ricardo. Deliberation moves from a high to a low level.

(*Interruption*)

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 3)**

He was probably not on duty. But if you had said to him "look those two over there wanted to rob me". He would have [*done something*]. He would if he had safe conditions to make the approach. He would have approached him or else he would have sought support and would have confronted the thieves.

*Justification of code:* Another Police officer tried to give a reason for the police officer not taking action during the situation mentioned by Larissa. Ricardo demonstrated some angry in this speech act. Probably because he did not agree with Larissa's opinion, which implicitly suggests that the police are neglectful and careless. The delay in the retelling of that situation caused a break in the debate dynamics and deliberation remains at low level.

**Larissa (code 3)**

I think he was there for a walk rather than to do his job.

*Justification of code:* By using sarcasm, she criticized the police officer. The police officer Ricardo, who is the official in charge for the neighborhood, gets uncomfortable. At this point, conversation remains off topic and code 3 was applied.

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 3)**

I am telling you, if there was only one police officer, he probably was not on duty. He may live in the area, but I believe he was not on duty.

*Justification of code:* The Police officer showed clear uneasiness with the flow of conversation. He kept suggesting hypothetical reasons to explain the police officer's lack of action in the story. Code 3 is used here because Ricardo neither found a way to

truly engage in a debate nor could provide satisfactory answer to his opponent. Furthermore, no new topics were brought into the discussion.

*(Moderator says that the discussion time is almost at the end)*

**Moderator**

How do you think it is possible to build a culture of peace between the police and the community?

*(Silence)*

*(Carolina apologized for leaving the room for a while)*

**Carolina, teenager (code 4)**

That's it. As I was saying, I think there is a need to do workshops with the elderly, etc. with everyone along with the young people, adults, teenagers. They should give workshop of how to get out of drug problems, leaving the gang and etc. I think they would communicate and would attract more people, they would speak for the entire community and would help young people not get into drugs and violence.

*Justification of code:* Carolina was able to increase the deliberative process by suggesting some actions and projects that could keep teenagers far from drugs and violence. Code 4 is used here because she tried to show how people can build a culture of peace through different means and strategies.

**Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

I think this should be done at least once a week, be a type of communication. Young people would come, police officers too, and they could speak a little of their work and we could tell them what we wanted, you know?

*Justification of code:* Larissa improved Carolina's idea and was more specific about how these meetings could be arranged. This idea was created in reference to the early discussion. The conversation is still at a high level.

**Carolina, teenager (code 1)**

And it would be too heavy work. So they [*the police officers*] could teach the teenagers, and the teenagers could share their knowledge with children so it'd not be too much work for them [*the police officers*] because they have to work too, right?

*Justification of code:* Carolina kept improving the first idea and she suggested a way to make it real. By doing this, she demonstrates a good perception about social solidarity to develop people's capacity through a networking processes ("they [*police officers*] could teach the teenagers and the teenagers could share their knowledge with children"). The conversation is still at a high level.

**Ricardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

In fact, we already do this. Like I said, a part of my team visits schools giving lectures. They give speeches about drugs, about violence, and a little bit of their everyday work. They do this work but the demand is very large and unfortunately we can't keep up with the demand. But they go to schools, the school headmaster books a meeting with them

and they lecture about certain subject. Nowadays, in fact, this already happens more, but no one knows about the good things we do like I said, *[this sort of information]* is not spread.

*Justification of code:* The Police Officer Ricardo explained that the solution proposed by the teenager is something that happens already. He provides evidence for the police's educational actions in schools. However, Ricardo complains that they do not have enough resources to attend all the demand. Again, he intended to be accountable and explain police actions in the community. As he maintained the discussion at a high level, the code 1 is used.

**Eduardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Have you ever participated in the PROERD? *[Drug Resistance Education Police Program]* Has any of you have participated? Did your school provided the program?

*Justification of code:* Although one may think Eduardo changed the subject matter - from "what actions to do to build a peace culture" to a specific police program - he was very much attuned with the topic under discussion. PROERD, mentioned by Eduardo, is a project organized by the police in partnership with local government in several States in Brazil. It aims at providing information and drug abuse resistance education in public as well as in private schools. Since this project offers the opportunity for children and teenager to interact with the police during several weeks, Eduardo asks if the teenager knows about this program. In this way, the level of deliberation stays at a high level.

**Fábio, teenager (code 1)**

What is it?

*Justification of code:* The teenager just wanted to know what PROERD is. Deliberation stays at high level.

**Eduardo, Police Officer (code 1)**

Are you asking about that program the captain was just talking about?

*Justification of code:* Eduardo was just trying to clarify Fábio doubts. Deliberation stays at high level.

**Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

I have participated already... it is nice. It talks about drugs and how to avoid getting involved with drug users, and they made several stories that we had to finish *[as an exercise]*.

*Justification of code:* The teenager brings her opinion to support a positive assessment of PROERD. Yet, one may wonder if the main topic was forgotten and the attention is now addressed to the participation or not in the aforementioned program.

**Carolina, teenager (code 4)**

I think the police could give this course to young people and the young people could pass this to the small children in the 11/12 range. I think so, I think, young people could try this because they would give a good example.

*Justification of code:* Carolina tried to return to the discussion of proposals. For this reason, code 4 is applied here.

**Larissa, teenager (code 1)**

I think they could teach us and we could teach another class while another class would teach another one. It would be nice.

*Justification of code:* Larissa just repeated Carolina's previous suggestion. They agreed on a kind of scale action ("they could teach us and we could teach another class while another class would teach another one"). The conversation finished with a suggestion made by the teenagers to reach a culture of peace between police and community residents. For that reason, it ended at a high level of discussion.

**Group 6 of Brazilian police officers and community residents**

**Participants**

**Sérgio**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, higher education

**Suzana**, Police Officer, 25 to 39 years old, high school education

**Elaine**, Police Officer, 15 to 24 years old, incomplete higher education

**Elizabeth**, teenager, 15 to 24 years old, incomplete higher education

**Talita**, teenager, 19 years old, incomplete higher education

**Alex**, teenager, 15 to 24 years old, incomplete higher education

**Igor**, teenager, 15 to 24 years old, incomplete higher education

**Gustavo**, community resident, 25 years old, higher education

**Alice**, community resident, 38 years old, incomplete higher education

**Vinícius**, community resident, 40 to 59 years old, high school education

**Moderator**

Well, now that we already know each other I'm going to ask you guys a question and I want you to answer me. How do you think is possible to build a peace culture between the police and the community?

*(Silence)*

**Vinícius, community resident (code 1)**

With obedience, right? I think that obedience is the most important thing. When one obeys, it sure is a better interactivity of the human being. Obedience usually - if God has set you before the police with their authority, you must obey.

*Justification of the code:* Although many people could disagree with Vinícius's opinion, and even though it is based on religious view, we cannot say that he is not outside the issue proposed for discussion. His speech opens the discussion for other participants to present opposed arguments and initiate a conversation regarding the establishment of a peaceful culture among the police and community residents.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

I believe that more openness ..., an openness in participation and planning in the security issue where it exists.... I put it as a participatory management, in which the society can express itself, right? An opportunity to express their desires; and what they

want from the police. An openness in the high command of the police too, of public security as a whole, because there are many secretaries, such as the secretary of public security, general delegates, colonels who don't see with good eyes the intervention of civilians in regard to... to how they plan [*their activities*]. They say they want to teach them how to do their job... but it's not like that, there are things we do know. I did not say it before, but I have a degree in Pedagogy and I believe that education is a step forward. It is crucial for us to reach a common ground. When we put not only the respect for your position; on the question of obedience, but not the blind obedience; because I think society needs to have their voice heard. When the police make a mistake, the society has the right to position itself. The police officer must have enough responsibility to know that this is not personal, it is not against Sérgio [he's referring to himself], that it is against the whole police institution, right? So I see that, yes, a plan where everyone can participate and where everyone can see the results, see the difficulties - because I'm talking from a social point, but seeing it as well from the point of view of the police, we suffer a lot of prejudice. I usually say that we are judged by the society, judged by the police command, by the public security secretary, all other people who do not know us, and still judge us. Those that are on our side are just our family and when I say family is the close family, those that are close to us: which is our child, our brother, our mother, our father. Sometimes even our cousin, our uncle who are more distant, they already have a prejudice, right?... [*Prejudice*] Of our profession. They say, "Look but, they are not like that, they are cops, you know how they are, don't you?". So, we are expected to always act correctly, it is expected from us that we always have the correct attitude. On other jobs, they make mistakes too, but they do not have a reputation as bad as the police, because we are, with all due respect to all other professions, we have to be educators, psychologists, social workers, judges, and that is very complicated. It is a very great burden of responsibility that is imposed upon the public security agents. There is even a prayer that is known. Of course, not all police officers are aware, not all of them pray... But there's an excerpt that says, "Lord, let us have the ability of discretion so that in a matter of seconds we can make a good decision regarding a life, a decision which others, judges, prosecutors, a jury trial, would have days, months, or even years to decide what we will decide in a matter of seconds". So, I see that to end this, we would have to act in a more integrated way with society.

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio takes the space left by the former participant and presents a very interesting opinion about the construction of a culture of peace. The officer tells the advantages of public participation to defend the creation of participatory institutions that would offer opportunities for citizens to engage in the public security planning along with traditional authorities. According to Sérgio, it would allow the population to better understand the work of the police and to provide the police institution more information regarding their needs. He believes that both citizens and the police would benefit from this interaction, avoiding prejudice against police officers and offering them better conditions to do what society expects from them. After these two speech acts, the conversation continues at a high level of deliberation.

### **Alex, teenager (code 1)**

I think it has more to do with the police officer's personality; it's different for each police officer, who must realize that he works for the people, that he is part of the people. Not only receiving commands, like receiving the command to leave a house... in that situation he received that command. There are policemen who will go like a mad man, destroying everything and not considering that they are part of the people, that

they work for the people. So I think it has more to do with police officer's personality, in my opinion (*Silence for a few seconds and continued to speak*)... not only to receive orders.

*Justification of the code:* The participant moves the focus to a more specific problem, the behavior of each police officer. Now it's not about the social structure anymore, the question is how each individual decides to perform their tasks. Alex is not expressing any recommendation about changes that could be applied to society's institutions in order to build a peaceful environment. The focus here is on the individual, the police officer himself. Since the speech is not specifically directed at anyone and was not a long and offensive statement against the other group, we cannot say it lowered the level of the conversation. Moreover, it is still within the topic of the study.

### **Alice, community resident (code 1)**

I believe that... I find it interesting that planning suggestion and I believe that this planning has to be done in order to intensify the dialogue between the society and the police, you know? For when I want ... Services, right?... I can talk to them as equals, understand?... And not being afraid, and not having that fear, right? I thank God I never had any problem, then I see comments that people are afraid, that people are scared, so I believe it is a matter of how we dialog, right? They have their function and I, as a member of society, I can understand this issue of respect... of knowing when to speak, right? Because sometimes we want to get involved when they are doing their job, so we get in their way and end up preventing them to do their job the right way, you know? So I think we have to... in relation to planning, we have to break this authority [*hierarchical*] thing, so I do not know if that is the correct word now, but to break this wall, you know? But of course, the importance of respect is clear for both sides.

*Justification of the code:* The participant brings the issue of dialogue back into the discussion. Although a bit confusing sometimes, Alice succeeds in presenting her opinion about how to build a better relationship between the community and the police. And, most importantly, she calls attention to the point of view of the society ("I, as a member of society, I can understand this issue of respect... of knowing when to speak, right?"), which was not the primary concern of the police officer who first brought up the question of participation. An interesting point to be noticed in this conversation is that, so far, there's no distinction between society in general and poor communities more specifically. The participants are discussing the relationship between police and society, not between police and slum residents.

### **Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

Just reinforcing what you said, the question, we... I'm representing a bit of the police voice as a whole because I have been in the institution for 9 years, right?... and that gives me a little more credit... because I've heard some comments and what creates a big anguish - We say that no one tells a doctor where he has to cut, where he has to sew. Unfortunately, on the police work, we suffer a lot because whenever something happens, we have to take an attitude. They say, "Oh, if he beats someone, it's arbitrary, if he doesn't do it, he is too soft, if he arrests someone, he used exaggerated force, if he does not arrest, that's what he should have done". So people tend to judge our service and this is very frustrating for me because, as Alex puts it, we exist to serve society. Many are corrupted as we see. I will not be hypocritical to that point and say that there aren't any corrupt cops. There is a large number of police officers who act arbitrarily,



but often they are not compelled to do that, there isn't anyone putting a gun to their head, but they are compelled by the system itself. When we get to make a presentation, we face the same kind of revolt. Is there anyone here who ever tried to make a police report at the police station? Do you see the bureaucracy that we have to deal with? The police officer faces it every day when he has to present an arrest act... you have to spend two hours...*(At this point, the audio was cut off because there was a problem with the recorder)*. So the police officer needs to act in a technical way that is more emphatic. As she said, we have a technique that is called "Progressive use of the force". So I will first do the assessment: "Good evening, sir! Put your hand on your head ", " Why? ", "Put your hand on your head". He will want to put his hand in his pocket, Am I going to let him? No. An outsider would think he was only trying to identify himself, but I'm not allowed the privilege of doubt, of thinking that he will pull his wallet off. First, I will address you, make a personal search. Moments later he can identify himself to say who he is, "Oh, I'm a lawyer". Congratulations, I will address you the same way because you are a professional like any other, and you're all in a suspected situation, because it is where we stand, which is reducing the suspicion. As she put it, then that's why we do this service. Because we have the issue of people having doubts, and in doubt, you act. You can't let that doubt stay and carry it home, we have to make sure that the guy was unarmed, that the girl wasn't carrying drugs, that he wasn't with a knife and so on, right? We have so many crimes that we can't... *(Interruption)*

*Justification of the code:* The conversation is slightly moving away from the main topic, although this speech is still related to the building of a culture of peace. Sérgio highlights the idea that the police always follow a procedure which is indifferent in regards to whom is being approached; and whether a person is a lawyer or any other worker. The flow of conversation remains the same and so the deliberative level. Nevertheless, the issue proposed for this study begins to be blurred by other subjects.

### **Suzana, Police Officer (code 2)**

I, personally, in the neighborhood I live, everybody knows me. Last Tuesday, eight days ago, I was robbed. I knew the guy, he robbed me and said he did not remember me. They pointed two guns on me and they took my motorcycle and my cellphone. He approached me and said, "Look, this is a robbery, you've lost it."! I just did this *(raises her arms)*: Here, "you can take it". He took the key, pulled out my phone and ran away. But then I got another motorcycle and went after him. "I will not lose it to him", I thought to myself. Right in front I took my colleague's police car and we went after him. We retrieved my motorcycle in front of the planetarium. This episode went on television. It happened in Medici, which is a neighborhood, Medici Mendaraé. It's a "red area", where robberies happen all the time. When we arrived at the station, he said: "I didn't know you were a cop". "But if you knew it you would have killed me, my friend. I have no doubt you would have killed me. You would think, "No, I'm not going to rob you because you are a police officer, because you're cute I'll mount the motorcycle and I'm going to leave". So, we are exposed. *(In the part: "But if you knew you would kill me (...)" the participant seems cynical)*

*Justification of the code:* Suzana comes up with a personal story that finally takes the conversation out of the issue. The point of view of the police is now completely dominant in the conversation, with no concern whatsoever about the relationship between police and society. Society is out of the scene. We keep wondering: what does her story have to do with building a peace culture? It's hard to see any evidence that it

will encourage the participants to express their opinion about what has and what should be done in this direction. Moreover, the sarcasm expressed by the police officer on the last part of her speech is another feature that contributed to lower the level of deliberation of this conversation.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

We are also victims of violence. Sometimes even in higher levels than the average citizen, as she said. If you get robbed you will only be robbed... If you are from this region I think you will probably remember... About a robbery in a pharmacy in Cidade Nova [*a neighborhood in Belém Region*] ended up with a police officer being murdered, in a situation where he showed no reaction at all. The robber made him lay down, pulled his gun and shot him. Why? Because he was a cop, because he knew he was a cop. Therefore, we are also a victim of such violence. (*Interruption*)

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio adds another story to the narrative told by the former participant. Still nothing that could bring the conversation back to the topic. What the representatives of the police are doing is only insisting on the idea that they are the ones who suffer the most with the culture of violence we supposedly have in our society. The police is the weaker side, as they say.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

I just want to say, just a minute... the guy is arrested, I spent five hours to make... me, a police officer, in the area where I used to work, in the sectional... I spent five hours to fill in the forms... and, from inside the prison, he sent me a message, saying that he was going to kill me. And I said it back to him: "Let's see who will die first". I will not move out from the neighborhood I live. I'm not the one who has to move. Not me, a citizen. He is the punk who has to migrate to another place, you know? I have my mother, I have my brother, I have my daughter, and am I moving because I'm afraid of a bum? I would have to disturb my whole family. Because if I sold my house, I would have to sell my mother's and my brother's house, because I'd have to take them with me. It doesn't make sense I getting out and leaving them. Because he will not bother me, but he would bother my mother, who is an elderly, or my brother who is a young person and has a lifetime ahead him. If he wanted to do something, do it with me. I know how to defend myself. And if he does something to me and I'm not able to defend myself, at least he would be attacking the right person, the one who messed with him and not with a third party. Then, we face the same risk you citizens face... we are also citizens. While we protect your lives, who protects ours? Society requires a lot from us. Yes! I usually say, "There are a lot of chiefs to only one tribe". Everyone bosses around, everyone says what you have to do, what you should do, what you did wrong, what you did right. But we think what should we do at the time, we don't have much time to think about it. If you stop to think long enough you will die, and if you die - you would even need to die, but a hostage could be killed, a person who has nothing to do with the story could die. So, we have to be very fast, think very fast... we make mistakes, yes, who does not make mistakes? Everyone makes mistakes. If a citizen makes a mistake he pays his bail, but if the officer makes mistakes, in the other day he is in (*Silence*)... The other day he is in Anastácio, then it is a thousand times you... (*Interruption, angry tone*)

*Justification of the code:* Suzana insists on her point, stressing the risk policemen face on their day-to-day lives. Following the same strategy of the last speech, she brings up a personal story as proof of her argument. In this sense, she makes even more evident the

distinction between society and police, being the former always a source of potential harm to the later. At this moment we don't see any way out of the path the conversation took after Suzana's first statement.

**Moderator**

Anastácio?

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

Anastácio.

*Justification of the code:* Suzana is just answering the moderator's question regarding a name mentioned on her last speech. Conversation remains on the same level.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

Colonel Anastacio das Neves is the recovery center, it is our prison for public employees.

*Justification of the code:* Conversation remains in the same topic, but now even deeper in the specific question of what happens with the police if they are reported for acting outside the law. In this case, the moderator's intervention was meant to clarify something said by the participant, but it ended up contributing for the conversation to be stuck in the same low level of deliberation.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

So if we... (*Interruption*)

*Justification of the code:* Suzana was about to start a new speech, but she was interrupted by other participant. Not only the conversation is out of topic, now its structure starts to get more and more confusing. People started talking at the same time and interrupting one another.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

It is a common jail, it has nothing fancy.

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio is still explaining the moderator about the prison where police officers go when they are reported for not acting according to the rules. We can clearly see that the moderator's intervention, along with Suzana's insistence in telling personal stories that have little to do with the culture of peace and Sérgio argument that police officers are in a very bad position within society, are driving the conversation deeper and deeper to a non-deliberative situation.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

No, it's a prison, it is just not worse because it is not with the bad guys that we have to deal with all the time in the streets, it's an institution reserved for police officers.

*Justification of the code:* At this point, there is no interaction with the other participants at all. Only Sérgio and Suzana are talking and they are managing to control the conversation and leave it the way that most benefits their point of view. Members of the other groups, teenagers and community residents, did not have the chance to express

their opinion, not even to complain about the way the police approaches them. The cops are defending themselves before being attacked.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

No, just for public employees.

*Justification of the code:* Still no space for other participants. It remains a chat between Sérgio and Suzana, totally oriented to the police unfair situation within society.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

Public employees, that's it. So it's the same risk, guys, it is the same risk.

*Justification of the code:* No other information is provided. Suzana is only expressing agreement with her colleague and again insisting on the risk police officers face.

**Moderator**

Now I would like to come back to our question: It is possible to build a culture of peace between the police and the community?

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

I think exchanging information.

*Justification of the code:* The moderator had to intervene on the chat between Suzana and Sérgio in order to try to get the conversation back and to include other participants. In this speech act, Suzana answers the moderator's question. Once again she is trying to assume a protagonist role, but in a brief and raw statement, not offering space for the other members of the group to engage in the conversation.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 3)**

I think we have to make a very interesting analysis here. We went out of the dictatorship in 1988, right? Cool, you are saying here.. I am a member from the civil society, I'm a member of the Youth Ministry, the PJ [*Portuguese acronym for Pastoral da Juventude*], a youth organization. We are constantly disturbed on the streets by the captains, the colonels, by you, because you reproduce the dictatorship, and here in Pará we still have captains, lieutenants, following the same behavior.

*Justification of the code:* Motivated by the previous interaction between Suzana and Sérgio, Gustavo brings attention to the fact that the police's behavior nowadays preserves a strong association with their behavior during the civil-military dictatorship that ruled the country for more than twenty years. In directly accusing those representatives of the police of assaulting him and other members of his civil society organization, Gustavo expresses anger against police officers. So the conversation remains at the same level of (no) deliberation.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

They still think this way.

*Justification of the code:* The deliberative level is still low. Gustavo got into the conversation, but his speech act did nothing to reinsert the topic of peace into the discussion.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 3)**

It's very hard. They probably would never sit at this table.

*Justification of the code:* Gustavo managed to get into the discussion that was originally restricted to Suzana and Sérgio. He presented the point of view of society. Nevertheless, he was not able to change the conversation tendency to short and poorly deliberative interventions.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 4)**

The reflection today is even stronger. At that time they were lieutenants and captains, today they are colonels and the high command. So they bring these ideas from the top down, right? And as Alex puts it, in most of the time we have to follow [*their rules*] because there is our statute providing the pillars, governing us. The police has a strong discipline, which means the hierarchy determines that the orders come from the top down. And discipline, but this discipline cannot be blindly followed, you have to preserve your "I believe... I think that it will work". I need to have this conviction. Of course I can be punished for that, right? And here comes our great dilemma: Staying or leaving the institution? Is it something that I believe in? Is it something that I believe it can be changed? And then, answering your question, I believe that I said... it wasn't recording that time, right? But I believe that a more participatory management, democratic management, where everyone can participate, not only from what is expected, but in the whole process, the difficulties and results, and where everyone can be responsible it, right? Both with the burden and the benefit to society, or with the decrease or increase in crime rates.

*Justification of the code:* At this point Sérgio finally broadens the scope of the conversation to include some structural variables and their effects over the police behavior in its relationship with society. Agreeing with Gustavo about the existence of police officers who still act as if we were in a dictatorship, in which citizens have no right to protest and freedom of expression, he relates it to the high hierarchy of the police. Moreover, Sérgio mentions once again the question of participation as the way to transform the relationship between police and society. According to him, the burden has to be shared in order for the benefits to be brought.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 1)**

If we analyze the context, for example, in Belém... Belém, Ananindeua, Marabá [cities in the state of Pará]... Belém is the capital where more young people are killed in the country, right? In other words, the violence only increases, and we increased the number of police officers. There was more hiring in 2010, 2012... and what worries me sometimes: Is this work having any effect? Or do we have to think like a public safety organization? Are these guys actually being prepared to go to the streets? Sometimes I think so. I often talk about civil society, I understand all the issues, I believe that is one of the most stressful jobs there is. We know it, it's silly to say it is, but it is one of the most stressful. Bad salaries, bad bosses, that is clear. But what worries me is "Are these guys really being prepared to work in the neighborhoods?" "Does this insertion gets them closer to the issues of proximity?" Because, for example, I trust you, I'll talk to you. But I'm afraid of the police, I fear their approach. I was already approached once and it was ok. I was there, coming back from playing soccer with my shorts, but I

confess, I am afraid of the police just because it was so ... You know? Those things are so...

*Justification of the code:* To start, Gustavo refers to the young people murder rate in Belém to affirm that there is a complex problem of violence in society. According to his argument, this rate is still high despite the increase in the number of police officers on the streets. So the problem of violence, for him, is not related with the amount of officers acting to avoid crimes. The path to the construction of a peaceful society has to be searched elsewhere. In the end he recurs to a personal story to illustrate this argument, sustaining that the dialogue suggested by the former participant is important, but that it will not happen with the kind of people commanding the police. Gustavo also opens the way for other participants to contribute in the discussion.

### **Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

Stigmatized

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio helps Gustavo to remember a word he was missing to express his opinion. There is no interruption in the flow of the conversation.

### **Gustavo, community resident (code 1)**

Stigmatized, that's the word! And it keeps reproducing in our minds, we feel afraid. Of course there are good cops, such as in any profession, as in politics, in medicine, in sociology, in philosophy... but we get so worried about these things. You talked about the direct participation issue. I think it's one of the ways, to have a civil society as a whole because I realize that the pacification units, in theory, - I don't know there still are, correct me if I'm wrong, - it started in Rio de Janeiro as an initiative... Which I thought it would be a good thing because the police would be closer... like... because if something happens here in UNAMA [*the University where the study is being hosted*], I know which police officer I have to call, which one is in charge [*of the area*]. I don't know if it still works that way, if I'm wrong you can tell me later, - it could be a good initiative because to have a police officer as a reference, one who is closer to the society, we could avoid some things, for instance: I've had the opportunity to walk with some police officers and they were like "No, no, no, we really have to approach that way"... but they never talked to us, do you understand? Like you, guys, are doing right now with us and that's good not only for you but for us as well, for us to break this barrier. For example: I'm breaking some barriers because, for example, you said it "I was robbed"... and I thought, "Damn, a police officer was robbed in her own home in her territory". And I think what you said was right: "I'm not going to move". Who has to move is him because he is the wrong one, you are not wrong. You pay your taxes, lives with your family. Right?! (*Surprise and outrage at the situation that the police shared before; interruption*)

*Justification of the code:* Conversation keeps flowing at a high level of deliberation since Gustavo complements his speech; he is still trying to elaborate ideas about the manner to build a peaceful environment. He clearly expresses recognition for the police officers' situation, mentioning one of Suzana's personal stories. At this point, the discussion is open; and it welcomes new contributions. Yet only three persons are actively talking – Suzana, Sérgio and Gustavo.

### **Suzana, Police Officer (code 2)**

One thing is certain: If the police is close, it bothers, and if the police is away, you miss it. (*Silence*) Look, I've been in the police for 18 years, I love my job, and if I have to act to defend a life I won't think twice, I'll defend that life because I like what I do. I'm a teacher as well but between being a teacher and being a police officer... Was it stupid? It was (*laughs*)... but it's what I like. My daughter is 15 years old, she has to deal with it every day. When she was younger, she would say, "Gee mom, I wish you weren't a cop"! Because when we leave our houses to work we don't know if we're going to get back alive, unfortunately. I used to say, "Bless, mom". I see my mom every day in the morning, in the afternoon, at night, every day. I have to see her, no matter what, every day. When I leave for work I say "Bless, mom"...and she says, "God bless you, my daughter". Then I say, joking, "I don't know if I'll be back". And she answers, "Girl, stop it, you will kill me that way". Then, a few years later, my mother lost a son to a bum. So guys, I hate punks. Because of that, I lost a brother, my older brother. That was painful, it is a scar that it will stay for the rest of my mother's life; you know what is like to see your desperate mother, being unable to comfort her? That's what happened to my own mother. When they killed my brother, she said: "My daughter", kneeling at my feet, "Quit your job, I want you to be laundress, street sweepers, but I do not want to lose a child again, I can't handle it anymore, got it?" "But mom, I'll be frustrated if I quit, because I like to be a cop, I like to be a cop". And if one day you guys need me, if you need my services and if in the occasion I have a police car available, I will meet you, I'll put you in the car. I will not do as many police officers do. They say, "Ok, I'll do a patrol to see if we locate". Bullshit! He will only pretend to be listening to you and he will go somewhere else. Unfortunately this happens. Few police officers will say, "No, I'll go after it", and will actually do it. However, sometimes it's not like that. They will rarely put you in the vehicle, but some of them will. As it can happen to you, it can happen to someone in my family, so I think a lot. Let's take her for example, here, (*Pointing to a group member*)... "My daughter, my daughter was robbed"! She asks for the support of one of the police cars, then my colleague say they will help her, but they will not, this girl back there may need me and will I make the same thing he did? No, I will provide her support indeed, I'll do my job because I like to be a cop because you have to do something you like; you have to love your profession, above all. (*silence*)

*Justification of the code:* Suzana insists in bringing her own story; and she reiterates her point of view regarding the police officer's role. This intervention seems to spoil the conversation with an issue out of topic. We can see that she wishes to demonstrate that she is a very dedicated professional, but she does not focus on the issue of how to build a peace culture.

### **Moderator**

What is the police-community relationship like in the places you live?

### **Vinícius, community resident (code 3)**

They make a visit, you know, when someone dies. When a robbery happens, they visit us and then go away again, and only come back when something else happens.

*Justification of the code:* Vinícius is answering to the question raised by the moderator. Despite of the moderator's intervention, we can notice an association between the participant's speech and the former discourse, when Suzana stresses how she would act if someone in the room asked for her help. The conversation is still lost from what should be its main concern.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 3)**

As I told you, right? If he had a living (*unintelligible on the recording*)... There on Satélite, in the neighborhood of Coqueiro, Belém/Ananindeua, if he had someone as a reference, like you said, if I knew... I mean I know someone who lives close to my house... But if it was, strategically speaking... I do not know who I would look for if something happened, I would go directly to the police station, but that day when someone is particularly close... I don't know... it's one of the things that we should know. We need a reference, I don't know if it would be a strategy for the police,... or public safety strategy to have a benchmark for each or for each two or three neighborhoods... something like that.

*Justification of the code:* We can still see the reflections of Suzana's statements in Gustavo's speech. The discussion is around the best tactic for the police to respond to the population's calls. And it remains carried out by few participants.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

But there is!

*Justification of the code:* Suzana continues to provide the police's point of view. She seems decided to confront the participants' perception that the service is considered ineffective.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 3)**

I don't know any.

*Justification of the code:* Gustavo and Suzana are now in a dialogue. Yet, the discussion seem polarized at this moment. No agreement seems plausible, since both speakers seem unable to provide evidences for their arguments.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

In your neighborhood, you can search for the number of the cop that is in charge of your neighborhood each day.

*Justification of the code:* No changes in the type of discussion so far. Suzana and Gustavo are still exchanging views, but at a low level of deliberation.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 3)**

I'm not aware, that's why I'm asking. Is it? Just to clarify.

*Justification of the code:* No one is encouraged to interfere and Gustavo is asking for more clarification in a subject that is not really related to the whole discussion. It is interesting to note that Suzana's speech act is still driving the conversation far from the issue of a peaceful culture.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

Because it is easier for you to call the cop in charge on a specific day than 190 [*If you call 190*] You will get "Tananananana, tanananan" (*Laughter*) there "beep... beep ...beep ... beep.. beep..." (*ring tone noise when no one answers a call*) (*Irony*)



*Justification of the code:* Suzana does not really answer Gustavo's question. She is insisting that people should call the officer in charge of their neighborhood but do not provide any information regarding how they can get access to the officer's phone number. Her sarcasm does nothing to help the discussion.

**Talita, teenager (code 3)**

Day cop?

*Justification of the code:* In her first participation, Talita asks for more information about what Suzana was saying. Conversation remains at the same level, with no way out of the issue raised by Suzana when she lowered its deliberative degree.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

The "cop of the day".

*Justification of the code:* Suzana reaffirms her statement without offering any new information that would justify her argument. Nobody knows so far how to reach the cop in charge of their area. It is still obscure to the other participants what she meant when she said they should call a specific officer.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

Let me tell you, guys, my opinion. Here is the deal: there is a huge flaw in the police institution regarding the propagation of their services. There is indeed a number where you can reach the "day cop", that officer is the one who is from that area. It had several names before: "interactive officer", "service officer"... but there's always the officer who is a Lieutenant, Captain, or now the assistant that is figurative, the assistant that diversifies, he shortens the action field. In the battalions area, the metropolitan area, it is managed by the police command of the capital, the CPC. Below CPC comes the battalions. The CPC is composed by the 1st Battalion, the 2nd Battalion, and the 21st Battalion. You guys who are responsible for the area...can you help me here? The 20th, the 10<sup>th</sup>.... so there are several battalions, each battalion has its commander. In the area of each battalion there is an officer that is up 24 hours a day... either in 24 or 12 hours turns. There is a "functional number" that reaches directly this phone, which cannot discharge at any time... So as I said... it comes back to the point I mentioned: the police fails on the issue of communication with society when they do not disclose these services, do not disclose that they are available. Yes, there's a number. No, the only alternative is not the 190. 190 is a tool, yes, but as I said today, they go through many prank calls and sometimes people call 190 to prevent the police from dismantling criminal organizations. Some minds that act for the crime and say, if I want to commit a robbery in the area of Entroncamento, I will call to say that there's a robbery with hostage in Augusto Montenegro, then the car will go there and I'll be free to act in the area of Entroncamento.

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio offers a better explanation for the issue at stake, providing also an idea why the population is not informed about the services offered by the police. According to him, the police is not successful in offering citizens the information they need to help the police being more effective. That is actually the main theme at this point: how to make the police effective in avoiding crimes. Thus still not related to the creation of a culture of peace.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

To deviate the focus.

*Justification of the code:* Suzana gets in the conversation once again to give her contribution to Sérgio's argument. By completing his information, she is agreeing with him and with the focus of the conversation. It remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 4)**

It exists and they have to have the necessary devices to be able to say “What now? Will you discover the area?” That has to be taken forward by someone who is above. Why the police communication does not act to inform the people? Because it exists and anyone can stop any police car anywhere. You, just as an example, where do you live?

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio moves forward in the issue, but the transformative moment, in this case, is the moment when he addresses a participant who was not feeling included in the conversation encouraging them to join the talk.

**Vinícius, community resident (code 1)**

Marituba.

*Justification of the code:* The participant accepts Sérgio's invitation and answers to his question.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

Marituba... when you see a police car around your neighborhood, that's the reference vehicle. It can pass just once in the day, but it is the reference vehicle in your area, you can stop it and say, “I would like to know which is the day cop number?”. The officer in charge, the supervisor officer... the officer's number... “But what for?”, they will ask you. “Because someday I might have an occurrence here, and if I need to, I can call it”. But this service should be done by them only. “Look, we're here on the reference points, the Pastoral [*a church entity*], associations, trade unions, community centers”, where the reference population concentration are, like churches, and it comes from the police to the community, since the community is not coming to us. We have to find a way to decrease that, but that is not interesting to the high command... they think the company will make an intervention beyond what is your duty and I think it is very healthy, from my point of view... is very healthy because... look, if I hadn't said it here, who would know? And any of you can tell others, you can go to any police car and ask, “What's the day cop phone number?” And with that number you can make a direct connection with the officer in charge and he will answer you. (*Interruption*)

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio is patiently explaining to the participants how to use the service they were talking about, the “day cop” in charge of specific areas. What is important to notice is that, although the main issue is still the police effectiveness, he is now approaching it from the population's point of view, trying to help them in their relation with the police. The conversation is now more balanced, closer to a grammar that is understandable for the community dweller, on in which they can interact.

**Talita, teenager (code 1)**

I'm terrified to approach them (*interrupted*)

*Justification of the code:* Talita expresses her feeling regarding her relationship with the police. Such statements can be very helpful to clarify the population's perspective regarding the police work, how they view the police. The conversation, in this sense, seems to be slowly stabilizing at a high level of deliberation, broadening its scope by offering opportunities for more participants to engage the discussion.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

But this issue, of being afraid... because you know how... (*interrupted*)

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio tries to initiate a conversation with the teenager in order to figure out what bothers her regarding the police. He seems to be willing to understand what Talita is trying to express when she said she is afraid.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 2)**

Why are you afraid of the police? For you and for you! [*pointing to two members of the group*]

*Justification of the code:* Suzana interrupts Sérgio's statement to put her view once again in the forefront. Her intervention seems angry and possibly intimidating for the teenager who, after a long period of silence, was trying to express her feeling towards the police. Suzana seems to show no respect for opinions that diverge from her view about the work of the police. Moreover, she points to two other members of the group, in such a way that put them even farther away from expressing their opinions. Once again she lowers the conversation level.

**Talita, teenager (code 4)**

Look, I did not realize I had this fear. Now asking me, "Why don't you approach?" In fact, why don't I?... Because it is something already deeply rooted in society. It's subconsciously... (*Interruption*)

*Justification of the code:* Until being interrupted again, Talita seems to be trying to understand her own state of mind. Being addressed in an intimidating way by Suzana, she can only understand the feeling she holds towards the police by something unconscious, something with collective roots, as a collective perception that is beyond her understanding as an individual. Nevertheless, she is struggling to bring her point of view back to the table.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

It creates a barrier, right?

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio engages in Talita's argument expressing comprehension in relation to her feelings. Implicitly in his statement is the idea that society lacks information about the police. That is potentially why Talita fears to approach a police officer, even to ask for help.

**Talita, teenager (code 1)**

It is such a barrier!

*Justification of the code:* The teenager is now really engaged in the conversation with Sérgio. They seem to have found a common understanding with regards to the

relationship between police and society. Due to a failure in communication, both groups ignore each other's' views.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 1)**

But you have to lose this fear...

*Justification of the code:* Suzana is just giving her opinion regarding the teenager's affliction. There is no change in the conversation flow.

**Talita, teenager (code 1)**

Yes, that's why it's been good to know your reality, this exchange of... (*Interruption*)

*Justification of the code:* Before being interrupted, Talita was trying to show respect for the police officer's arguments. She shows to understand their situation.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 2)**

Do you know why you have to lose this fear? Because you do not owe anything to the police, you are a citizen, you can stop any police vehicle, and say, "Guys, good night, I'd like you to provide me the "day cop" number... because in my street there are many robberies". There's a conversation that you are having with the police, you are participating, so it is very important that communication between citizens and police, and vice versa because that will work, I can't know if there are robberies in your street if you don't tell me. (*Excitement tone in speech*)

*Justification of the code:* Suzana once again interrupts one of the participants to provide her opinion on the matter. The conversation was flowing in a good manner and the participants were acknowledging each other's' arguments. The police officer, once again, interrupted the conversation to give an example of how interaction between these groups could occur.

**Talita, teenager (code 2)**

Yes.

*Justification of the code:* Talita seems discouraged to keep talking. After being interrupted in her speech, she expresses agreement with Suzana's opinion. She is no longer in the same status as the police officer.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

I don't know if you have been robbed because... did you make a police report? How often are people assaulted and don't make the police report? So it'll often appear a police vehicle. Because for us that area is quiet, unlike a neighborhood that you live in and... say Marituba... it has a very large police reports index, then it is considered a red area, so there will be more police vehicles available there. But if the person doesn't make it [*a report*], "Oh, I will not do, I will not recover anything anyway....". (*Indifference*)

*Justification of the code:* In this statement, Suzana argues that the fact of not reporting occurrences (because people think the only reason for doing a report is to recover what has been robbed) prevents them from doing their job. This argument seems not to be searching for solutions for the creation of a culture of peace.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

So it does not appear.

*Justification of the code:* The conversation remains at a low level of conversation.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

You will not recover, but you will protect yourself, protect your family.

*Justification of the code:* Suzana is still arguing in a very strong manner, and that does not help to encourage people to engage in the conversation. Only Sérgio and Suzana are talking at this point.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

Protect your community.

*Justification of the code:* The flow of the conversation remains the same, with no concern whatsoever with the topic of the study.

**Elaine, Police Officer (code 3)**

It is precisely with the police report, with that information that we can work to build the statistics.

*Justification of the code:* Elaine expresses herself for the first time in this group. It should be noticed that only the representatives of the police are feeling encouraged to participate in the conversation at this point. This seem to produce an atmosphere in the discussion group that intimidates community residents to express their opinions.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

Look, she and I, we work recording all these police reports, it's huge, it's a cabinet full of papers and I think 4 people is not enough to do the job.

*Justification of the code:* Suzana is still restricted to the police point of view. No one else is invited to join the discussion. Suzana is once again in control, and this seems not favoring deliberation.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

It is a paper this size, really tiny, but there are two closets full of them.

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio only reaffirms what is being argued by the other two police officers. Not any change.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

This size, and there are places for which we almost don't have reports. Then we think: "Oh, but this place is calm...".

*Justification of the code:* Suzana insists in the same argument raised before. If it wasn't for the population who do not provide information, the police would be efficient. For her, it is not about the relationship between the two groups, but about the people's behavior.

**Talita, teenager (code 3)**

For example, I've never done a police report, but I've been robbed.

*Justification of the code:* Talita is the only teenager who is brave enough to say something. She expresses agreement with the point of view of the police. Conversation remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

How many times have you been robbed?

*Justification of the code:* Nothing has changed yet in the conversation; and we are away from the topic raised by the moderator in the beginning.

**Talita, teenager (code 3)**

This... The people I know who have been robbed do not have the habit to do so either...  
(*Interruption*)

*Justification of the code:* The teenager is trying to add more information to the discussion. But once again she was interrupted by Suzana. Conversation remains away from the topic and at a low level.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

There you go! If you don't do it [*the police report*], me and the others colleagues will think, "Let's leave the police vehicle where it's more dangerous".

*Justification of the code:* Suzana is still in control. She uses the teenager's opinion to reinforce her point of view.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 4)**

And another... even... to ensure safety... so that we can demand from our representatives, demand from the deputies we elect, demand from our leaders, demand from the mayor so he can show it to the governor. Because nowadays the UN demands a certain amount cops... it's one police officer, if I'm not wrong, for every 250 or 350 inhabitants. Today, the police in the state of Pará... it has something around 1 police officer for every 1.500, if I'm not wrong. So it's an unimaginable lack of cops. We get in some places, - locations where those who have the habit of visiting the countryside... those who have not can start paying attention...- there are some locations that you say, "Gee, I don't see any police here!". But certainly there is. There are places where you sometimes have... sometimes one police officer or a group of police officers, sometimes 4 police officers to cover 3 or 4 villages, so there is a demand, it's dangerous there... imminent danger, because anyone can die there, someone can suffer violence... so it must have... and we must adapt it, and how we can adapt it? With the participation of society to inform the government that there is a need. If you get beaten up, and you are my daughter... your brother hits you... if you don't tell me, for me you are doing very well. So that's how the police acts. All the public safety organization acts from what it is motivated. Don't think that the police is nice... "Oh, I'll be good because there are rich kids in Nazaré [*a neighborhood*], ok then". But look, Barreiro [*a neighborhood*]... there are so many poor people there, poor men... let's put more cars there: "No! If they are not motivated, the government does not act" (*Irony*)

*Justification of the code:* Although the main issue here is still the police reports, Sérgio recovers the topic of the culture of peace. The conversation is now inviting the representatives of the society to contribute with their point of view. Moreover, he speaks again about the importance of the direct participation of the society in the decisions about public policies in the security area.

**Talita, teenager (code 1)**

It is interesting what you said, because it is a clear example of group work, the community works with the police and... like... reflecting... also, about the first question that you asked, how we work with the culture of peace between police and society... actually I think everyone has to participate, the whole society, civil groups, schools, universities....

*Justification of the code:* From this speech we can notice more clearly how the last statement was a transformative moment. In Talita's statement the issue of the culture of peace and the search for solutions is brought back into the conversation. The teenager feels once again invited to participate in the discussion. We are now at a high level of deliberation.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

Churches...

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio is only adding another example of institution to Talita's statement. Doing this, he expresses respect for the teenager's opinion. The flow of the conversation does not change, remaining at a high level.

**Talita, teenager (code 1)**

The church and the organizations need to participate in building a culture of peace. Look, there is a problem of violence. What's happening there? "Oh, that family was suffering, they don't have access to... let's say... social services and so they thought it was best to commit crimes than to work". So, I'm in Psychology school, and we really make a family analysis, right? An analysis about the fact that a dysfunctional family can generate... there's the possibility... a dysfunctional child, a son who will search through other means to fill some emotional needs, that can call the parent's attention by breaking the law, using drugs... So, this work has to be everywhere, we cannot say, "Oh, why is the police formed for this? Is this really the best for it?". No! It has to be everywhere, we need to have a common goal, for example, we all want less violence in Belém... so let's go! Let's have a discussion, the churches with the mayor, the mayor with the police, all together, to understand what we can do to reduce the violence in the city of Belém. So it will be more integrated work, more efficient. Reducing the violence in the sense of your work too. It will ease a little if you have a lower violence rate... and in the society people will feel safer, and that's it.

*Justification of the code:* Talita advances in the argument of a coordinated action, some teamwork in which the police and the society would be part of the same project to decrease violence in the city. The teenager offers a very interesting point of view, recognizing that the creation of a culture of peace would be helpful for the police officers themselves, because their work would be less dangerous. She brings different elements from the contributions of the other participants and articulates an sophisticated argument trying to find a solution for the issue of violence.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 2)**

Just to add something, reinforcing what she said, regarding violence: the violence that is practiced by the citizen himself... the citizen who acts according to his rights... just the vulnerability... I'm being neutral, trying to be as neutral as possible... but what about the violence committed by the police apparatus? In this case the guy hits the foot in the door because he is a victim of prejudice... Psychology describes this very well ... it's a two-way street... I'm not being violent, but the question is why won't I be violent or why will I agree to suffer violence? So I am also a victim and my way to deal with this was to use power... I will look for black people, poor people, women, elders... and I will use them as objects for my revenge. I'll get home and I will hit my wife, I'll hit my son and I'll have to go out or something. I'll have to drink and when I start drinking I'll have no control... then I will remember another time that we didn't leave the society, we didn't come from Santa Catarina, we didn't come from England, our police is not from England, it's the police of Pará. Here we are, talking about the police of Pará, where we came from.

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio wanted to add something, to reinforce the opinions exposed by Talita on her former statement. He starts by trying to offer a reasonable view about the relationship between the police and the society. In the end he is only providing a limited point of view. Moreover, his speech demonstrates confusion; it is not clear what he is fighting for. The deliberative level goes down at this point.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 4)**

As I told you, I think, at least from my point of view, that there is no bad student; there are bad teachers. Of course I, particularly... I don't know how is the training for the police service, I have a basic understanding of it, of course... but I realized that there are teachers who are forming bad cops and that these bad cops repeat it again and again. Then you asked why are people afraid. Because we see a lot of bad cops... of course, just like in any job... there are also teachers who are useless. I graduated in Souza Franco... from the beginning of the year until the end of the year I had no physics class, but I got a 10 in all classes, without actually having a single class. And what happens, what worries me sometimes... I like the speech... "Oh, let's work together"... that's the thing... being close to each other... sometimes... maybe not just me, but the colleague who also mentioned it, the issue of fearing the police... if we end this view that you guys are bad, violent... It was very cool that you spoke about your daughter, sometimes I look at a police officer as if they were something far from our reality, you know? It was great that you spoke of your daughter, your mother, of your reality. (*Indignant voice*)

*Justification of the code:* Gustavo brings the idea of working together back into the table. He mentions the arguments raised by the other participants, which gives them recognition. The personal story he tells is not directly related to the main issue, but it works in the same way, of acknowledging that there are good and bad cops, as in any other job. If the next participants accept the challenge, the conversation can keep flowing at a high level, seeking policies that may help to build a peaceful environment.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

It's easy to share, right? The experiences we have... we are also human beings.



*Justification of the code:* The idea of sharing and working together is probably one of the most important arguments in this group. Sérgio agrees with the former participant and reaffirms the opinion he had raised in several opportunities before.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 1)**

And it is good for us to sit down, to have this dialogue, to talk to society. I think what we lack, perhaps... in my opinion ... I will speak for the young people... that I missed, maybe... I broke some barriers in my mind.

*Justification of the code:* In a quite disordered way, Gustavo reinforces the argument of dialogue. It seems to be a consensus among the participants that talking is a fundamental mechanism for building a peaceful culture in divided and violent societies. Everyone can contribute to elaborate public policies and plans that will be helpful in the creation of a good relationship between the police and the rest of society.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 2)**

Let me tell you, the teacher is important indeed, but it has much more to do with someone's personality. If you have a formed character you will follow what you are. Do you get it?

*Justification of the code:* Suzana disagrees with the other participants. The question is only related to people's character. She suggests that social change is related to individuals' personality. We must change the people, otherwise nothing will change.

**Gustavo, community resident (code 3)**

I understand what you are talking about.

*Justification of the code:* Suzana is frequently acting as a spoiler. When she speaks, the conversation flow is interrupted. Gustavo was establishing a consensual idea about the requirement of dialogue and participation. But Suzana presented a strong opinion and apparently other participants become intimidated by her intervention. It seems hard to express disagreement when she speaks.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

It depends on the teachers, for sure... but character... everybody has their own. (*Silence*)

*Justification of the code:* Again, the conversation flow is interrupted at this point. It is not by chance that we have a mute moment here: her interventions are often off-topic and too strong to invite other participants to engage in the conversation.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

And so, just to finish my speech... (*Interrupted*)

*Justification of the code:* The participant is interrupted by the moderator here. Sérgio was about to complete the idea he tried to defend before and was not able to. The conversation remains at a low level.

**Moderator**

Just for let you guys know. I have to warn you that we will finish the first part of our discussion in 10 minutes. Just an advice so you guys can make your conclusions about this debate, about how we can build a culture of peace between police and community.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

Ok, so, from the identification of these points I told you before, the issue of violence by the police apparatus and the fact that we can also be a victim... so we can charge our governments, our commanders, so they can realize that we also need to be equipped to offer qualified work. Because I cannot offer you what I do not have, you cannot demand from me to be a police officer who is prepared... Because you will require... especially when I... right?... You want someone who is trained, who is on the bench of the university... You want the most prepared people, and you begin to feel more prepared, you are more prepared if you are being prepared for it. So, when you get robbed you don't want me to kill the guy. Actually, you want me to arrest him and take him to respond any sentence that is adequate for his crime. You'll want me to shoot him to immobilize, for me to arrest him. But how can I shoot him? I shot, in nine years in the police, was nine years ago? I carry a gun here and you'll want me to... if I need to act... I have to act correctly, using all the techniques that I was taught nine years ago. I had no training since then, right? If I want to train, if I want, I'll have to mobilize them in a tactical way... I'll have to pay. I paid the course, I paid a one-week course that cost 600 reais... a single course! I say that I don't do that anymore, because who must offer me this course is the institution. But there is one question that she mentioned... I, as a good professional, I try to be a good professional. I also like what I do, but today I have my reservations. If today I'm no more... when I'm philosophizing at home, I say, "I think I'm too much for this institution"... because sometimes I've to blindly obey; sometimes the guy will say, "No, boss, it's not like that... if we do it that way...". "No, do it the way I'm saying". "No, boss, but what if we do..."...he would say, "Do it the way I'm ordering". "But commander ... If we do ..." "Do it the way I'm saying!". Then you'll say: "Okay boss" [*In the final part of speech he mimics his superior with a tall, gruff voice, to demonstrate authority. His answer is a little more quietly, showing submission*]

*Justification of the code:* Sérgio shows the other participants the lack of incentives and the problems faced by the police officers when they want to get better training for their job. Moreover, he focus on the hierarchical structure of the institution, which avoids the cops of the lower level to help the commanders in improving their service to society. The personal story he mobilizes illustrate problems he had himself when he tried to get more training in order to provide better services. Although this speech is directed towards the main issue of the relationship between police and society, it is still somewhat out of topic.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

It's not often that he accepts your opinion.

*Justification o the code:* Suzana does not interrupt the flow of conversation. She is only expressing agreement with what the former participant said before.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 3)**

He does not accept. Then you say... "But, look, what I learned in the academy"... "Forget what you learned in college, I'm telling you to do it that way". Then we suffer a

lot when we work in the administrative branch. But today... I worked in a motorcycle... I've worked in the police car... I've already done extensive policing. Everyone who worked on the street... we see that the management committee changes, the head, the guy comes, sits on the chair and say, "Here's what I want you to do now, the dynamics will be as such". Then we say, "But commander, it was that way"... "Forget the other commander, I'm the commander now, it's no longer [name omitted], now the commander is [name omitted]". So it's his way, it will not be like [name omitted] used to do, although you know that the other was more practical, more dynamic, more fair. It has to be like that... (*Sharply in imitation*) (*Silence*)

*Justification of the code:* The conversation follows the same path. The police officer Sérgio explains difficulties related to the hierarchy in the police institution; and we cannot see a clear effort to debate mechanisms for creating a peaceful culture. Moreover, the cops, especially Suzana and Sérgio, are dominating the discussion, so the police point of view is much more evident than the others.

**Suzana, Police Officer (code 3)**

The dynamic does not last even a year, and it changes again. (*Laughter; silence*)

*Justification of the code:* Suzana showed sarcasm in her statements; and this can work as a form of discouraging other contributions.

**Moderator:** So, how can we build a culture of peace between police and community? (*Silence*)

**Talita, teenager (code 4)**

When she talked about the issue of getting the institutions together... family, right? Civil society, all these institutions... I remembered the speech of the boy when he said that the police contingent increases... The job interviews... that is, the person who is hired... that person is prepared because she was accepted... and there is still increasing violence... I think the thing is... this project to talk to the institutions... right? The officers are there, the contingent is increasing... okay... but the violence itself is still increasing, right?... And I was watching the TV news, and the number of women in crime is also increasing... I don't know if I'm right or not... to my knowledge, it is increasing, right? So... that's something that is happening, something that should be analyzed, right? To know which is, as we should improve this situation, why wait, the tendency is to become worse, and I believe that it has to be seen as a whole. Both society with their side as a whole, that is our problem too. He is also part of society, right? Nothing better than a dialogue among all?

*Justification of the code:* The teenager seems quite confused in this speech, but she definitely brings the issue of the culture of peace back. As we mentioned before, the main question here is working together, the police, the civil society and the government to improve the capacity society has to deal with violence. Talita shows a great deal of maturity in her intervention, always trying to articulate her speech with what other participants said.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

The culture of peace, it can be constructed incessantly from participation because you believe most when you are part of the process.

*Justification of the code:* We can clearly see in this statement that the issue of the culture of peace is definitely back into the conversation. Here's a good example of a direct proposal to build a peaceful environment.

**Talita, teenager (code 1)**

Yeah, it's true.

*Justification of the code:* No interruptions in the flow of conversation. This intervention only expresses agreement with what is being said.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 1)**

If you get a product and you don't know how it was made, you'll be suspicious about it. It's like that in public security, it's the same thing. I'm sure it's going to be different from the moment the university is aware of how the security planning is done. From that moment on, they will start discussing public security within the academy, and it will start to spread...and it's going to be a two way street ... Because I will know how people from the universities are being formed, I'll know what a university professor thinks, I'll know how the university students think, I'll know what that high school teenager thinks, I'll know what an old man who had no access to education thinks, right? Where their culture is a mass culture it doesn't help them think... Then I'll know how I treat each one, and vice-versa... and that person who didn't have access to education... and all others who were mentioned above will know how the police acts, everyone will know when to begin diversifying, and when to start expanding these communications. Knowing how the police work, you will know that there is... there is a standard for who is approached. The police never disclosed that, but there is... there is a pattern regarding who is approached. So...if you go to the police... you'll know... "Hands up! Do it! Obey!". That's it, is not a certain obedience... but... "Already? Is it already over?". So now... "Yes, sir... I will identify myself, I would like to know why was I approached". And they will explain... "No, it was... etc". It's not gonna be that answer people are used to, "None of your business" (*Excited in his speech; interruption*)

*Justification of the code:* Even though the speech is quite disorganized and although he deals with several issues at a time, Sérgio is still on-topic. The police point of view is still dominant, but he acknowledges the importance of listening to society in order to elaborate a public security plan. Both society and the police would gain from listening to each other. Discussion help the two sides to better understand each other.

**Gustavo, Police Officer (code 1)**

It is what it is. (*Laughter*)

*Justification of the code:* Gustavo agrees with Sérgio without interrupting the flow of the conversation. This intervention shows that the participants were feeling invited to participate. The environment is now light and more open.

**Sérgio, Police Officer (code 2)**

"None of your business, you know? If it is none of your business just go away!" (*Laughter*). But there's the question of the conscious police officer... it's what Cabo [*second lowest position in the police rank hierarchy*] Suzana said... "Thank you for your cooperation. You were approached because you are in a red area here. It's better if

you get your drink and drink it in your front door”. I went to an operation with Cabo [name omitted], an operation in which I had to run for her, you know? But ok...that's not under discussion... I was in an operation with Cabo [name omitted] and another Cabo that works with us in which we approached... we both approached around 25 people, we approached 25 people... And we were calling the CIOP [*Policial Operation Center*]... then the police cars came and they were saying... like... “Here, over here, over there, CIOP is moving over there”... When we got there we realized they were students who had left... I believe Souza Franco School or Amazonas Pedroso [*school*]... they had a meeting at the gas station and they were drinking and bothering some other people. But the gas station owner wasn't happy with that and decided to call the authorities to take them out of there. We got there and we said: “We're going to inspect everyone”. And I was explaining them... then when we came up I said, “Look, I'm going to ask you to leave, because we came to respond a call about you”. So, there's a whole thing of explaining... there's also the question of the level of education... Today we see that the police has been undergoing a gradual progress, but before we had... we even had a story concerning the selection to the police that was made before. In the past, nobody wanted to be a cop, because being a police officer meant earning less than the minimum wage. Today we can see a change. It's still not the ideal for the position of responsibility that we have, for what is required from us. We do not get paid well enough; we sure should get paid as much as they [*politicians*] are paid in Brasília [*the capital*]. Why? Because the crime here... homicides for instance... a homicide here is not considered as much as a homicide in Brasilia. We have another discussion that I won't expand because I didn't come here for this... but before discussing the educational level of the police... before, the police band went to the street playing music then, entered the headquarters and “pum”!... Lock! You'll be a cop! That was the form of selection. It was... but are you sure you want to be a cop? Where's the preparation? “Doesn't matter, fuck, I'm a cop, respect me!” “Last week you were playing football, smoking weed on Sundays, how come you're a cop now?” “It doesn't matter, I'm a cop”. And today we see a minimum preparation; the minimum selection which I think is required. I'm a soldier of the police and some lawyer came to me and tries to explain the penal code to me. “Look, kid, be quiet because I'm a lawyer!” What if I have no power of persuasion at all... “Kid, I'm a lawyer”. “Congratulations, but I'm doing my job”. “But why did you consider me a suspect?”. I'd say: “Discretionary power”. Then he realizes...”well, this cop has some knowledge of the law”. What about the cops that came before? There are a lot of sergeants who are not able to apply the procedure. [*Some parts with indignant tone when he realizes that the police officer who entered the gym, before smoking pot*]

*Justification of the code:* In the end, Sérgio deviates the conversation completely from its topic. The personal story he brings just shows how the police has a different procedural approach depending on who is being approached. We cannot see, however, how this distinction is done, how it operates. Sérgio recognizes that the improvement of their work efficiency is a process; and the old structure of selection was abandoned to give place to a more careful selection. Moreover, their salary has been raised, which encourages more people to choose this occupation. All in all, the conversation, nevertheless, ends at a low level of deliberation.