

The History of Policing

Lt. Raymond E. Foster, LAPD (ret.)

The rain fell hard and steady on the bill of the young police officer's cap. Although it was unlikely that someone would stumble across the crime scene in the dark early morning, he was alert just inside the crime scene tape. The sergeant silently appeared at side and said, "Wet, eh?" The officer nodded his head dropping a pool of rain water from his cap to his rain coat. The sergeant continued, "You know, 2000 years ago some hapless Roman soldiers were probably standing around at a crime scene and I know one of them said, 'I knew it was going to rain.'" The young police officer smiled, realizing he was carrying on a long tradition of all-weather, dependable service.¹

History is important to policing. As you learn more about the field of policing you will discover the strong influence of history on modern policing. Many of the

challenges, problems and strengths of modern American policing are rooted in the past. Furthermore, history is important because it is the way in which people learn to become police officers. In later chapters you will be exposed to several different types of training models but, you will see that these different training models have a common foundation - the use of history to teach policing.

History influences modern policing in many ways. Some of them are significant, like fragmentation, some of them are not very significant, but demonstrate the influence of history, none-the-less. As an example, according to the New York City Police Museum, "It is believed that the Rattle Watchmen who patrolled New Amsterdam in the 1650's, carried lanterns at night with green glass sides in them as a means of identification. When the Watchmen returned to the watch house after patrol, they hung their lantern on a hook by the front door to show people seeking the watchman that he was in the watch house. Today, green lights are hung outside the entrances of New York Police Department Precincts as a symbol that the Watch is present and vigilant."

Becoming a police officer is a journey. Generally, you begin with some sort of formal training, like a police academy, and then work with a more experienced police officer. This journey to becoming a police officer is very much akin to an apprenticeship because you learn most of your skills by doing. By practicing the art of policing while working in the communities of our country, a police officer moves from becoming an apprentice, or rookie, to becoming an experienced practitioner of policing.

Often, once a police officer moves from an apprentice to a trusted practitioner, they are called on to teach new police officers. Typically, a police officer who is teaching the new apprentices is called a Field Training Officer (FTO). The FTO uses his or her own past experiences and the experiences of their FTOs to teach the new person. Much of policing is learned through this oral history. Police officers teach and acculturate the new generation of police officers by handing down the hard lessons of the past as an oral history.

It is not uncommon for a police officer to teach a rookie about policing by relating a story of something that happened years, if not decades, ago. Oral histories, or "war stories," are used as lessons learned about what was done well and what was done poorly. Because policing is an apprenticeship which relies heavily on history and because much of the modern laws, rules and procedures are rooted in history, the history of policing is important to us. Finally, history also gives us a glimpse at why we do what we do. In a later chapter we will discuss the nature of

discretion in policing. As you will see, discretion plays a critical role in many of the challenges facing today's police officers. Understanding why we do something a certain way improves the use of discretion. Overall, studying the history of policing is critical to both the criminal justice student and future police officers.

Iron Age Badges

While criminal justice scholars generally agree that the history of modern policing begins with the formation of the London Metropolitan Police Department, there are traces of our modern system dating back at least to the time of the Greeks and Romans. In Greek culture, the word *politiea* was used to describe all government actions that enhanced order and the continued the existence of Greek society.² Eventually, this word would be transformed through German, French and finally English usage to come to our modern understanding of the word "police." Greek history tells us that in 621BCE, a nobleman named Draco created the first written code of laws for Greek society.

As a nobleman, Draco's primary concern was the maintenance of the existing social order in which he was a prime beneficiary. In other words, his law heavily favored the ruling class, called the oligarchy. Draco, which literally means dragon, created a system of laws wherein even minor transgressions against property ownership carried the death penalty. As an example, the theft of a cabbage was punishable by death. There is a story that when someone asked Draco why the theft of a cabbage could mean death he reportedly replied, "Because I could think of no

more severe punishment.”³ As you may have surmised, the harsh nature of Draco’s laws led to our modern word “draconian,” meaning an usually harsh measure.

Draco’s laws are important for two reasons. First, they demonstrate that as society became more complex there was a need to create laws in order to maintain the social order. In early, undemocratic societies, these laws benefited the ruling

class. Although harsh, the early Greek laws clearly outlined the concept that the private ownership of property was enforceable by the community through a system of laws.

Secondly, although the laws were harsh and biased, a written code provides the opportunity to study and apply the law consistently.

Excerpts from the Twelve Tables:

Table I: Preliminaries to a trial

1. If plaintiff summons defendant to court, he shall go. If he does not go, plaintiff shall call witness thereto. Then only shall he take defendant by force.
2. If defendant shirks or takes to heels, plaintiff shall lay hands on him.
3. If disease or age shall be an impediment, he shall grant him a team (for transport); he should not spread with cushions a covered carriage if he shall not so desire.

In 168 BCE, Greek society and military influence declined to the point of being conquered by the Roman Empire. Eventually, the Roman Empire stretched over vast areas of Europe including Great Britain. While the Roman Empire eventually receded into history, it left behind many organizational, engineering and societal concepts we see today. A few hundred years after Draco penned his laws, Roman society began its journey with Civil law. In 451 BCE, Roman civil law began with the Twelve Tables.⁴

Roman society as we know it began with the codification of family and clan custom, creating the Twelve Tables and Roman society. Throughout Roman history civil law changed and sometimes because of civil, political and military conflict the law was not followed by the government. However, the essence of the original

Twelve Tables remained in effect for about 900 years when they were finally superseded by the Justinian legislation beginning about 528AD.

In almost any government, a primary function is the collection of taxes. If you look at the Greek and Roman early laws, you see a concentrated effort to protect property rights. From a government point of view, the protection of personal property makes sense because it is easier to collect taxes if ownership is clear. Long before conquering the Greeks, around 451 BCE, the Romans employed a person called a **Questores**, literally meaning seeking, to collect, account for and forward taxes.⁵ Early in the formation of the Roman Republic, a different kind of seeking was employed. Perhaps the first official police officers were **Questores Paricidii**. **Questores Paricidii** were agents of the highest elected officials in Rome, the Consuls. The job of the **Questories Paricidii**, who worked and traveled in pairs, was literally to seek or track and capture those accused of murder. Once the **Questories** had captured the accused they were required to ensure the accused appeared before the assembly to face their charges.⁶ The number of appointed **Questories** fluctuated, depending on who ruled the empire.

The **Questories** would bring the accused before the **Praetor**, a consul who was appointed to administer justice between Roman citizens. The **Praetor** would hold a public trial where the merits of the case would be argued openly. Just as today's high-profile trials attract attention, so did some Roman trials. Indeed, the **Praetor** would occasionally have to have extra legionnaires on hand to control the crowds. Because of rebellions, military takeovers and civil wars, the Romans did not like large numbers of armed legionary in the city. Indeed, there were often rules prohibiting

legionnaires from entering the city in more than groups of two or three, and prohibiting them carrying armor or weapons. Whenever legionnaires were employed to keep the peace at trials, they would often be armed with long wooden staves instead of their short swords. Just as contemporary American police officers have both lethal and less-lethal weapons, so did their early Roman counterparts.

By the time of Caesar Augustus, around 6AD, the Romans began to develop a number of concepts that moved them closer to a having a police force that we could recognize. Paramilitary units like Vigiles, Praetorian Guards, and Urban Cohorts came into existence.⁷ Caesar Augustus taxed the sale of slaves in order to finance night watchmen for the city of Rome. Vigiles Urbani (literally watchmen of the city) were founded primarily as a fire prevention force, but they also provided patrol to prevent burglaries and occasionally pursued run-away slaves. Furthermore, like modern police agencies, these Vigiles were organized along the military lines of the time. Whereas today a local police agency is headed by a chief who is assisted by captains, lieutenants and sergeants, the Roman Vigiles were commanded by a praefectus vigilum who was assisted by a subpraefectus, tribunes and centurios.

Just as modern police officers in large cities work out of precincts or stations and patrol specific geographic areas, Roman Vigiles were assigned to cohorts (a cohort was 560 men commanded by a tribune) which patrolled one of the fourteen administrative districts of the City of Rome. Eventually, Roman influence and organization faded from the European continent. For several hundred years, justice would be decided by the various chiefs, kings and princes of the Middle Ages.

Medieval Shields and English Roots

As we saw with the Greeks and Romans, as society becomes more complex, so does the nature of justice and policing. There are many definitions of policing but, at its most basic, policing is about maintaining order in society. Imagine early humans who begin to form groups of families, like clans or tribes. As these groups grew larger, the way in which they maintained order became more complex. At first, if there were only a dozen or so people connected with the group, the rules were probably informal. As the group grew larger, the rules about group membership became more complex and increasing formal. Perhaps clan or tribal councils were formed to decide the fate of those who transgressed the group's membership rules.

As society became more complex, the group membership rules became a system of laws that regulated the group members' conduct. These laws maintained order. In today's society, there are two main sources of law. First, there is statute. The second is common law. A statute is "a formal, written enactment by the authorized powers of a state. The term is usually not applied to a written constitution but is restricted to the enactments of a legislature. Statute law is to be distinguished chiefly from common law, which may be defined as the body of legal rules derived from judicial decisions and custom."⁸ Before the development of either a unified system of statutes or common law, Medieval English rulers, were responsible for maintaining order within their individual kingdoms.

Much of the Medieval system of justice in England can be traced further back to early Danish and Saxon customs brought to England during various invasions. Indeed, many of these concepts brought to England eventually found their way to America

and into our modern society. Perhaps the earliest European system of maintaining social order was the *Frankpledge* system.⁹ Under Frankpledge, every free male over the age of 12 took an oath of loyalty and obligation to the Crown. In this system, the men were banded together in groups of ten and responsible for the conduct of all members of the group. A group of ten men was called a *tithing*. Each group was headed by the Chief (Frank) Pledge. The groups of ten were organized into larger groups of one hundred called *Tithings*.¹⁰

Part of the obligation of the Frankpledge was to take up arms in defense of the group and the King, keeping the peace and responding to the *Hue and Cry*. The Hue and Cry¹¹ refers to raising an alarm when there is some kind of violation against the peace or order. In addition to raising the alarm, Frankpledge members were bound to join other members of their tithing in detaining, capturing or pursuing people who committed crimes.

As you can imagine the Chief Pledge in charge of an entire hundred men became a very important figure in village life. By 1284 when King Edward I, issued the *Statute of Winchester*, men belonging to the tithings were known as *Constables*. The Statute of Winchester further formalized the position of Constable and Chief Constable because it decreed that in every hundred or tithings, two of the constables would be chosen to view the armor of each member of their hundred.¹² The men selected as the "Chief Constable" slowly became responsible for keeping the peace in their tithings and within the villages and towns wherein their tithings were located. In essence, the Medieval Chief Constables were the ancestors of our modern Chiefs of Police.

In addition to establishing the parish constable as the chief law enforcement officer of the area, the Statute of Winchester also formalized several other important concepts. The statute established the *watch and ward* system, and made the men in the town or village responsible to keep weapons in their homes. Watch and ward was a system requiring the men of the town or village to rotate the responsibility for fire watch, crime prevention and, in some cases other municipal duties such as lighting the street lamps. The statute also codified the concept of raising the hue and cry.

By the time the Norman conquest ended in 1066, William the Conqueror found that England was divided into counties which were also known as Shires. The person who was nominally in charge of enforcing the King's justice and collecting taxes was called the Reeve.¹³ The word sheriff is a combination of the words Shire and Reeve.

The small villages and towns within the Shires (today we call them counties) contained the various tithings.¹⁴ While the Reeve was responsible for keeping the peace and collecting taxes within the Shire, justice and tax paying within the tithings was accomplished by a person called a Bailiff. Further complicating the system of justice was the influence of the landowners. At this time in English history landowners were royal officials, minimally known as Lords. While the Lords were holding Manor Court over their tenants, the bailiff presided over the tithings within his district and the Sheriff was deciding issues on a "county-wide" basis.¹⁵ Not only were there a great many conflicts in the administration of criminal justice between the various systems but there also were conflicts over the collection of fees and taxes. Central to these conflicts seems to be the collection and administration of taxes on behalf of the central government, the King.

By the Twelfth Century, Henry the II King of England, began to take active steps toward centralizing tax collection and the administration of justice. The King's solution was to divide England into circuits and send judges around the country to hear and decide local land disputes and criminal cases. Eventually, in early American history we would have a similar judicial system wherein judges would ride the circuit on horseback from town to town, hearing local cases. Henry II's circuit judges led directly to the development of common law. As a judge rode between the various shires (counties) and districts (hundreds) his case decisions in one local area would apply to another. Over time, as more cases were heard by the King's judges, there was more consistency in expectation and application of the law. As an example, if you had a dispute with someone you could turn to the "*common law*" as it had been developed by the circuit judges for expectations in how your dispute might be handled.

Throughout the early English history of policing, many of the changes and advances toward our modern system were taken as a means to develop stronger centralized control over local affairs.¹⁶ Many of the problems were a clash between different elements of society. An instance of this is that the goals of royal society (Lords of the Manors, etc.) sometimes conflicted with the goals of the growing middle class (the landed gentry). A turning point in sorting out the conflicting systems was the enactment of the Justice of the Peace Act of 1361.¹⁷ This act established the Justice of the Peace as having authority over the local constables and the sheriff. The Justice of the Peace became a very powerful office in the politics and social life of England. In America, we tend to think of a Justice of the Peace as some sort of

court officer, but in early England the Justice of the Peace was really police officer¹⁸. Charles Beard (1906) describes the Justice of the Peace, as probably, the real turning point in policing being a community effort through the tithings to a modern concept of justice conducted by paid professionals:

“After an offence was committed, the justice could arrest the offender and conduct the preliminary examination, but only in very minor matters could he hear and determine. In conducting the preliminary inquest and making presentments to the higher courts which had authority to hear and determine, he relieved the community of a burden which had been extremely irksome in the middle ages. The capture by hue and cry and presentment by the representatives of the vills and hundreds became obsolete. The justices assumed the work of examining persons arrested for manslaughter or felony. They took information as to facts and circumstances, and bound witnesses and offenders over to the next sessions of gaol delivery where the case was to be heard and determined. The single justice, however, had no authority to let such offenders out on bail; that could be done only by two justices at least, one of the Quorum. The justice could of course take the preliminary steps in cases which could be heard and determined in general sessions of the peace.”¹⁹

For two or three hundred years, the combination of a Justice of the Peace and the Constable remained the primary method of both law enforcement and case adjudication in England. This arrangement was popular in the small towns and villages where the Justice of the Peace was generally a local man of good standing. Unlike the Sheriff who was appointed by the King, the Justice of the Peace enjoyed some popularity in his own community.²⁰ There were a number of factors that led to a decline in the popularity and effectiveness of the Sheriff-Justice of the Peace-constable arrangement. First, society was growing larger and more complex. By the late 1700s, London had a population of more than 600,000. The increase in the number of people living in close proximity naturally increased the number of conflicts that could be considered criminal matters. Second, throughout the 400 year history of the Justice of the Peace England was plagued by a series of civil wars and intense political

disputes. These wars and disputes led to a considerable amount of social disorder including an increase in crime.

Finally, the nature of the Justice of the Peace led to corruption and thus unpopularity with the community. The corruption the Justice of the Peace probably hinged on the fact that the justice's were paid for each act they performed. The more "justice" they dispensed, the more money they were able to make.

Additionally, the Justice of the Peace was paid based on the number of convictions and it was not uncommon for accused criminals of with money to essentially out bid the state rate for justice. Indeed, Douglas Brown, in the History of *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police*, noted:

"The beginning of the eighteenth century found petty justice, as administered in the Metropolis, still at a shamefully low level. At Middlesex and Westminster Sessions there would be some façade of respectability, but in the privacy of his own 'office,' usually a room in his house, the 'trading justice,' as he was now called, did a lucrative business." ²¹

The three reasons for the disappearance of the Justice of the Peace began to converge during the middle of the 17th Century. In 1660, after over twenty years of political violence, Charles II returned to Metropolitan London to find the concepts of policing and justice in extreme disorder. In 1663, in London the Common Council Enacted a law which established a force of over 1000 night watchmen to supplement the constables.²² These night watchmen were officially referred to as "Bellmen" but were nicknamed "Charlies" after the King, Charles II.

Recall that during the age of Iron Badges the Romans had established the Vigiles Urbani. A thousand years after the Vigiles Urbani, the Charlies had many of the same duties. If you consider the development of large cities both during Roman

and late 17th Century England, you get a good idea why nighttime fire watches were necessary. The large cities of both eras built huge, poorly constructed areas for the lower classes. Much of the housing was either all wood or certainly wooden framed, cramped and heated by fire. Moreover, the people living in these areas also cooked by fire. As you can well imagine, fire was a constant danger. Unlike contemporary America, there was no paid, well-trained and equipped force that could respond to fires. At that time they simply had to be prevented or at least contained quickly or they could destroy larger areas.

We mentioned that there was civil war and violent political disorder around the same time as these developments. Often, men would be employed as soldiers during these disputes and once the disputes were settled, the soldiers, armed and somewhat trained, were out of a job. These likely contributed to the emergence of highwaymen. Highwaymen were robbers and thieves who attacked people traveling between cities. In addition to establishing the Charlies as a means to supplement the fire watch, the Charlies were also an effort to control the increasing robberies and acts of theft both on the highway and in the large city of London. The largely untrained and poorly financed Charlies proved to be ineffective, and in 1692, the English government instituted a system whereby money was paid and pardons given to those who gave information about or assistance in capturing highwaymen. The people who acted as pain informants were called *Thief Takers*. This system of compensating informants had a similar corrupting effect as the system of paying the Justice of the Peace for their services. London, like Rome before it and New York and Los Angeles today, is divided up into administrative districts. London, like New York,

calls these administrative political districts “boroughs.” At the time of the highwaymen, people who lived within London borough were referred to as

Officially called Justice Hall or Sessions House, the Old Bailey Court is named for the street wherein it was located. You can read the original cases online at www.oldbaileyonline.org. As an example the text from the trial of an unnamed woman for infanticide reads:

The first of these was a Woman of the Parish of St. Martins in the fields, a Married Woman, and one whose Husband is accounted a Person of good repute, and credit, and with him she lived, to the seeming of those that know them, contentedly and well, it pleased God (whose Judgments are unaccountable to his Creatures) so for to suffer the Devil to prevail upon this poor wretch, as to cause her to perpetrate that horrid action whereof she was not indicted.

The fact upon the Evidence given into the Court appeared to be thus; this woman had (not long before the fact) been delivered of the Child, which she after Murdered, and was then but newly Siting up after her labour, she was observed for some time before to be some what discomposed and distempered in her mind; the ground of which is Variously reported but not certainly known, but was so far taken notice off, that those that were about her were feareful at any time to leave her alone, and it had been well if they had continued true to their own feares.”

parishioners. Beginning around 1674, a

Constable, Justice of the Peace or even a Thief Taker could assist a citizen in taking someone to court at the Old Bailey court.

Because the system of paying informants had so increased crime, the local borough parishioners demanded and gained the right to hire their own private deputies to combat crime. As with the system in the larger metropolitan of London, the ranks of the borough deputies soon found themselves rife with corruption. Indeed, this system may have had the larger effect of actually creating a large, city-wide network of criminals who bought, sold and traded justice. By the mid 1700s, England was awash in crime and certain neighborhoods in London were controlled by criminals. Indeed, this system of Thief Taking

was so ineffectual that merchants and shopkeepers often found it necessary to form “Frith-guilds” or mutual assistance societies which sometimes employed their own private security guards.²³

Enlightened Stars

As we move forward in time, the link between the development of society, government and policing becomes fairly clear. Just as the highwaymen were running amok in England, a new movement with huge social, political and scientific implications was beginning. Commonly referred to as the Age of Enlightenment, this was a time when people were beginning to re-learn how to ask questions and find the answers to problems about the world around them. This was a time in history when the scientific method was being used to examine almost all of the problems facing humankind.²⁴

One example of how the age of enlightenment began to influence thinking about policing is Cesare Beccaria's book "On Crime and Punishment." Written in 1764, On Crimes and Punishment was a huge literary success which suggested that the best way to deal with crime was through some rationale punishment policy instituted by a government agency charged with apprehending, trying and punishing criminals²⁵. Meanwhile, a few years prior to Beccaria's book, the Henry and John Fielding brought the age of enlightenment to English Policing.²⁶

Henry Fielding was a popular 18th Century novelist. In 1743, he published a book on the exploits of an English highwayman, Jonathan Wild. Five years later, Henry was appointed as a magistrate in Westminster, a city near Central London. Shortly after taking the appointment as magistrate, Henry moved to a residence on Bow Street. Henry's Bow Street home also became his official office and the *Bow Street Runners* were born.

More important than Henry's work as a magistrate is his thinking and writing on policing. Fielding is quite appropriately considered a pioneer in the intellectual or

Henry Fielding is best known as a novelist for writing "Tom Jones." However, Fielding wrote a number of very interesting stories that give us a glimpse into the criminal element of the 18th Century. One of the books, *The History of the Life of the Late Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great: And a Journey from This World to the Next*, is particularly interesting because it not only gives some insight into justice of the era, but also because Jonathan Wilde worked both sides of the law - he was a thief and a thief taker! According to G.D. Sproul (1903), "Jonathan Wild, born about 1682 and executed at Tyburn in 1725, was one of the most notorious criminals of his age. His resemblance to the hero in Fielding's satire of the same name is general rather than particular. The real Jonathan (whose legitimate business was that of a buckle-maker) like Fielding's, won his fame, not as a robber himself, but as an informer, and a receiver of stolen goods." Here is a small taste of Fielding's Writing: "The count was one night very successful at the hazard-table, where Wild, who was just returned from his travels, was then present; as was likewise a young gentleman, whose name was Bob Bagshot, an acquaintance of Mr. Wild, and of whom he entertained a great opinion. Taking, therefore, Mr. Bagshot aside, he advised him to provide himself (if he had them not about him) with a case of pistols, and to attack the count in his way home, promising to plant himself near with the same arms, as a corps de reserve, and to come up on occasion. This was accordingly executed, and the count obliged to surrender to savage force what he had in so genteel and civil a manner taken at play."

theoretical aspects of policing, as well as the administrative aspects of the job. Henry Fielding published a number of pamphlets about policing such as the *Inquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers* (1751).²⁷ These pamphlets and publications in the Coventry Journal some of Fielding's writings can be considered the precursors to the local police blotter. It also becomes clear from his writings that Henry Fielding thought that the police did not have to be merely reactive in nature.²⁸

Prior to Fielding's efforts, most of early policing was reactive; it waited from something to happen. After the act was committed the Roman

Questores pursued the murderer, the Tithingmen raised the Hue and Cry and the original Thief Takers informed. Fielding, on the other hand, believed that policing

should be proactive - it should seek to prevent crime. Primary in Fielding's ideas was the belief that the citizens should come together and prevent crime.²⁹ Fielding's ideas eventually developed into the *Bow Street Runners*.³⁰ Working with the local parish constables Fielding established probably the first semi-official proactive law enforcement. In addition to seeking out those who had committed crimes, the Bow Street Runners patrolled for crime and conducted somewhat rudimentary investigations. Indeed, the Bow Street Runners were so successful that in a relatively short period of time the Runners were funded by the government. Now, the Bow Street Runners changed from a group very similar to the Thief Takers (who were funded by the rewards they collected) to a group funded by the government for their overall activities.

The change in how the Bow Street Runners were funded is quite dramatic. Much of the criticism leveled at the earlier Thief Takers involved their "trading justice." Since the activities were funded, some of the temptation for corruption was removed. The corruption of the Thief Takers has direct consequences and lessons for modern policing. In Chapter Eleven we will have an in-depth discussion on the use of informants. For now, consider that informants are valuable sources of information, because by definition informants are somehow involved in criminal activity. They are informing on other criminals. Some of the largest incidents of corruption in the late 20th Century involved police use of informants. Like the magistrates who relied on Thief Takers, police officers and detectives who rely on informants must always be mindful of the concept of "trading justice."

With the success of the Bow Street Runners, Fielding moved into new areas of

preventative as well as reactive law enforcement. Although Fielding's small force was being successful at breaking up gangs of thieves and bringing people to justice before the Bow Street Court, many of the thieves and robbers could still quickly slip out of the city. Fielding proposed that military cavalry³¹ be used to guard the major turnpikes leading out of the city. Douglas Browne noted in *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police*, that

"George Grenville, who was then (in 1763) First Lord of the Treasury, sanctioned the cost of a Horse Patrole of eight men, later increased to ten. The men, who did not wear uniform, were selected from constables and others who had worked for Fielding. Though there were then turnpikes within two or three miles of Charing Cross, the patrole had to cover a wide area. It was generally welcomed, and its usefulness was not denied; but after less than eighteen months the experiment was discontinued, at the instance³²."

Henry Fielding died in 1754 and his blind brother John took up the work of the Bow Street Runners. During their time, the Fielding brother's efforts weren't greatly appreciated by the people or the government at large. Henry Fielding's basic idea that a paid magistrate in charge of paid full-time constables was the best model of policing was not readily accepted. Indeed, it was over seventy years after Henry Fielding's death that the people and the government overcame their suspicions of a full-time, paid police force.

Near the end of the 18th Century, both the people and the government were suspicious a full-time police force was a potential threat to their liberty, somewhat like having a standing army. Some of this fear may have been founded in use of the police by France. Just across the channel from England, the French government underwent a revolution which ultimately lead to the Napoleonic wars. Under the command of Joseph Fouche, the French Ministry of Police had become an institution

of political repression.³³ So, in France, instead of largely protecting the community, the police were a branch of the government designed to repress the community. In addition to fearing a standing army, there was a strong belief in the marketplace being able to solve problems. In other words, people and the government at large believed that private solutions to crime problems like the Thief Takers were the best solution because it did not cost the government any money; it was a private enterprise.

The Dawn of Modern Policing

In 1795, Patrick Colquhoun, an economist and merchant, anonymously published "*Police of the Metropolis*."³⁴ Colquhoun, known as a reformer, picked up where the Fielding brothers left off and began to write extensively about preventive policing as a science. Colquhoun is also credited with garnering political and public support for the formation of a private marine police patrol on the river Thames. His success with the privately funded patrol led to the government establishing the Thames River Police in 1800. Despite many text books to the contrary, it is arguable that the Thames River Police of 1800 is the first full-time, paid professional police force.

About the same time as the Thames River Police was established, the Bow Street Horse patrol was reconstituted from early uses of military cavalry to block routes to London. Indeed, in 1805, the Bow Street Horse Patrol became the first uniformed police force in England.³⁵ The Bow Street Horse Patrol's uniform consisted of blue coats and pants, yellow buttons and a scarlet waistcoat (similar to a modern

vest), all topped off with a black hat. Because of the red and blue combination of their uniforms the Horse Patrol was nicknamed the "Robin RedBreasts."³⁶ In addition to the reconstituted horse patrol, the Bow Street foot patrols were brought back, expanded and given additional dues.

In 1812, just as the war between England the United States of America would re-ignite, Sir Robert Peel, a member of the English parliament, was appointed as the Chief Secretary for Ireland. For an English politician, a posting in Ireland is, at best, a difficult job. In our recent past, we recall the political violence that has continuously rocked the northern part of Ireland. As an example, according to the 1997, Patterns of Global Terrorism released by the United States Department of State:

"As the debates wore on over the summer, Ireland suffered its worst single terrorist act. On 15 August terrorists from one of the splinter groups, the self-styled Real IRA, exploded a 500-pound car bomb outside a courthouse in downtown Omagh, killing 29 persons and injuring more than 330 others. This attack followed another terrorist bombing by the Real IRA in Banbridge on 1 August, which injured 35 persons and damaged approximately 200 homes."³⁷

Although not as massive, there was similar violence in Peel's time. In 1814, as the Secretary for Ireland, Peel responded to political violence in Ireland by reinstating portions of the previously repealed Insurrection Act of 1807. Through this act, Peel established the Peace Preservation Force which ultimately became the Royal Irish Constabulary. The members of the peace preservation force were nicknamed "Peelers." By the time Peel moved on to another cabinet post in the English government, his activities in Ireland had already shown him to be an advocate of police reform.³⁸ In 1822, Peel would accept the post of Secretary of State for the Home Department commonly called "the Home Secretary." In the English

government, the Home Secretary is responsible for managing the domestic affairs of the country. In this position, it is quite natural that the crime problems plaguing England fell into Peel's lap.

When Peel took over the Home Office, a uniformed, day only patrol, mostly consisting of old soldiers, was deployed in London. By the time the English government began to debate establishing a full-time, paid and uniformed police department in London, there were already Bow Street foot patrols, the Red Robin horse patrols, the Thames River Police and the new day patrol of old soldiers. Moreover, there were still the Parish Constables and night watchmen from earlier periods. London, with a city of with a population of around 1.5 million, was policed by a disjointed, uncoordinated and large ineffectually force. Simply put, England was politically and socially ready to consider an official police force.

On April 15, 1829, Sir Robert Peel introduced into parliament a "Bill for Improving the Police in and near the Metropolis." The bill (a proposed law) called for the creation of paid constables in what was called the Metropolitan Police District. Peel's bill became law on July 19, 1829.³⁹ The opening paragraph of Peel's bill sums up the state of policing: "Whereas Offences against Property have of late increased in and near the Metropolis; and the local Establishments of Nightly Watch and Nightly Police have been found inadequate to the Prevention and Detection of Crime, by reason of the frequent Unfitness of the individuals employed, the Insufficiency of their Number, the limited Sphere of their Authority, and their Want of Connection and Cooperation with each other."⁴⁰

Although we tend to think of Peel as founder of modern policing, there were

Although not directly involved in the day-to-day organizing of the new police force, Peel, as a reformed mined leader left his imprint on policing with his nine principles. Take note of the principles and see if you can determine areas in the history of policing where law enforcement lost sight of Peel's vision and has tried to regain it through later reforms:

1. The basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder.
2. The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police actions.
3. Police must secure the willing cooperation of the public in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the respect of the public.
4. The degree of cooperation of the public that can be secured diminishes proportionately to the necessity of the use of physical force.
5. Police seek and preserve public favor not by catering to public opinion but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to the law.
6. Police use physical force to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient.
7. Police, at all times, should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police, the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence.
8. Police should always direct their action strictly towards their functions and never appear to usurp the powers of the judiciary.
9. The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it.

many people who deserve as much credit for developing and implementing the proactive role the modern police officers assumes. What Peel can be most credited with is coupling his reform-minded understanding of policing with his ability as a politician and government leader. There were several attempts to found a police force before Peel, but Peel was the individual with the understanding of policing, enlightened mind and political ability and power to obtain passage of the bill. One more accolade belongs to Peel - his choice of the first leaders of the new police force. Peel appointed two commissioners to organize and implement the new police force - Charles Rowan and Richard Mayne.

As the organization and structure of the new police force took shape, Rowan, a retired Army Colonel and Mayne, a young lawyer, wrestled with many of the issues common to our modern police agencies.

For instance, they divided the metropolitan district up into seventeen police divisions. This geographic division of responsibility is similar to the Los Angeles Police Department with its nineteen divisions, or the New York Police Department with its 76 precincts. Today we deploy police officers into geographical areas based on a complex formula related to crime, population and density. In the new Metropolitan police force of 1829, 2800 men were divided into companies of 165 and dispersed to the 17 divisions.⁴¹ In Chapter Three we look at the organizational aspects of police departments. For now, realize that police departments are organized both geographically and in a traditional hierarchal sense. In other words there are workers, supervisors, managers and so on. Rowan and Mayne chose military-type internal organizational structure when they appointed a superintendent in charge of each division, with four inspectors and sixteen sergeants to supervise the daily operations.

Rowan and Mayne decided to locate the headquarters for their new police force on a street called Whitehall Place. There was a rear entrance to the headquarters through a narrow lane from a place called Scotland Yard. Of course as time passed the London Police became synonymous with Scotland Yard. While there are a number of explanations how the area of Scotland Yard was named, the most popular seems to be that it was the location that visiting kings from Scotland (prior to the unification of England and Scotland) stayed while visiting English Court.

Finding a location and organizing the new police force were probably the least of Rowan and Mayne's challenges. They also had to recruit police officers and then overcome the public's suspicion of the new force. To somewhat relieve public

concerns, Rowan and Mayne decided the new police officer's uniform would be a non-military appearing uniform with blue pants and coat and a black top hat. At first the new police officers carried a rattle to attract attention (as opposed to the famous whistle) and a short impact weapon called a truncheon. Again, to allay public concerns the rattle and weapon were concealed under the police officer's coat. Like Sir Robert Peel's Irish Peace Protection Force, the new police officer picked up the nickname of "Peelers." Sometime later in their early history someone began calling them "Bobbies" in reference to their political founder, Sir Robert Peel. As you know, today the nicknames of Scotland Yard and Bobbies have become recognized worldwide as references to the London Metropolitan Police Force.

In general, developments in policing often take place alongside other developments in government. Six years after the formation of the early metropolitan police force, the central English government was working on overall government reform and reorganization. In 1835, the Municipal Corporations Act allowed other boroughs in London and small towns outside of the London area to incorporate and establish permanent local governments. Part of this act required that these new local governments establish police forces. However, many of the local governments were very slow to implement their own forces because of the expense and a lack of political support.⁴²

In 1839, the Rural Constabulary Act formalized the process of the English counties (previously called Shires) forming their own police forces. The act required the county Justice of the Peace to appoint a Chief Constable who would supervise one police officer for every 1000 persons in the county. The 1839 act seems to have

motivated the London boroughs and smaller towns to form their own police forces because they did not want to be taxed the expense of the county police force. A key point in the development of English policing is the somewhat centralized approach to formation of local policing. Today, there are 44 different police agencies in England, a country with a population of just over 60 million, which are somewhat coordinated by the Home Office. Conversely, today in America we have over 17,000 police agencies in a country of around 300 million and our local police forces are not coordinated by the federal government.

Early American Policing

While many of the policing concepts developed in England eventually found their way to America, it would be a mistake to believe we transplanted the English system wholesale. You can probably already see that our political heritage of local government control has led to having many more police agencies than our English cousins.

Like the Romans and English before them, American police officers started out as a night watch, particularly interested in fire prevention. In 1624, the Dutch settled New Amsterdam (now New York) and established a night watch where men would patrol at night with weapons, a lantern and a wooden rattle. The wooden rattle made a loud noise that signaled an alarm. Thus, the first New York police force was called the "*rattle watch*." About 40 years after the Dutch settled New Amsterdam, they were conquered by the English who renamed the area New York. The Rattle Watch continued working and was supplemental by the local military garrison. Other

colonial areas, such as Boston and Philadelphia, also formed night watches and “constables whose duties included keeping the peace, ensuring public safety, and law enforcement.”⁴³

Recall that all thirteen American colonies were administered by the English government. Each colony had a Royal governor who was appointed by the King of England. The English government transplanted a number of ideas about policing and justice into their colonies. In each colony, except Georgia, a local sheriff's were appointed in every county by the Royal governor. In Georgia they were elected. The concept of the constable was a direct transplant from the English system of policing into America. The colonial constables were untrained and generally unpaid tradesmen who “were expected to keep their communities peaceful and orderly, supervise the night watch, administer punishments, and provide at least minimal protection from criminals during the day.”⁴⁴ While the constables were sometimes paid fees for the services they performed, they could also be fined for failing to provide certain services. The additional responsibility of constable was often very difficult for the tradesmen of the era who can be thought of as the small business person of today. As you can imagine, there was little incentive for someone to be a constable.

While the constables performed the day-to-day activities of maintaining social order in the cities and towns, the sheriffs in the colonies became the chief law enforcement officers in the counties. In addition to serving warrants and making arrests, sheriffs also collected fees owed to the Royal governor. Because the sheriff was in charge of policing within an area much larger than a city or town, their duties

tended to be different and they eventually became one of the first law enforcement models used as our country expanded westward. This law enforcement model exists today - Sheriffs are usually the ranking law enforcement officer in a county and the constable (or, today's chief of police) is the ranking law enforcement officer in the city or town. Because the sheriff is the ranking officer within the county, in times of emergencies he or she is often charged with coordinating mutual aid between the cities and towns within his or her county. Also, England was not the only colonizing power in America. Spain, France, the Netherlands and others established colonies. In many instances we can see the influence of the early colonizing power on different police agencies today.

By the time of the American Revolution, New York had a policing system very similar to the English system prior to Peel's reforms. The Constable was the primary law enforcement official during the day and at night, the watch was kept by "four hired bellmen who made the rounds of the city announcing the state of the weather and the hour of the night."⁴⁵ Between the time of the Dutch colonization of New York and the American Revolution, the Spanish colonizers (the Conquistadors) were busy on the West coast. The backbone of the Spanish colonization of California was a system of missions and presidios, or forts. An early and persistent problem with Spanish colonization was supplying the presidios with food. As a means to solve this problem, Antonio Bucareli, the Spanish Viceroy of California proposed establishing two farming communities. One of them was "nine miles west of San Gabriel on the banks of the little stream named El Rio de Nuestra Señora de los Ángeles de Porciúncula."⁴⁶ On September 4, 1781, six weeks before Cornwallis surrendered to George Washington,

eleven families settled El Pueblo de Nuestra Señora la Reina de los Angeles de Porciúncula,"⁴⁷ or, The Town of Our Lady the Queen of Angels of the Little Portion." As time passed, the city became simply Los Angeles.

While the Spanish were settling Los Angeles, the colonists on the east coast were winning the American Revolution. Between the time of the end of the Revolution and the adoption of our Constitution, American policing continued with the system of paid night watchmen, and in larger cities, daytime constables. However, this is a critical juncture in the ultimate development of modern American policing. Whereas English policing would continue to develop with a strong central guiding hand out of the Home Office, Americans chose policing to be mostly a local matter. Perhaps because the Revolution was about the suspension of basic Rights from afar, Americans wanted to keep the management of their police close to home. An exception to the local policing paradigm was the establishment of the first federal law enforcement agency, the United States (US) Marshal's Service.

The *Judiciary Act of 1789* established the US Marshal and our federal judiciary system. It gave the US Marshal and his deputies extensive duties in support of the court system. In addition to carrying out the orders of judges, Congress and the President, the marshals and their Deputies served the subpoenas, summonses, writs, warrants, and other processes issued by the courts, made all the arrests, and handled all the prisoners. The marshals were also expected to disperse much of the money designated to operate the court system. As an example marshals paid the fees and expenses of the court clerks, U.S. Attorneys, jurors, and witnesses. Moreover, they rented the courtrooms and jail space and hired the bailiffs, criers, and janitors. The

first marshals also did some of the tasks their modern day counterparts do, such as make sure prisoners are present, jurors are available and the witnesses are on time.

The Political Era of Policing

Between passing of the Judiciary Act in 1789 and the mid-1840s, America's population continued to grow. New York's 1790 population of 33,000 grew to over 400,000 by 1845. The same forces of increasing urbanization and industrialization that led London to adopt a full-time paid police force were pressuring American government leaders. The constable system in New York City (NYC) was overwhelmed by the social and crime problems caused by the tremendous increase in the number of people living in a relatively small area. Slums, crime and rioting plagued the city. In fact, 1845 became known as "The Year of the Riots." Although there was growing support for a police force along the lines of Peel's model, there were many who did not like the idea of a police force because they thought of it as a standing army whose presence and activities might infringe on American liberties.

In 1845, despite the opposition, the clear inadequacies of the constable system caused NYC Mayor William Havemeyer to gain passage of a police bill which created the municipal police. Nine hundred men under the leadership of the first NYC Chief of Police, George W. Matsell, took to the streets. Although the precursor to the New York Police Department (NYPD), this new police force bared little resemblance to the modern force. For the first nine years, NYC police force the officers did not wear uniforms.⁴⁸ Indeed, requiring police officers to wear uniforms was one of the most controversial aspects of early policing. Americans simply did not like the idea of a

standing army and uniformed police officers, in the minds of the people of that day, reminded them of a standing army. Secondly, early NYC police officers did not carry firearms.

Larger cities began quickly to follow New York's lead. The police forces of the mid 1800s all shared common aspects with the first NYC police force, so a slightly more in-depth history of the NYPD can give us some insight into early American policing. From the beginning of the NYC police force, the job was tied directly to the politics of the day. This era of American policing is referred to as the *Political Era* because police officers around the country were appointed by local politicians and served as police officers as long as they served the political party. Today's police officers go through a selection, testing and training process, whereas the police officers of the Political Era were given jobs as political favor. Jay Stuart Berman (1987) observed in *Police Administration and Progressive Reform: Theodore Roosevelt as Police Commissioner of New York*, "In exchange for benefits such as menial *patronage* jobs in city government, these groups pledged their allegiance and newly acquired votes to the bosses, thus supporting the continuing domination of the [political] machines. Sanctioned and, in some cases, sponsored by city officials, organized vice flourished with liquor, gambling, and prostitution providing recreation for the rich and a measure of escape for the suffering masses⁴⁹."

During the political era, NYC police officers typically served for a one or two-year period. Police officers found themselves completing all kinds of tasks which were not even remotely related to policing. For instance, even though the police officers received their job from a politician whom they supported, the officers were

often called upon to supervise elections. As you can imagine, controlling the police department was an important means to political power for both of the dominant political parties of the city and state of New York which were called the Tammany Hall Democrats and the Whigs. Struggles over who would control the police culminated in 1857 when a democrat was elected Mayor of New York. The opposition party, the Whigs, controlled the state government and decided to try and take control of city policing away from the Mayor's party. The New York State government created three new, distinct police forces - the Metropolitan Police for the City of New York, one for the City of Brooklyn, and the third for Westchester County.

As a result of the political struggles over control of the NYC police two distinct police forces now patrolled the city. The situation came to a head when the state-sponsored police attempted to arrest the Mayor on the steps of city hall. A large fight ensued between the two competing police forces. The state-sponsored police force ultimately prevailed over the city sponsored force. This resulted in state control of NYC policing until 1870, when control of the police force returned to the City. During the political era police officers did many non-law enforcement related jobs. For instance, in NYC they cleaned the streets, licensed certain establishments and conducted building inspections. The police even ran homeless shelters and by 1885, more than 134,000 people lived in the basements of police precincts because no other housing was available.

By 1882 there were approximately 2,500 police officers working in a city in excess of one million persons. As time passed, the police were performing fewer non-law enforcement jobs and concentrating more on maintaining order and arresting

criminals, but there was a lot of crime and disorder. In addition to the crime in an urban area, the police of the Political Era in NYC had to deal with vice, gangs and even pirates on the Hudson River. So, the police in the Political Era did just about everything no one else wanted to do and they did it in an era when corruption was commonplace, if not routine.

Back on the Frontier

Meanwhile, on the West Coast, the political and power structures of Spanish California were different than those of the east coast colonies which by this time were united by the Constitution into our American government. However, Spanish authorities, like their English and French counterparts, used a variety of political and administrative controls to influence local government from very far-away. According to Charles E. Chapman, *A History of California: The Spanish Period*, "The governor was the military and political head, uniting all the functions of government in his own person -- executive, legislative, and judicial. According to the changes of jurisdiction he was subject either to the viceroy or the commandant-general in military and political affairs, but to the Audiencia of Guadalajara in judicial matters."⁵⁰ While the history of California is rich and complex, for our purposes it is enough to realize that westward expansion of Americans, particularly after the Gold Rush of 1849, swept away the Spanish institutions.

The American colonization of California demonstrates many of the policing aspects of the early frontier. After the new colonists disposed of the old government (whether Spanish, Native American, French or Mexican) there wasn't any formal

system to replace it quickly. There was a significant period of time between the old governments and the new American government. Areas that experienced a rapid growth in population along with the absence of any formal government sometimes became a very lawless.

Larry Ball (1992) in *Desert Lawmen: The High Sheriffs of New Mexico and Arizona, 1846-1912*, Paints an interesting picture of Frontier life:

“The frontier had always attracted various fringe elements, from religious seekers to utopian community builders to veteran evil-doers. Arizona and New Mexico were no exception. Journalists speculated about the sources of criminal behavior. Anglos accused the Hispano community of producing many criminals. Since the Anglos controlled the press in the two territories, the Spanish-speaking community usually lost this battle on the printed page. Both elements could agree on one source of lawlessness: the international boundary. This remote and largely unpoliced region had attracted outlaws since the Mexican War. As the cattle industry spread after the Civil War, town-dwellers accused herders of being a primary source of criminal behavior. Not only did cowboys possess knowledge of guns, horses, and back trails, but their roving trade ran contrary to the best practices of sedentary, civilized life. As this debate raged in the 1880s, livestock men rebutted that villages produced just as many, or more, lawless men. Far from ranches and towns, the railroads probably increased the quotient of criminals more than any other source. The sheriffs certainly witnessed a dramatic increase in public disturbances and crime as thousands of construction workers laid the new rails across Arizona and New Mexico territories⁵¹.

Settlements on the frontier grew to become towns and small cities. Sometimes these towns and cities were in areas that were already considered United States Territory. Other large areas, like California and Texas were independent nations that became territories and then states. However, crime often forced citizen groups to form committees to deal with the crime, whether they lived in an official territory or some wilderness area yet to be proclaimed a territory. These groups and committees were called *Vigilantes*. For instance, vigilante committees were formed in both Los

Angeles and San Francisco as they were in many different frontier areas. Sometimes these citizen committees formed in response to a specific crisis like a murder or robbery and at other times there were formed because of the general disorder and crime.⁵²

Thomas J. Dimsdale (1953) provides a somewhat colorful description of the formation a vigilante committee in Montana:

“Such was the state of affairs, when five men in Virginia and four in Bannack initiated the movement which resulted in the formation of a tribunal, supported by an omnipresent executive, comprising within itself nearly every good man in the Territory, and pledged to render impartial justice to friend and foe, without regard to clime, creed, race, or politics. In a few short weeks it was known that the voice of justice had spoken in tones that might not be disregarded. The face of society was changed, as if by magic; for the Vigilantes, holding in one hand the invisible yet effectual shield of protection, and in the other, the swift descending and inevitable sword of retribution, struck from his nerveless grasp the weapon of the assassin; commanded the brawler to cease from strife; warned the thief to steal no more; bade the good citizen take courage; and compelled the ruffians and marauders who had so long maintained the "reign of terror" in Montana, to fly the Territory, or meet the just rewards of their crimes. Need we say that they were at once obeyed? Yet not before more than one hundred valuable lives had been pitilessly sacrificed and twenty-four miscreants had met a dog's doom as the reward of their crimes⁵³.”

Dimsdale provides several clues as to the operation of vigilante groups, their methods of operation and success. In his description of a vigilante committee, Dimsdale notes that the group was “invisible.” Often, these committees and groups met in secret when they decided who needed justice and how it was going to be carried out.

Second, Dimsdale’s description of lives lost and the manner in which offenders were treated let’s us know that vigilantes weren’t interested in due process nor in the manner in which justice was carried out. While the vigilantes may have succeeded in a temporary reduction in crime and disorder the price may have been very high.

After an area became a US territory, the Marshal's service assumed responsibility for law enforcement. The arrival of the Marshals caused a decrease in the formation of vigilante groups. As a territory became a state, counties were formed and the English model of a sheriff as the chief law enforcement officer of the county was duplicated across the frontier.⁵⁴ As the state government further solidified, charters were granted to cities and towns who often chose to appoint and/or elect their own town constable, town marshal or chief of police. By 1895, 45 of our current 50 states had joined the Union and the model of a Sheriff in the county and some form of police officer for the various towns and cities was fairly well adopted. However, the idea of community involvement in law enforcement was still fairly strong, particularly on the frontier. In towns, cities and counties with small police forces, the law enforcement official sometimes called upon the citizens to help in capturing a criminal. Dating back to the old English system of the Hue and Cry, this was called Posse Comitatus, or gathering a posse.

Good Government and the Police

By the end of the 19th Century, the US was a country that stretched from coast to coast. The basic models for government, including policing, were in place in most states. While there are some regional differences, most states elect the sheriff (the chief law enforcement officer in the county) and some variant of the chief of police is appointed by the city leadership. Recall earlier in the text that we saw how the New York police were very much involved with the political machine attempting to control the city. The idea of patronage, that is, getting a government job as a favor with the

expectation that the favor would be returned, was not a problem solely affecting policing. Many government jobs were gained as a result of patronage. Essentially, if you were the political party in power you had the authority to appoint people who were supportive to you in many jobs, from very important commissions to street sweepers and police officers. Moreover, the ineffectiveness and corruption seen in local policing pervaded much of local government.

As the country grew, so did the citizen expectations of the government. Thusly, a number of good government reforms began to take shape in the late 19th Century. These reform movements coincided with the beginnings of a branch of the Social Sciences - Organizational Behavior. Organizational Behavior is the study of how human beings organize themselves in order to complete a task. A key point here is that the job of policing has not developed in a vacuum. It has been tremendously affected by general developments in government, management and, as we shall see later, technology. As American policing prepared to enter the 20th Century, the basic system was in place and the strong forces of government reform, organizational behavior theorists and technology were forming to change and improve policing.

At the federal level, the forces of change took on the face of the *Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act* which the Congress passed on January 16, 1883. The Pendleton Act created the Civil Service Commission and was an effort to replace the patronage, or spoils system, that had operated within the federal government. The first civil service commissioner was the future 26th President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt remained commissioner for over ten years and the commission itself is still in existence as the Office of Personal Management in the

federal bureaucracy.

The first major scandal in American policing occurred nine years after the Pendleton Act. In the 1893, in New York, Republicans won political control of the state government. The new state government began an investigation into the democratic city government in New York and its police force.⁵⁵ Named after its chairman, Senator Charles Lexow, the Lexow Commission was the first of its kind to shine a light on the darker side of police practices. The Commission found systematic and pervasive police corruption which included brutality, election fraud, purchased appointments and promotions and that "the most influential police officials were the precinct captains, who, with the cooperation of the ward bosses, ran their commands as little fiefdoms. The captains were all-powerful within their domains, enjoying virtually unrestricted authority ranging from hiring (with the acquiescence of the local ward leader) to determining which laws would be enforced and which criminals pursued."⁵⁶

On January 15, 1884, Theodore Roosevelt, was appointed Chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the Local Government of the City and County of New York. Jay Stuart Berman (1987) observed that the reform committee focused on "two primary causes: incompetent, venal officials who wastefully mismanaged municipalities and the destructive influence of partisan politicians."⁵⁷ The committee made two recommendations that had significant effect on NYC policing, and American policing. First, they recommended the adoption of a civil service system for the recruitment, selection and training of police officers. Secondly, the committee recommended that the appointment and tenure of city administrative leaders be

strengthened and extended. Although the committee was “not specifically cognizant of a 'model' per se, they embraced a philosophy and approach to law enforcement that would later come to be known as police professionalism.”⁵⁸ This second model of policing became known as the *Professional Model of Policing*.

Somewhat based on this committee, two other aspect of today’s policing were beginning to solidify. First, the committee believed in the strengthening of centralized police executive control. Progressive reform efforts were aimed at “shifting the focus of power from the precincts to central headquarters, thus reducing the influence of neighborhood political interests on police operations and policy.”⁵⁹ The reformers felt that by centralizing police command decision-making they could remove some of the corruption that was rampant when local station commanders had complete control. The second major concept strengthened the idea of using the military model as an organizational tool. Recall that when Robert Peel organized the Irish Constabulary and later the London Metropolitan Police Force, he used a military model. Indeed, one of his first police superintendents was a former military colonel. The committee (and other reform movements) believed the military model of organizing was best for policing.”⁶⁰

In 1895, after serving on the Civil Service Commission and the reform committee, Theodore Roosevelt was appointed President of the New York City Police Commission. Whereas many municipal police agencies are led by someone with the title Chief of Police, the New York Police Department would ultimately become led by the “Commissioner.” Roosevelt instituted a number of reforms that were reproduced nationwide. He established a new set of disciplinary rules, reorganized the Detective

Bureau, formed a bicycle squad, regularly inspected firearms and instituted annual physical exams. During Roosevelt's two years, nearly 1,600 new police officers were hired not because of their political connections but because they had been selected and hired based on a civil service system that looked at physical as well as mental qualifications.

Professionalism from Within

While reform pressures and measures outside of policing were extensive, there were a large number of police officers within the system who were progressive reformers. In 1893, police executives from throughout the US traveled to Chicago and formed the National Chiefs of Police Union. The purpose of the first meeting was to improve ways of handling fugitives who had fled across jurisdictional lines. From this first meeting the National Chiefs of Police Union became the largest and most respected professional organization in the world - the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). As you will see, throughout the next 100 years the IACP will have a hand in many police reforms and innovations.

One of the earliest and perhaps best known progressive police professionals was August Vollmer. In 1905, ten years after Roosevelt had become commission in NYC, Vollmer, then 29, became the Town Marshal for the City of Berkeley, California (a town near San Francisco). Vollmer entered policing at a time when the public and people inside government were concerned with the direction of policing. As we examine Vollmer's contribution to policing it is as important to consider the way in which he introduced a technique or technology to policing as it is to consider the

impact. For instance, after taking command of the Berkeley Police Department, Vollmer expanded the force from three officers to twelve so that his force could provide day and night-time coverage to his city. In Chapter Three, when we look at scheduling and deployment, think back to Vollmer's efforts to provide continuous coverage.

As we saw earlier, the NYC police force had already developed a bicycle patrol. However, the bicycle patrol was aimed at enforcing traffic laws. Vollmer, on the other hand, placed all of his officers on bicycles. In the pre-mass automobile era, having your entire force converted from foot patrol to bicycle patrol was a unique idea. But, the way in which Vollmer introduced the idea gives us a clue into his thinking and foreshadows the way in which he would introduce other innovations. In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of bicycle patrol over foot patrol Vollmer ran a series of time tests that demonstrated officers on bicycles could respond up to three times faster to *calls for service* than officers on foot. The key concept is that Vollmer is used the scientific method to test new methods and, later, he would use the scientific method to test new technologies and other innovations. Moreover, Vollmer's search for professionalism and innovation in policing led him to bring other academic and practitioner disciplines into the field of law enforcement. In 1906, the ever curious Vollmer began to question his arrestees about the commission of their crimes. What he found was that criminals tend to use a specific method of operations, or in Latin a "*Modus Operandi*."

Vollmer's interest in the use of science in police work may be best exemplified by his own words in 1932 he wrote a foreword for John A. Larson's book *Lying and Its*

Detection: A Study of Deception and Deception Tests:

“In this book the vast literature relating to deception is critically analyzed, and excerpts from the best works on the subject are arranged in an orderly manner. The various types of deceptions are defined and classified. Deceivers are placed in their pigeonholes so that each type is readily recognizable. A detailed description is given of the physical and mental manifestations of deception in normal and abnormal persons. Ancient and modern methods employed by law enforcement officials to determine guilt or innocence are shown to be inefficient; and finally, a comprehensive outline of scientific efforts to develop a deception technique is given, including the author's researches in California and Illinois.”⁶¹

You are reading this text book because of an innovation brought about by August Vollmer because in 1908 Vollmer developed the idea for a police school. Vollmer's idea wasn't just a police academy where the fundamentals of policing were taught. His idea was the forerunner of the hundreds of academic criminal justice related programs we see in universities and colleges today. Vollmer brought university professors and police officers together to design courses for police officers in subjects ranging from criminal law to first aid. It was Vollmer's mix of the academic and practitioner points of view that made many innovations unique. Indeed, this police school was so successful and comprehensive for its day that in 1917 it was lengthened from one year to a three year course.

By the time Vollmer's police school was being lengthened, science and technology were making themselves felt in many Americans lives. The automobile was becoming a mass market produced vehicle, the radio was beginning to be used for commercial purposes and telephone and electrical lines were being rapidly strung in cities, towns and some rural areas. While Vollmer wasn't the only police executive to see the potential of these new technologies in police work he was certainly at the forefront of their use. Just as he put his foot officers on bicycles, in 1917 he put all

of his officers in motor vehicles. Vollmer was not the first to adopt the automobile, but he was the first to adopt it wholesale.

A year earlier, in 1916, Vollmer created a position with which many American television viewers are familiar; the Criminalist. Vollmer convinced a professor of pharmacology and bacteriology to lead Berkeley's criminal investigation laboratory. Nearly a hundred years ago the first "Grissom" began to use science in the pursuit of truth. But Vollmer wasn't satisfied with bringing in experts; he wanted to increase the professional abilities of all police officers. You see, Vollmer intuitively understood what all good cops learn, police work is about working with people under extreme conditions and the different disciplines and sciences, such as physiology, economics, biology and a host of others are the foundations for working with the human condition. Understanding that knowledgeable cops are good cops, Vollmer began to recruit college students as part-time police officers. Again, Vollmer introduced the internship journey that you will likely take as an undergraduate. Vollmer's paid internship or "college cops" as they were called resulted in several leaders in the professionalizing of policing like O.W. Wilson.

Vollmer's innovations in policing caught the attention of many city leaders. In 1923, Vollmer left Berkeley and headed to Los Angeles where he assumed the role of chief of police. During World War I (1914-1918), the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) became involved in the enforcement of certain federal crimes. Indeed, much of the force would be organized into a special Home Guard unit during the war. By the time Vollmer arrived, he would find that the LAPD was very corrupt. Indeed, many of the corruption issues the Lexow commission found in the NYPD could also be

found in Los Angeles. Perhaps corruption was also heightened by the Prohibition against alcohol consumption which took effect on January 16, 1920. This was definitely the era of the rise of organized crime in America. While rural areas had their "moon shiners" big cities like Chicago, had Al Capone, New York had Charlie "Lucky" Luciano, and Los Angeles had Carlo Matranga.

The National Prohibition Act of 1919, enforced the Eighteenth Amendment to our Constitution and prohibited the consumption of alcohol. The act is commonly referred to as the Volstead Act because it was sponsored by Representative Andrew Volstead (Republican from Minnesota).

During Vollmer's short one-year term as chief of the LAPD he laid the ground work for later department reforms. Some of Vollmer's interesting work helps to span the historical breadth of police work. For instance, while in Los Angeles, Vollmer hired former criminals as a means of gather information on criminal enterprises in the city. Recall that the "thief takers" over two hundred years prior were primarily criminals hired to catch other criminals.

Vollmer also continued his use of testing in an effort to place the right person in the right job. As a result of testing thousands of LAPD officers Vollmer reassigned many of them to different jobs within the department. Unfortunately, his efforts at reform undermined his popularity within and without the department and Vollmer left LAPD, returning to Berkeley in 1924. A little less than three years later, in 1927, William H. Parker joined the LAPD as a police officer.

Professional Crime Fighters

All the seeds of what would become the modern American police force are nearly in place post World War II: The basic model has been borrowed from England and modified to fit our notion of local control; civil service testing as a means of selecting police officers is set; the use of the military model and scientific management ideas has been added; science and technology are forcing their way into policing; and, progressive academics and practitioners are in place to root out corruption and properly mix the ingredients. There are a few things missing and it will take the three decades (between the 1920s and 1950s) for the professional model of policing to fully bloom.

While all the ingredients were in place for the professional model to take hold, what was missing was a clearly defined mission for the professional police officers to do. Recall that during the political model, especially in New York, police officers were involved in all sorts of tasks that we don't, today, associate with police work. During the 1930s policing found its primary goal - crime fighting. In Chapter Two we will take in-depth look at the functions of law enforcement at the various levels - federal, state and local. But, there is a little history that will help explain how both the police and the public began to develop the image of police officers as crime fighters.

We have to back track a little to see how the "crime fighter" mission and image emerged. Recall that the US Marshal's Service was the first federal law enforcement agency. In 1865, shortly after the Civil War, a second federal law enforcement agency was born, the US Secret Service. The Post-Civil War boom in

counterfeiting motivated the federal government to establish the Secret Service with a sole purpose in mind; the protection of US Currency. Later, the Secret Service took on the additional duty of dignitary protection. In 1909, under the Department of Justice, the Bureau of Investigations was established. In 1935, the Bureau of Investigations became the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

In 1924, J. Edgar Hoover was appointed as the head of the FBI. Hoover undertook two missions. First, he sought to enhance the professional reputation of the FBI with strict hiring, educational and training standards. He also worked to enhance the professional reputation by adopting many innovations in policing, especially anything having to do with science. Indeed, in 1932, Hoover established the FBI's National Crime Laboratory. Hoover worked just as hard at his second goal; enhancing the professional image of the FBI. It wasn't enough that they were professional, corruption free and innovative, people had to believe that they were. As the public began to view the FBI as the epitome of the professional crime fighter, so too did police officers around the country.

The FBI, working with the IACP, established the national fingerprint repository and the FBI's National Academy for local law enforcement professionals. While the FBI was working to fine tune its methods and image, things were definitely changing in America's large urban areas.

By 1930, New York had grown to a metropolis of almost seven million people and the police department had grown to nearly 7,500. Modern management techniques and technology were beginning to be seen in NYC. Indeed, it is said that the NYPD combined the two technologies that would change and define American law

enforcement for the better part of the 20th Century: the radio and the automobile. Of course, at the early part of the 20th Century, NYPD would still be heavily dependant on the horse with more than 800 of the animals dedicated to traffic control.

New York, like Chicago, was particularly affected by Prohibition. For instance, a gang war over the control of illegal alcohol saw dozens of shootings and murders committed between two gangs - the Irish White Hand and the mostly Italian Black Hand. In addition to the wars between the organized crime families and gangs there were vicious robberies, murders and wars between the lesser organized gangs like the Candy Kid Gang and the Cake Eaters Gang. Don't be fooled by the names; these gangs were as vicious as today's modern street gangs. In response to gang warfare, the NYPD created the Gunman's Squad. Sixty heavily armed police officers (who even had motorcycles with armor plating) hunted down street gangs and some organized crime members. Fighting crime became something akin to warfare with 57 NYPD officers killed in the 1920s alone.

In 1920, the prohibition against the consumption of alcohol made criminals out of ordinary people who were not and might never have become criminals. This is important because as organized crime began to take over the illegal production and distribution of alcohol ordinary people purchased alcohol knowing that the illegal consumption and distribution of alcohol was contributing to the growth of organized crime. Moreover, the amount of money generated by the illegal sales of alcohol dwarfed any organized, street-level, criminal activity to that time. Criminal organizations (gangs) fought for control over a substance for which people wanted to

consume. Street wars over the control and the public's acceptance of those wars rose.

By 1929 it was clear that crime was out of control across the nation. In May of that year, President Herbert Hoover appointed George W. Wickersham to head the National Committee on Law Observation and Enforcement. As with many "blue ribbon" committees, it became popularly known by the last name of its chairman as the Wickersham Committee. The President charged the eleven-member group with the responsibility of identifying the causes of crime and making recommendations. Naturally, the Commission focused on the crimes caused by the widespread and organized crime associated with the prohibition against alcohol. The Wickersham Committee surprised many people when, instead of recommending the repeal of prohibition it recommended more aggressive law enforcement. Clearly, the attitude of the times was to fight crime, not change the law. Reflecting back on the history of policing, we can see that the mission of "crime fighter" was added to the professional model during the 1920s and 1930s.

Policing becomes Incident Driven

In 1950, in the wake of a "Bloody Sunday" corruption scandal, William W. Parker was appointed Chief of the LAPD. Parker was a strict, corruption free police administrator who would do more than any other police executive, to that point, to bring all of the ideas of professional policing into his administration. Just as Parker was taking LAPD's helm, O.W. Wilson was making the most dramatic academic contribution to date. Recall that Wilson was one of Vollmer's college cops. Wilson

had his own successful career as a police officer and executive. He published a text book, *Police Administration*, which captured and presented in one work all of the previous decades improvements in policing. Indeed, as Vila and Morris (1999), observed, his work “clearly defined a 'professional model' for police organizations. The key concepts of Wilson's approach were administrative efficiency fostered by a semi-military hierarchy. Other essential elements were police integrity, education, and training. The textbook, which also dealt with a variety of technical, administrative, and management topics, became required reading for any police officer who aspired to promotion.”⁶²

Over his 16 years as chief of the LAPD, Parker would ingrain nearly all of Wilson's concepts into the LAPD. And, like Hoover, Parker knew the value of image and worked to not only improve the professional ability of the LAPD, but its public image as well. Perhaps because LAPD polices the movie capitol of the world (yes, Hollywood is actually a part of the City of Los Angeles), Parker was able to use radio, movies and later television to enhance the public's perception of the Department and export the idea of the “Thin Blue Line” to every police agency in the US.

Thus far we have seen that American policing developed two distinct Models - the Political and the Professional. Before we move to the third model, there is an in-between stage that we should examine so that we can understand the model with which modern police agencies are experimenting. For the NYPD, the use of Radio Motor Patrol (RMP) cars dates back to 1932. In Los Angeles (LA), radio equipped cars simply became “radio cars.” Within their first six months of use in NYC, the RMP officers were able to respond to 5,000 calls for service and make 377 arrests. Early

RMPs in NYC and radio cars in LA were one-way; they could only receive calls. None-the-less, police administrators were quick to grasp the potential improvement to the efficiency of the police through the use of radio dispatched vehicles.

Recall that police administrators were now being heavily influenced by academic works that touted the administration or business side of policing. They wanted police officers to be corruption free, efficient and effective. Of the three, efficiency is easily the clearest to measure. As the 1960s and 1970s passed, police administrators emphasized efficiency. They counted how many calls for service, citations or arrests an individual officer made. The police officer responded by responding more quickly and doing more of the things their supervisor counted. You simply get what you count.

By 1950, all NYPD police vehicles were equipped with two-way radios and LAPD vehicles would soon be similarly equipped. Indeed, on both coasts, NYPD and LAPD were setting standards for police agencies around country. Hiring, selection and promotional standards, although somewhat different from agency to agency, were in place in most of the US. The ideas of efficient police management and supervision had taken hold and police officers of this era were doing what they were asked to do respond quickly to calls for service, make arrest and issue citations.

As policing headed into the 1960s, it had solidified the Professional Model of police officers in vehicles being dispatched from a central location to calls for service. As technology continued to improve, the advent of the Universal Emergency Number 9-1-1 and technology like Computer Aided Dispatch increased police reliance on the model. However, as the 1960s and the 1970s passed it was clear that while the police

were being efficient, there were not being effective. During the 1964 presidential campaigns, "law and order" and "crime in the streets" became key campaign issues. Moreover, in his first message to Congress in 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson initiated the idea of a commission to explore "fully and deeply into the problems of crime in our nation." This led to the creation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.⁶³

The commission found that, between 1933 and 1965, our country's population had increased by 47%, yet the crime rate for forcible rape tripled; aggravated assault doubled; robbery increased 20%; and, that property crimes had increased much more than these crimes of violence.⁶⁴ As Robert Winslow noted in *Crime in a Free Society: Selections from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice*, "Taken together they raise a multitude of questions about how the police, the courts, and corrections should be organized; how their personnel should be selected, trained and paid; what modern technology can do to help their work; what kinds of knowledge they need; what procedures they should use; what resources they should be given; what the relations between the community and the various parts of the criminal justice system should be."⁶⁵

During the 1960s and 1970s, crime and community dissatisfaction with the police was at an all time high. The Professional Model of policing had created very good administrative controls in many departments. This meant, that as police officers went about their daily duties, they were collecting data on the number of calls they handled, arrests they made, citations they issued and so forth. This data and the information from the Uniformed Crime Reports (a subject further examined in

Chapter Two), provided a rich source of information for academic researchers. Since our police were now well established professionals and relatively corruption free, research and development could turn from efficiency to effectiveness.

Back to the Future: Problem Solving and the Community

Two early experiments in policing paved the way for continuing research and development in a new policing model. From October 1972 through September 1973, the Kansas City Preventive Patrol experiment was conducted. Although somewhat controversial, this research project "found that decreasing or increasing the level of police patrol in a given area had no significant impact on the level of crime, police response time, people's fear of crime, or their attitudes toward police service in that area."⁶⁶ A subsequent study in Kansas City also found that police response to calls for service did not lead to an increase in the apprehension of offenders. In that second study it was noted that almost two-thirds of the crimes were not reported quickly enough for rapid response to have been effective. That is, for an arrest to have been made.

In New Jersey, research found "while foot patrol did not actually lead to reduced crime in a neighborhood, it did lead to increased public order in the community. The foot patrol officers kept an eye on strangers, and also helped to keep "disreputable regulars" such as drunks, drug addicts, prostitutes, panhandlers, loiterers, rowdy teenagers, and others under control. As a result, people's fears of being "bothered by disorderly people" decreased, and their perceptions of public safety increased, despite the fact that crime levels had not actually gone down."⁶⁷

In 1979, Herman Goldstein, a leading scholar and researcher into police matters, developed the idea of *Problem Orientated Policing*. Goldstein, like many police officers, realized that the professional model had morphed into an incident driven model. Under the incident driven model, police officers responded to call after call, often at the same location for the same general problem. Because police officers were evaluated by the supervisors on the number of calls to which they responded there was little incentive to take a deeper look at the problem. In fact, some rules and regulations prevented police officers from taking the time and the measures necessary to attempt to examine and fix the problem. Herman Goldstein, in *Problem-Orientated Policing* sums up how the Professional Model of policing became incident driven and ultimately ineffective:

“In an effort to make the police apolitical, the police were sometimes cut off from all accountability to the public. In the desire to achieve effective controls over their personnel, administrators often destroyed important contacts with members of the community, stifled imitative, and created a negative, distrustful working environment. And to achieve a high level of efficiency, operative procedures were adopted that, in retrospect, irritated citizens on whose cooperation the police depended and reduced the effectiveness of the police in meeting community expectations.”⁶⁸

Goldstein proposed that police officers (and police leaders) look at policing in a different way. He believed that fixing problems that led to multiple calls for service was a better model of policing. This new model moved away from the reactive, incident driven model to actively seeking answers to problems that were at the root of community disorder. In Newport News, Virginia, a study on the implementation of a problem orientated policing model found that it was an effective way to work with the community in an effort to solve the root causes of disorder.

In 1982, James Q. Wilson and George Kelling, two leading scholars in

government studies, published an article in the Atlantic Monthly entitled Broken Windows. They added to Goldstein's idea of addressing the root problems of disorder when they "argued that the police role should be expanded beyond law enforcement to include active participation in maintaining and/or improving the quality of community life through an increased focus on order maintenance."⁶⁹ The authors explained the power of order maintenance with a few sentences:

"Consider a building with a few broken windows. If the windows are not repaired, the tendency is for vandals to break a few more windows. Eventually, they may even break into the building, and if it's unoccupied, perhaps become squatters or light fires inside. Or consider a sidewalk. Some litter accumulates. Soon, more litter accumulates. Eventually, people even start leaving bags of trash from take-out restaurants there or breaking into cars."⁷⁰

What Wilson and Kelling argued was that small problems often lead to larger problems, and by focusing our efforts when problems were small we could prevent larger issues. Through these scholars, and many others, the current model of policing has developed into the Community Orientated Policing (COP) model.

You should note that there is no one universally accepted model of COP. Indeed, it is a work in progress which is being experimented with by thousands of police agencies across our country. However, there are few common threads that bind these various ways of policing into the banner of community policing. Some of the major commonalities here:

- Nearly all of the models have some problem solving component. Some agencies have problem solving teams while others assign officers to a specific beat or area and give them time to identify and work on the problems;

- Most of the models incorporate partnerships with the community. This can happen in number of ways and on number of levels. Some agencies define communities by strict geographic regions and then work to engender community support and input into the problems. Other agencies tend to define communities by problem, for instance, if there was a problem within a local park the community would be defined by people who may or may not live nearby such as local residents, park users, park employees, etc;
- Many of the models promote decentralization of decision making and responsibility for the outcomes down to the lowest level in the organization - the cop on the beat;
- Fewer of the models actually incorporate their entire organizations into the COP model. In these organizations all employees are expected to become problem-solvers, form partnerships and be make decisions within their area of responsibility.

In 1994, William Bratton became the commissioner of the NYPD. Eight years later, in 2002, he was hired by the City of Los Angeles as Chief of Police. In both cities, Bratton employed the new model of policing, concentrating on solving small crime and disorder problems in order to cause a decrease in larger, often more violent crime. It is clear that during his terms in both departments crime decreased, substantially. What is less clear is the relationship between the implementation of the COP/POP models of policing and the reduction in crime. During the same period, most of America experienced a decrease in crime similar to the ones experienced by

New York and Los Angeles. Some argue that the decrease was larger in New York during Bratton's tenure than elsewhere, others scholars are not convinced.

As we move into the 21st Century the next era policing remains to be written by students and practitioners like you. Of course, like all the Centurions before you, occasionally your apprenticeship will involve standing in the rain and you will learn your profession through the rich oral history of the Centurions standing out there now.

About the Author

Lieutenant Raymond E. Foster, LAPD (ret.) was a sworn member of the Los Angeles Police Department for 24 years. He retired in 2003 at the rank of Lieutenant. He holds a bachelor's from the Union Institute and University in Criminal Justice Management and a Master's Degree in Public Financial Management from California State University, Fullerton. He completed all the course work for his doctoral studies in business research. Raymond is a graduate of the West Point Leadership program and has attended law enforcement, technology and leadership programs such as the National Institute for Justice, Technology Institute, Washington, DC.

Raymond is currently a part-time lecturer at California State University, Fullerton and the Union Institute and University. He has experience teaching upper division courses in law enforcement, public policy, technology and leadership. Raymond is an experienced author who has published numerous articles in a wide range of venues including magazines such as Government Technology, Mobile Government, Airborne Law Enforcement Magazine, and Police One. He has appeared on the History Channel and radio programs in the United States and Europe as subject matter expert in technological applications in law enforcement. For instance, he was recently interviewed by the London Independent on the use of cellular telephone technology in explosive devices.

His first book, "Police Technology (Prentice Hall, July 2004)" is used in over 40 colleges and universities nationwide. Raymond has two additional contracts with Prentice Hall to publish works on global terrorism and an introduction to policing. As an outgrowth of his writing, Raymond maintains two websites and acts as the editor of a monthly newsletter with a growing subscriber base.

Raymond can be reached through the Criminal Justice Forum at www.criminaljustice-online.com or by email at raymond@hitechcj.com.

End Notes

- ¹ This conversation occurred in 1985 between police officer Raymond E. Foster and Sergeant Jack Hoar.
- ² Roth, M. (2000) Historical Dictionary of Law Enforcement. Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport, CT., p 273.
- ³ Asimov, I. (1965). The Greeks: A great Adventure. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA.
- ⁴ Michael H. Crawford "Twelve Tables" *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. Oxford University Press, 1998. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. Cal State Fullerton/Mission Viejo. 19 February 2006
- ⁵ "quaestors" *The Concise Oxford Companion to Classical Literature*. Ed. M.C. Howatson and Ian Chilvers. Oxford University Press, 1996. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. Cal State Fullerton/Mission Viejo. 19 February 2006
- ⁶ Roth, M. (2000) Historical Dictionary of Law Enforcement. Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport, CT., p 285.
- ⁷ Roth, M. (2000) Historical Dictionary of Law Enforcement. Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport, CT., p. ix.
- ⁸ *The Columbia Encyclopedia* 6th ed., s.v. "Statute," 6).
- ⁹ Bradford B. Broughton, *Dictionary of Medieval Knighthood and Chivalry Concepts and Terms* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 212
- ¹⁰ J. E. A. Jolliffe, *The Constitutional History of Medieval England: From the English Settlement to 1485* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1937), 60,
- ¹¹ Bradford B. Broughton, *Dictionary of Medieval Knighthood and Chivalry Concepts and Terms* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 258,
- ¹² Bradford B. Broughton, *Dictionary of Medieval Knighthood and Chivalry Concepts and Terms* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 119,
- ¹³ Helen M. Cam, *The Hundred and the Hundred Rolls: An Outline of Local Government in Medieval England* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1930), 1.
- ¹⁴ Helen M. Cam, *The Hundred and the Hundred Rolls: An Outline of Local Government in Medieval England* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1930), 1.
- ¹⁵ J. David Hirschel, and William Wakefield, *Criminal Justice in England and the United States* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1995), 24,
- ¹⁶ Charles Austin Beard, *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in Its Origin and Development: In Its Origin and Development* (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1904)
- ¹⁷ Charles Austin Beard, *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in Its Origin and Development: In Its Origin and Development* (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1904)
- ¹⁸ Charles Austin Beard, *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in Its Origin and Development: In Its Origin and Development* (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1904), 165.
- ¹⁹ Charles Austin Beard, *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in Its Origin and Development: In Its Origin and Development* (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1904), 166
- ²⁰ Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 16.
- ²¹ Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 20.
- ²² Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 20.
- ²³ Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 14,
- ²⁴ Peter Jimack, "Chapter 9 The French Enlightenment I: Science, Materialism and Determinism," in *British Philosophy and the Age of Enlightenment* ed. Stuart Brown (New York: Routledge, 1996), 236.
- ²⁵ Clive Emsley, "The Origins of the Modern Police," *History Today*, April 1999, 8,
- ²⁶ Frank Morn, *A History of the Pinkerton National Detective Agency A History of the Pinkerton National Detective Agency* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982), 5,
- ²⁷ J. David Hirschel, and William Wakefield, *Criminal Justice in England and the United States* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1995), 72.
- ²⁸ Frank Morn, *A History of the Pinkerton National Detective Agency A History of the Pinkerton National Detective Agency* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982), 5.
- ²⁹ J. David Hirschel, and William Wakefield, *Criminal Justice in England and the United States* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1995), 24.

-
30. Frank Morn, *A History of the Pinkerton National Detective Agency* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982), 5.
- ³¹ Actually Fielding proposed the use of light horse. Light horse differs from cavalry in that light horse is configured to fight dismounted. However, the authors felt that students would probably understand cavalry rather than light horse, and that a longer explanation would not add to the discussion of the history of policing.
32. Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 31,
- ³³ Frank Morn, *A History of the Pinkerton National Detective Agency* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982), 5,
34. Clive Emsley, *Crime and Society in England, 1750-1900* 2nd ed., (London: Longman, 1996), 61,
- ³⁵ Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 20.
- ³⁶ Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 20.
- ³⁷ Department of State Publication No. 10610, Office of Secretary of State, Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Released April 1999.
38. Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 65,
- ³⁹ Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 65,
- ⁴⁰ Statutes, 10 Geo. IV cap. 44, An Act for improving the Police in and near the Metropolis (19 June 1829)
41. Douglas G. Browne, *The Rise of Scotland Yard: A History of the Metropolitan Police* (London: George G. Harrap, 1956), 81,
- ⁴² <http://www.bridgend.org.uk/History/History.html>
- ⁴³ Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, eds., *The Role of Police in American Society A Documentary History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 3,
- ⁴⁴ Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, eds., *The Role of Police in American Society A Documentary History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 4,
45. Bayrd Still, *Mirror for Gotham: New York as Seen by Contemporaries from Dutch Days to the Present* (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 30.
46. David Lavender, *California: Land of New Beginnings* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 58
47. David Lavender, *California: Land of New Beginnings* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 60
48. Bayrd Still, *Mirror for Gotham: New York as Seen by Contemporaries from Dutch Days to the Present* (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 137.
49. Jay Stuart Berman, *Police Administration and Progressive Reform: Theodore Roosevelt as Police Commissioner of New York* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 2,
50. Charles E. Chapman, *A History of California: The Spanish Period* (New York: Macmillan, 1991), 394,
51. Larry D. Ball, *Desert Lawmen: The High Sheriffs of New Mexico and Arizona, 1846-1912* 1st ed., (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1992), 180,
52. Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, eds., *The Role of Police in American Society A Documentary History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 24,
53. Thomas J. Dimsdale, *The Vigilantes of Montana: Or, Popular Justice in the Rocky Mountains. Being a Correct and Impartial Narrative of the Chase, Trial, Capture, and Execution of Henry Plummer's Road Agent Band, Together with Accounts of the Lives and Crimes of Many of the Robbers and Desperadoes* (Norma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953), 15,
54. Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, eds., *The Role of Police in American Society A Documentary History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 24,
- ⁵⁵ McDonald, William & Paromchik, Sergei (1996), Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Comparing Firsthand Knowledge with Experience from the West, College of Police and Security Studies, Slovenia retrieved on March 26, 2006, from
56. Jay Stuart Berman, *Police Administration and Progressive Reform: Theodore Roosevelt as Police Commissioner of New York* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 62.
- ⁵⁷ Jay Stuart Berman, *Police Administration and Progressive Reform: Theodore Roosevelt as Police Commissioner of New York* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 4.
58. Jay Stuart Berman, *Police Administration and Progressive Reform: Theodore Roosevelt as Police Commissioner of New York* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 6.
59. Jay Stuart Berman, *Police Administration and Progressive Reform: Theodore Roosevelt as Police Commissioner of New York* (New

York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 63.

60. Jay Stuart Berman, *Police Administration and Progressive Reform: Theodore Roosevelt as Police Commissioner of New York* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 60.

61. John A. Larson, *Lying and Its Detection: A Study of Deception and Deception Tests* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), vii.

62. Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, eds., *The Role of Police in American Society A Documentary History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 134,

⁶³ O'Bryant, J. & Seghetti, L. (2002) Crime Control: The Federal Response. Congressional Research Service, retrieved from http://www.policyalmanac.org/crime/archive/crs_federal_crime_policy.shtml on March 28, 2006.

64. Robert W. Winslow, *Crime in a Free Society: Selections from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice* (Belmont, CA: Dickenson Publishing, 1968), 46.

65. Robert W. Winslow, *Crime in a Free Society: Selections from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice* (Belmont, CA: Dickenson Publishing, 1968), 3.

66. Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, eds., *The Role of Police in American Society A Documentary History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 210

67. Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, eds., *The Role of Police in American Society A Documentary History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 236,

⁶⁸ Goldstein, Herman. (1990). Problem-Orientated Policing. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

69. Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris, eds., *The Role of Police in American Society A Documentary History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 236,

⁷⁰ Wilson, J. & Kelling, G. (1982). Broken Windows, Atlantic Monthly.