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Flashback: Moments in American Police History

The First American Police Officer
The day the first American police officer went out on patrol, he had received no training, patrolled on foot, had no two-way radio, could not be dispatched through a 911 system, and carried no weapon. Moreover, he had little education, received no formal preservice training, and had no manual of policies or procedures. Policing in 1838, in short, was completely different from what it is today.

Flash Forward: 1950
The 1950 police officer worked in a very different situation. He probably had a high school education (and he was definitely a male, because there were no women on patrol for another sixteen years), may have had some brief academy training but no in-service training, and had a policy and procedure manual, which, however, contained no policies on when to use deadly force, how to handle domestic violence incidents, or when to do a high-speed pursuit. He did not have to worry about any Supreme Court rulings on police procedure, and did not worry too much about being disciplined if he beat up someone with his billy club. Policing had changed a lot since 1838, but was still a long way from where it would be in 2010.

The police today are the product of their history. This chapter examines the history of the American police, from its roots in England and colonial America down to present-day issues related to community policing, racial profiling, and other matters.
Why Study Police History?

Why study police history? The history of the American police can help us understand policing today. Many people believe the police do not change. That is a myth. In fact, American policing has changed tremendously, even in the last several years. David Bayley argues that “the last decade of the twentieth century may be the most creative period in policing since the modern police officer was put onto the streets of London in 1829.”

Studying this history can help us understand how and why important changes occur. Racial profiling, for example, is nothing new. The police–community relations problem has a long history. It is useful to understand why it continues despite many reforms intended to eliminate discrimination. The patrol car revolutionized police work, and it is important to understand both its positive contributions and its negative effects.

The English Heritage

American policing is a product of its English heritage. The English colonists brought a criminal justice system as part of their cultural baggage. This heritage included the English common law, the high value placed on individual rights, the court systems and forms of punishment, and different law enforcement agencies.

The English heritage contributed three enduring features to American policing. The first is a tradition of limited police authority. The Anglo American legal tradition places a high value on individual liberty and on governmental authority. In the United States, these limits are embodied in the Bill of Rights. Continental European countries, by contrast, give their law enforcement agencies much broader powers. German citizens, for example, are required to carry identity cards and report changes of address to police authorities.

The second feature is a tradition of local control of law enforcement agencies. Almost every other country in the world has a centralized, national police force.

The third feature, which is a consequence of local control, is a highly decentralized and fragmented system of law enforcement. The United States is unique in

The Relevance of History

The study of police history can:

1. Highlight the fact of change.
2. Put current problems into perspective.
3. Help us understand which reforms have worked.
4. Alert us to the unintended consequences of reforms.
having about 15,000 separate law enforcement agencies, subject only to minimal coordination and very little national control or regulation.  

Formal law enforcement agencies emerged in England in the thirteenth century, and over the years evolved in an unsystematic fashion. Responsibility for law enforcement and keeping the peace was shared by the constable, the sheriff, and the justice of the peace. Private citizens, however, retained much of the responsibility for law enforcement, pursuing offenders on their own and initiating criminal cases. This approach was brought to America and persisted into the nineteenth century.  

**Creation of the Modern Police: London, 1829**

Robert Peel is the “father” of modern policing. An important political leader in England, he fought for over 30 years to improve law enforcement in that country. By the early 1900s, the old system of law enforcement collapsed under the impact of urbanization and industrialization. London suffered from poverty, disorder, ethnic conflict, and crime. The 1780 Gordon riots, a clash between Irish immigrants and English citizens, triggered a 50-year debate over how to provide better public safety. Peel finally persuaded Parliament to create the **London Metropolitan Police** in 1829. It is recognized as the first modern police force, and officers are still known as “Bobbies” in honor of Peel.  

What exactly is “modern” about the type of policing created by Peel? The three core elements involve the mission, strategy, and organizational structure of the police. The mission of Peel’s new police was **crime prevention**. This reflected the utilitarian idea that it is better to prevent crime than to respond after the fact. Before the London Police, all law enforcement was reactive, responding to crimes that had been committed.  

The strategy for implementing the mission of crime prevention was preventive patrol. Peel introduced the idea of officers patrolling fixed “beats” to maintain a visible police presence throughout the community. This presence was designed to deter crime.  

The organizational structure for organizing police operations was borrowed from the military. This included a hierarchical organization, uniforms, rank designations, and an authoritarian system of command and discipline. This “quasi-military” style still exists in American police administration today.  

The modern police represented a new concept in social control. Allan Silver argues that a continuous presence of police reflected a growing “demand for order” in urban industrial society. David Bayley, meanwhile, argues that to accomplish this the modern police are “public, specialized, and professional.” Public, or government, agencies have the primary responsibility for public safety. They have a specialized mission of law enforcement and crime prevention. Finally, they are professional in the sense that they are full-time, paid employees. Bayley cautions that these characteristics did not appear all at once. Although 1829 is traditionally cited as the birth of the London police, in reality all the new features did not appear for many decades. The American police, in particular, were slow to become fully “modern.”
Law Enforcement in Colonial America

When the first English colonists in America created their own law enforcement agencies, they borrowed from their English heritage (Sidebar 2–2). The three important institutions were the sheriff, the constable, and the watch. In the new environment of America, however, these institutions acquired distinctive American features.9

The sheriff was the most important law enforcement official in America. Appointed by the colonial governor, the sheriff had a very broad role that included law enforcement, collecting taxes, supervising elections, maintaining bridges and roads, and other miscellaneous duties.10

The constable also had responsibility for enforcing the law and carrying out certain legal duties. Initially an elective position, the constable gradually evolved into a semiprofessional appointed office. In Boston and several other cities, the office of constable became a desirable and often lucrative position.11

The watch most resembled the modern-day police. Watchmen patrolled the city to guard against fires, crime, and disorder. At first there was only a night watch. As towns grew larger, they added a day watch. Boston created its first watch in 1634. Following the English tradition, all adult males were expected to serve as watchmen. Many men tried to avoid this duty, either by outright evasion or by paying others to serve in their place. Eventually, the watch evolved into a paid professional position.12

The slave patrol was a distinctly American form of law enforcement. In southern states where slavery existed, it was intended to guard against slave revolts and capture runaway slaves. In some respects, the slave patrols were actually the first modern police forces in this country. The Charleston, South Carolina, slave patrol had about 100 officers in 1837 and was far larger than any northern city police force at that time.13

EXHIBIT 2–1

Law Enforcement Institutions in Colonial America
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The Quality of Colonial Law Enforcement

Colonial law enforcement was inefficient, corrupt, and affected by political interference. Contrary to popular myth, there was never a “golden age” of efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity in American policing.

With respect to crime, the sheriff, the constable, and the watch had little capacity to prevent crime or apprehend offenders. They were reactive, responding to complaints brought to them. Although watchmen patrolled, they were too few in number to really prevent crime. They did not have enough personnel to investigate many crimes. Crime victims could not easily report crimes. Finally, the sheriff and the watchmen were paid by fees for particular services. As a result, they had greater incentive to work on their civil responsibilities, which offered more certain payment, than on criminal law enforcement.  

Colonial agencies were also ill-equipped to maintain order. With very few watchmen on duty, there was little they could do in response to public drunkenness, disputes, or riots. Cities were in fact very disorderly in those years. Nor could citizens easily report disturbances. Finally, providing both routine and emergency service to the public, as today’s police do, was not a regular part of the sheriff’s or the constable’s job.

In practice, ordinary citizens played a major role in maintaining social control through informal means: a comment, a warning, or a rebuke from friends or neighbors, or a “trial” by the church congregation for misbehavior. This system worked because communities were small and homogeneous. There was much face-to-face contact, and people shared the same basic values. Eventually, however, the system broke down as communities grew into larger, diverse towns and cities.  

If policing was ineffective in cities and towns, it was almost nonexistent on the frontier. Organized government did not appear in many areas for decades. As a result, settlers relied on their own resources and often took the law into their own hands. The result was a terrible tradition of vigilantism that lasted into the twentieth century, and represented some of the worst aspects of American criminal justice. Frequently, mobs drove out of town or even killed people whom they did not like. The lynching of African Americans was used to maintain the system of racial segregation in the South.  

Corruption appeared very early. The criminal law was even more moralistic than today, with many restrictions on drinking, gambling, and sexual practices. As a result, people bribed law enforcement officials to overlook violation of the law.

The First Modern American Police

Modern police forces were established in the United States in the 1830s and 1840s. As in England, the old system of law enforcement broke down under the impact of urbanization, industrialization, and immigration. In the 1830s, a wave of riots struck American cities. Boston had major riots in 1834, 1835, and 1837. Philadelphia, New York, Cincinnati, Detroit, and other cities all had major disturbances. In 1838, Abraham Lincoln, then a member of the Illinois state legislature, warned of the “increasing disregard for law which pervades the country.”
Many riots were clashes between different ethnic groups: Irish or German immigrants versus native-born English Protestants. Other riots were economic in nature: angry depositors vandalized failed banks, for example. Moral issues also produced violence. People objecting to medical research on cadavers attacked hospitals; residents of Detroit staged several “whorehouse riots,” attempting to close down houses of prostitution. Finally, pro-slavery whites attacked abolitionists and free black citizens in northern cities.\(^\text{18}\)

Despite the breakdown in law and order, Americans moved very slowly in creating new police forces. New York City did not create a new police force until 1845, 11 years after the first serious riots. Philadelphia could not make up its mind, creating and abolishing several different law enforcement agencies between 1834 and 1854, before finally creating a consolidated, citywide police force on the London model.\(^\text{19}\)

Americans were very uncertain about the new police. The idea of a continual police presence on the streets brought back memories of the hated British colonial army. Many people were afraid their political opponents would control the police and use them to their advantage. Finally, taxpayers simply did not want to pay for a public police force.

Many of the first American police departments were basically expanded versions of the existing watch system. The Boston police department had only nine officers in 1838. The first American police officers did not wear uniforms, or carry weapons, and were identified only by a distinctive hat and badge. Weapons did not become standard police equipment until the late nineteenth century, in response to rising levels of crime and violence.

Americans borrowed most of the features of modern policing from London: the mission of crime prevention, the strategy of visible patrol over fixed beats, and the quasi-military organizational structure. The structure of political control of the police, however, was very different. The United States was a far more democratic country than Britain. American voters—although only white males with property until the latter part of the nineteenth century—exercised direct control over all government agencies. London residents, by contrast, had no direct control over their police. As a result, American police departments were immediately immersed in local politics, a situation that led to many serious problems. The commissioners of the London police, freed from political influence, were able to maintain high personnel standards.\(^\text{20}\)

### The “Political Era” in American Policing, 1830s–1900

Politics influenced every aspect of American policing in the nineteenth century, and the period from the 1830s to 1900 is often called the “political era” (see Exhibit 2–2). Inefficiency, corruption, and lack of professionalism were the chief results.\(^\text{21}\)

#### A Lack of Personnel Standards

Police departments in the political era had no personnel standards as we understand them today. Officers were selected entirely on the basis of their political connections.
Men with no formal education, those in bad health, and those with criminal records were hired. There were a few female matrons for the jail, but no female sworn officers until the early twentieth century. In New York City, a $300 payment to the Tammany Hall political machine was the only requirement for a job on the police force. In most departments, recruits received no formal preservice training. They were handed a badge, a baton, and a copy of the department rules (if one existed), and then sent out on patrol duty. Cincinnati created one of the first police academies in 1888, but it lasted only a few years. New York City established a School of Pistol Practice in 1895, but offered no training in any other aspect of policing until 1909. Even then, a 1913 investigation found it gave no tests and all recruits were automatically passed.

Police officers had no job security and could be fired at will. In some cases, almost all the officers were fired after an election. Nonetheless, it was an attractive job because salaries were generally higher than those for most blue collar jobs. In 1880 officers in most big cities earned $900 a year, compared with $450 for factory workers.

Jobs on the police force were a major form of patronage, which local politicians used to reward their friends. Consequently, the composition of departments reflected the ethnic and religious makeup of the cities. When Irish Americans began to win political power, they appointed their friends as police officers. When Barney McGinniskin became the first Irish American police officer in Boston in 1851, it provoked major protests from the English and Protestant establishment in the city. Many German Americans served as police officers in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, and St. Louis, where German immigration was heavy. After the Civil War, some African Americans were appointed police officers in northern cities where the Republicans, the party of Abraham Lincoln, were in power.

Patrol Work in the Political Era

Routine police patrol in the political era was hopelessly inefficient. Officers patrolled on foot and were spread very thin. In Chicago, beats were three and four miles long. In many cities entire areas were not patrolled at all. The telephone did not exist, and so it was impossible for citizens to call about crime and disorder. And with no patrol cars, officers could not have responded anyway.

Supervision was weak or nonexistent. Sergeants also patrolled on foot and could not keep track of the officers under their command. Many reports from those years indicate that officers easily evaded duty and spent much of their time in saloons and barbershops. Bad weather—rain, snow, and extremely hot weather—encouraged officers to spend their time in bars or barbershops.
The first primitive communications systems involved a network of call boxes that allowed patrol officers to call precinct stations. Officers soon learned to sabotage them, however: leaving receivers off the hook (which took the early systems out of operation), or lying about where they actually were. The lack of an effective communications system made it difficult if not impossible for citizens to contact the police. In the event of a crime or disturbance, a citizen had to go out into the street and find an officer.

The Police and the Public

There was never a “golden age” of policing where the police were friendly, knowledgeable about their neighborhoods, and enjoyed good relations with the public. There were so few police officers they could not possibly have known many people on their beats. There was a high turnover rate among officers, and the population was even more mobile than today. Many reports, moreover, indicate that many police officers drank on duty and frequently used excessive physical force. As a result, citizens were very disrespectful. Juvenile gangs, for example, made a sport of throwing rocks at the police or taunting them. People who were arrested often fought back, causing officers to use excessive force.

Historian Christopher Thale, analyzing the records of officer assignments in New York City in the nineteenth century, convincingly argues that it was “not mathematically plausible” for officers to know many people on their beats. First, the composition of neighborhoods constantly changed under the pressure of massive immigration. Second, officer assignments were not stable. When the New York City Police Department was first established, officers were required to live in their precinct. This policy was often ignored, however, and then abolished in 1857. The pressure of providing police services forced the department to assign officers where they were needed, particularly in new and growing neighborhoods. Thale concludes that citizens “experienced not ‘the’ cop on the beat, but ‘the cops.’”

In addition to the instability of assignments, police–citizen relations were characterized by ethnic and religious tensions. The New York City Police Department was largely Irish Catholic, and officers were often hostile to or even brutal toward the new Italian and Jewish immigrants. In short, long before the introduction of the police car in the twentieth century, American urban policing was highly impersonal and marked by police–citizen conflict. The idea of the friendly “neighborhood cop” is pure myth.

What went wrong with American policing? In a provocative comparative study, Wilbur Miller argues that the London police became highly professional, while the American police were completely unprofessional. The difference was that the Commissioners of the London Metropolitan Police were free from political interference and able to maintain high personnel standards. As a result, London Bobbies eventually won public respect. By contrast, the lack of adequate supervision in America tolerated police misconduct, and the result was public disrespect. From the very start, in short, police in the two countries went in different directions.

American police officers eventually began to carry firearms in response to increasing citizen violence. As late as 1880 the police in Brooklyn (then an independent city of 500,000 people) were unarmed. In some cities weapons were optional or carried at the discretion of a sergeant. As crime and violence increased in the late 1800s, however, officers began to carry firearms as standard equipment.
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The role of the police was very different in the political era from what it is today. The police were a major social welfare institution. Precinct stations provided lodging to the homeless. The Philadelphia police gave shelter to over 100,000 people a year during the 1880s. This began to change around 1900. The police professionalized, concentrating on crime, and care for the poor became the responsibility of professional social work agencies.28

Corruption and Politics

George W. Plunkitt represented everything that was wrong with American policing in the nineteenth century. Plunkitt was a district leader for Tammany Hall, the social club that controlled New York City politics for several generations. He is a famous historical figure because he explained in writing exactly how corruption worked.

Corruption, Plunkitt explained, was the essence of democracy. His Tammany Hall organization “always stood for rewardin’ the men that won the victory.” Jobs on the police department were one of the major rewards he and other political leaders had to offer. Running a political organization was expensive, and Tammany Hall funded itself through kickbacks from people it rewarded or payoffs from gamblers and prostitutes. Why did police corruption last so long? Plunkitt explained that the people “knew just what they were doin’.” They liked the rewards they received and were not offended by the illegal activity.29

Police corruption was epidemic in the nineteenth century. Historian Mark Haller argues that corruption was one of the main functions of local government, and the police were only one part of the problem.30 The police took payoffs for not enforcing laws on drinking, gambling, and prostitution. The money was then divided among officers at all ranks. Corruption extended to personnel decisions. Officers often had to pay bribes for promotion. The cost of obtaining a promotion was compensated for by the greater opportunities for graft. The New York City police

The Diary of a Police Officer: Boston, 1895

We know very little about what police officers actually did in the early years. Most of the evidence comes from reformers or journalists seeking to expose corruption and inefficiency. Their reports are inherently biased. An 1895 diary of Boston police officer Stillman S. Wakeman provides a rare glimpse into actual police work 100 years ago.

Officer Wakeman was “an officer of the neighborhood.” He spent most of his time on patrol responding to little problems that neighborhood residents brought to him: disputes, minor property crimes, and so on. He spent relatively little time on major offenses: murder, rape, robbery. He resolved most of the problems informally, acting as a neighborhood magistrate. His role was remarkably similar to that of contemporary patrol officers. He was reactive and a problem solver. The major difference was the absence of modern police technology: the patrol car and the 911 telephone system.

commissioner, forced to resign in 1894, admitted that he had amassed a personal fortune of over $350,000 (equivalent to millions in today’s dollars).  

Corruption served important social and political ends. Alcohol was an important symbolic issue in American politics. Protestant Americans saw sobriety as a badge of respectability and self-discipline. They sought to impose their morality on working class immigrant groups, especially the Irish and Germans, by limiting or outlawing drinking. For blue collar immigrants, the neighborhood saloon was not only a place to relax (remember: people in those days did not have large homes with recreation rooms), but an important social institution and often the base of operations for political machines. Thus, the attack on drinking was also an attack on working-class social life and political power. Working-class immigrants fought back by gaining political control of the police, and simply not enforcing the laws on drinking.  

**Immigration, Discrimination, and Police Corruption**

On December 3, 1882, the New York City Police arrested 137 people for violating the “Sunday Closing Law.” The crackdown was a dramatic reversal of traditional practice. Laws requiring businesses to close on Sunday had been on the books since the colonial period but were usually ignored. The new enforcement effort, and the controversy that lasted for many years afterward, illustrates the connection between immigration, ethnic and religious discrimination, and police corruption.  

Almost all of those arrested that Sunday in 1882 were Jewish small businessmen: butchers, barbers, bakers, and so forth. They worked on Sunday because their religious beliefs required them to close on Saturday to observe the Jewish Sabbath. Complying with the state law meant they would be closed two days a week, while their non-Jewish competitors only had to close for one day.  

As the battle over enforcement of the Sunday closing law continued for many years, several patterns emerged, according to cultural historian Batya Miller. “Reform” mayors, who were generally Protestant, were the most vigorous in enforcing the laws. Future U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt, who served as New York police commissioner from 1895 to 1897, advocated strict enforcement, for example. The Tammany Hall political machine, dominated by Irish Catholics, on the other hand, tended to ignore the law when it was in power. This did not mean that Jewish businessmen were free of discrimination, however. Tammany Hall politicians were notorious for corruption, and they extorted a $5 fee from street peddlers to avoid being arrested. In fact, police officers marked the carts of those who did not pay with chalk, indicating to other officers that they were fair game for arrest. At the same time, police brutality against Jews by Irish Catholic officers was “not uncommon” according to Miller.  

In short, cultural conflict over religious holidays was at the heart of arbitrary enforcement of the laws, corruption, police brutality, and deeper ethnic and religious conflict in city politics. This was no “golden age” of good law enforcement.  

**The Failure of Police Reform**

Political reformers made police corruption a major issue during the nineteenth century. Their efforts were generally unsuccessful. The reformers concentrated on changing the formal structure of control of police departments, usually by creating a
board of police commissioners appointed by the governor or the legislature. This struggle for control reflected divisions along the lines of political parties, ethnic groups, and urban and rural perspectives. New York created the first state-controlled police commission in 1857. In many cities, the battle for control of the police was endless. Cincinnati underwent ten major changes in the form of police control between 1859 and 1910. (This system of state control continues today with St. Louis and Kansas City, Missouri.)

Even when the reformers won, however, they did not succeed in improving the quality of policing. Their reform agenda emphasized replacing “bad” people (their political opponents) with “good” people (their own supporters). They did not have any substantive ideas about police administration, and did not improve recruitment standards, training, or supervision. Also, looking at it from today’s perspective, we can see that they did not give any attention to use of excessive force or race discrimination—two issues that are of paramount concern today.

Theodore Roosevelt, who was later president of the United States (1901 to 1909), is one of the most famous people in American history. Yet few people are aware that he earlier served as a police commissioner of New York City between 1895 and 1897. As commissioner he fought against the corrupt Tammany Hall political machine and tried to eliminate corruption and inefficiency in the NYPD.

His leadership style was vigorous and flamboyant, as he went out on the streets at night, catching officers in saloons or sleeping on the job. He tried to raise personnel standards and ensure enforcement of the liquor laws, but with little success. He made a lot of headlines (which, of course, advanced his political career) but did not achieve any lasting changes in the NYPD. Like other reformers of his day, he did not have a good theory of police administration. Corruption and inefficiency continued long after he resigned in 1897.

The Impact of the Police on Society

Did the early American police departments reduce crime and disorder? Did a young man in the slums of Cincinnati or Baltimore refrain from committing a burglary or robbery because he was afraid of being caught? Did the presence of patrol officers on the street help to maintain order? Probably not.

Historians debate the impact of the police on society. Cities did become more orderly as the nineteenth century progressed, and some historians argue that the police contributed to this. Other historians, however, argue that the police were so few in number that they could not possibly have deterred crime. The growth of order, they argue, was more a result of a natural adaptation to urban life. The daily routine of urban life—reporting to work every day at the same hour—cultivated habits of self-discipline and order. The police, according to this view, played a supporting role at best.

The role of the police in labor relations during the nineteenth century is also a matter of debate among historians. Marxist historians argue that the police served the interests of business and were used to harass labor unions and break strikes. American labor relations during these years were extremely violent. Management fought unions, and many strikes led to violence. In some communities, particularly those with coal and steel industries, strikes were virtual civil war. In many cities, however,
the police were friendly to organized labor, mainly because they came from the same blue-collar communities, and refused to serve the interests of businessmen.\textsuperscript{37}

In the end, while the modern police were created to deal with the problems of crime and disorder, they mainly succeeded in becoming a social and political problem themselves. The rampant corruption and inefficiency set in motion generations of reform efforts that continue today.

### The Professional Era, 1900–1960

American policing underwent a dramatic change in the twentieth century. The two principal forces for change were an organized movement for police professionalism, and the introduction of modern technology, particularly the telephone and the patrol car.

#### The Professionalization Movement

If Robert Peel was the father of the modern police, \textbf{August Vollmer} was the father of American police professionalism. Vollmer served as chief of police in Berkeley, California, from 1905 to 1932 and, more than any other person, defined the reform agenda that continues to influence policing today. He is most famous for advocating higher education for police officers, hiring college graduates in Berkeley and organizing the first college-level police science courses at the University of California in 1916. In that respect, he is also the father of modern criminal justice education. Vollmer also served as a consultant to many local police departments and national commissions. In 1923 he took a year’s leave from Berkeley to serve as chief of the Los Angeles police department. He also wrote the 1931 Wickersham Commission \textit{Report on Police}, which summarized the reform agenda of modern management for police departments and higher recruitment standards for officers. A number of his students went on to become reform police chiefs in California and other states.\textsuperscript{38}

Vollmer was part of a new generation of leaders at the turn of the century who launched an organized effort to professionalize the police. Police reform was part of a much broader political movement known as progressivism between 1900 and 1917. Progressive reformers sought to regulate big business, eliminate child labor, improve social welfare services, and reform local government, as well as professionalize the police.\textsuperscript{39}

#### The Reform Agenda

The \textbf{professionalization movement} developed a specific agenda of reform (see Exhibit 2–3). First, the reformers defined policing as a profession. This meant that the police should be public servants with a professional obligation to serve the entire community on a nonpartisan basis. Second, reformers sought to eliminate the influence of politics on policing. Third, they argued for hiring qualified chief executives to head police departments, people who had proven ability to manage a large organization. Arthur Woods, a prominent lawyer, served as police commissioner in New York City from 1914 to 1917, while Philadelphia hired Marine Corps General Smedley Butler to head its police department from 1911 to 1915.\textsuperscript{40}
Fourth, the reformers tried to raise personnel standards for rank-and-file officers. This included establishing minimum recruitment requirements of intelligence, health, and moral character. New York City created the first permanent police training academy in 1895. In most cities the process of reform was painfully slow. Some cities did not offer any meaningful training until the 1950s.

Fifth, professionalism meant applying modern management principles to police departments. This involved centralizing command and control and making efficient use of personnel. Until then, police chiefs had exercised little real control; captains in neighborhood precincts and their political friends had the real power. Reformers closed precinct stations and used the new communications technology to control both middle management personnel and officers on the street.

Sixth, reformers created the first specialized units devoted to traffic, juveniles, and vice. Previously, police departments had only patrol and detective units. Specialization, however, increased the size and complexity of the police bureaucracy, increasing the challenge of managing departments.

Juvenile units led to a historic innovation: the first female sworn officers. Until then, policing had been an all-male occupation. The Portland (Oregon) police hired the first policewoman, Lola Baldwin, as a juvenile specialist in 1905. Alice Stebbins Wells became the real leader of the policewomen’s movement. She joined the Los Angeles Police Department in 1910, and was soon active at the national level. She organized the International Association of Policewomen in 1915, and gave many talks around the country about the role of policewomen. By 1919 over sixty police departments employed female officers. Wells shared the dominant values of her time regarding women, however, which limited their role in policing.

The first policewomen did not perform regular patrol duty, usually did not wear uniforms, did not carry weapons, and had only limited arrest powers. Policewomen advocates argued that women were specially qualified to work with children and that they should not handle regular police duties.41

The Impact of Professionalization

Professionalization progressed very slowly. By 1920 Milwaukee, Cincinnati, and Berkeley had emerged as leaders in the field. Most other departments, however, remained mired in corruption and inefficiency. August Vollmer spent 1923 and 1924 trying to reform the Los Angeles police, but gave up in despair and returned to

---

**EXHIBIT 2–3**

**The Reform Agenda of the Professionalization Movement**

1. Define policing as a profession.
2. Eliminate political influence from policing.
3. Appoint qualified chief executives.
4. Raise personnel standards.
5. Introduce principles of modern management.
6. Create specialized units.
Berkeley. Chicago seemed to resist all efforts at reform. In some cities, the police made notable steps forward, only to slide backward a few years later. Philadelphia implemented many reforms between 1911 and 1915, only to have all progress wiped out when the city’s old political machine regained control.42

Despite these failures, the professionalization movement reformers achieved some important successes. The idea of professionalism was established as the goal for modern policing. Reformed departments also became models for other cities.

The New Police Subculture

Professionalization also introduced some new problems in policing. Reform increased the military ethos of police departments, adding parades, close-order drills, and military-style commendations. The command system became far more authoritarian than it had been in the old days.

The rank-and-file police officer became the forgotten person, not respected by reformers who placed their hopes on strong administrators. As a result, the rank and file retreated into an isolated and alienated police subculture that opposed most reforms.43

The most dramatic expression of the new police subculture was the emergence of police unions. As policing became a profession and officers thought in terms of the job as a career, they demanded better salaries and a voice in decisions affecting their jobs. The problem reached crisis proportions during World War I, when increases in the cost of living eroded the value of police salaries. This set the stage for the 1919 Boston police strike, one of the most famous events in police history. Salaries for Boston police officers had not been raised in nearly 20 years. When their demand for a 20 percent raise was rejected, they voted to form a union. Police Commissioner Edwin U. Curtis then suspended the union leaders, and 1,117 officers went out on strike, leaving only 427 on duty. Violence and disorder erupted throughout the city. Massachusetts Governor Calvin Coolidge called out the state militia and won national fame for his comment, “There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, at any time.” The strike quickly collapsed and all the strikers were fired.44

The violence in Boston produced a national backlash against police unions, and police unions in other cities disappeared. Police unionism was dead until the 1960s, but the problem of an alienated rank and file remained.

Professionalism also created new problems in police administration. As departments grew in size and created new specialized units, they became increasingly complex bureaucracies, which required increasingly sophisticated management. Managing police organizations continued to be a major challenge into the twenty-first century.

Police and Racial Minorities

Conflict between the police and the African American community also appeared during the World War I years. Major race riots erupted in East St. Louis, Illinois (1917), and in Chicago and other cities in 1919. Investigations of these riots found race discrimination by the police prior to and during the riots. In some cases, officers joined in the rioting themselves. The Chicago Riot Commission recommended several steps
to improve police–community relations, but virtually nothing was done to either hire more African American officers or eliminate race discrimination in police work.  

Even when some departments outside the south hired a few African American officers, they usually assigned them to the black community. Most southern police departments hired no African American officers at all, while some put them in a second-class category, assigning them only to the black community and not allowing them to arrest whites. Conflict between the police and the African American community remained a serious problem in all parts of the country, but it did not receive any serious attention until the riots of the 1960s.

**New Law Enforcement Agencies**

Two important new law enforcement agencies appeared in the years before World War I: the state police and the Bureau of Investigation.

Several states created state-level law enforcement agencies in the nineteenth century, but they remained relatively unimportant. The Texas Rangers were established in 1835. The Pennsylvania State Constabulary, created in 1905, was the first modern state police force, but was not typical of most others. It was a highly centralized, militaristic agency that concentrated on controlling strikes. Business leaders felt that local police and the militia were unreliable during strikes. Organized labor bitterly attacked the Constabulary, denouncing its officers as "cossacks."

Other states soon created their own agencies. About half were highway patrols, limited to traffic enforcement, while the other half were general law enforcement agencies. While business interests wanted Pennsylvania-style agencies, organized labor in several states was able to limit their powers or block their creation altogether.

The Bureau of Investigation was established in 1908 by executive order of President Theodore Roosevelt. (It was renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1935.) Until then, the federal government had no full-time criminal investigation agency. Private detective agencies were sometimes used under contract on an as-needed basis. The new Bureau of Investigation was immediately involved in scandal. Some agents were caught opening the mail of one senator who had opposed creating the Bureau. In 1919 and 1920, in the Palmer Raids, the Bureau conducted a massive roundup of alleged political radicals, accompanied by gross violations of due process. More scandals followed in the 1920s, as the Bureau continued to engage in political spying.

**Technology Revolutionizes Policing**

Some of the most important changes in policing were the result of modern technology, especially **communications technology**. The patrol car, the two-way radio, and the telephone revolutionized patrol work, the nature of police–citizen contacts, and police management (see Exhibit 2–4).

The patrol car first appeared just before World War I and by the 1920s was in widespread use. The police adopted it in part because they had to keep up with citizens and criminals who were now driving cars. Even more important, police chiefs believed the patrol car would make possible efficient and effective patrol coverage. Patrolling by car would allow officers to cover their beats more intensively, and...
chiefs believed this would deter crime more effectively than foot patrol. Also, patrol officers could respond quickly to crimes and calls for service. American police departments steadily converted from foot to motor patrol, and by the 1960s only a few major cities still relied heavily on foot patrol.

The patrol car had important unintended consequences, however, that created new problems. It removed the officer from the street and reduced informal contact with law-abiding citizens. The police became isolated from the public, and racial minorities in particular saw the police as an occupying army. This problem remained hidden until the police–community relations crisis of the 1960s.

The two-way radio became widespread in the late 1930s and had two important consequences. First, it allowed departments to dispatch officers in response to citizen calls for service. Second, it revolutionized police supervision by allowing the department to maintain continuous contact with patrol officers.

The telephone was invented in 1877, but it did not have a great impact on policing until it was linked with the patrol car and the two-way radio in the mid-twentieth century. Together, the three pieces of technology completed a new communications link between citizens and the police. Citizens could now easily call the police; the two-way radio enabled the department to dispatch a patrol car immediately; and the patrol car allowed the officer to reach the scene quickly.

Police departments encouraged people to call, promising an immediate response. Gradually, citizens became socialized into the habit of “calling the cops” to handle even the smallest problems. Over time, Americans developed higher expectations about the quality of life because they could now call someone to deal with all sorts of problems. As a result, the call workload steadily increased. When the rising number of calls overloaded the police, they responded by adding more officers, more patrol cars, and more sophisticated communications systems. More resources, however, only encouraged more calls, and the process repeated itself. This process continued until the idea of community policing questioned the importance of responding to each and every call for service. 51

Telephone-generated calls for service altered the nature of police–citizen contacts. Previously, police officers rarely entered private dwellings. Patrolling on foot, they had no way of learning about problems in private areas. Nor did citizens have any way of summoning the police. The new technology made it possible for citizens to invite the police into their homes. The result was a complex and contradictory change in
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### Exhibit 2–4

The Technological Revolution in Policing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Technology</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Citizens can easily call the police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way radio</td>
<td>Quick dispatch of police to calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant supervision of patrol officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol car</td>
<td>Quick response to citizen calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficient patrol coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isolation of patrol officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
police–citizen contacts. While the patrol car isolated the police from people on the streets, the telephone brought police officers into people’s living rooms, kitchens, and bedrooms. There, officers became involved in the most intimate domestic problems: domestic disputes, alcohol abuse, parent–child conflicts, and other social problems.52

**New Directions in Police Administration, 1930–1960**

**The Wickersham Commission Report**

In 1929 President Herbert Hoover created the *Wickersham Commission*, officially the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, to conduct the first national study of the American criminal justice system. The commission published fourteen reports in 1931, but the most important was the *Report on Lawlessness in Law Enforcement*. The report shocked the nation with its expose of “the third degree—the inflicting of pain, physical or mental, to extract confessions or statements.” Police abuse, it concluded, “is extensively practiced.” The report found that police routinely beat suspects, threatened them with worse punishment, and held them illegally for protracted questioning. It cited examples of a suspect who was held by the ankles from a third-story window, and another who was forced to stand in the morgue with his hand on the body of a murder victim. The chief of police in Buffalo, New York, openly declared that he would violate the Constitution if he felt he had to.53

The Wickersham report inspired a new generation of police administrators who made new efforts to professionalize the police.

**Professionalization Continues**

Influenced by August Vollmer, California police departments took the lead in professionalization from the 1920s through the 1960s. Vollmer’s protégés became police chiefs throughout the state, spreading the reform agenda. The first undergraduate law enforcement program was established at San Jose State College in 1931. California also developed a system of regional training for police officers in the late 1930s.54

O. W. Wilson was Vollmer’s most famous protégé, and he was the most prominent leader of the professionalization movement from the late 1930s through the end of the 1960s. He served as chief of police in Wichita, Kansas, from 1928 to 1935, Dean of the University of California School of Criminology from 1950 to 1960, and Superintendent of the Chicago police from 1960 to 1967.

Wilson made his greatest impact through his two textbooks on police management: the International City Management Association’s *Municipal Police Administration* and his own *Police Administration* (1950). The latter book became the informal “bible” of police administration, influencing a generation of police chiefs.55

Wilson’s major contribution to police management involved the efficient management of personnel, particularly patrol officers. In 1941 he developed a formula for assigning patrol officers on the basis of a workload formula that reflected reported crime and calls for service. This formula, refined and updated through modern management information systems, is still used by police departments today.
Simmering Racial and Ethnic Relations

Despite the progress in professionalization, the reformers did almost nothing to improve relations with racial and ethnic minority communities. They completely ignored the recommendations of the report on the 1919 Chicago race riot. In 1943 another wave of racial violence swept the country, with serious disturbances in Detroit, New York City, and Los Angeles. The Detroit riot was very serious, disrupting production of tanks and other vehicles needed in World War II.

The 1943 Los Angeles riot brought attention to growing conflict between the police and the Latino community. Often referred to as the “Zoot Suit” riot, the violence was the product of many factors. The population of Los Angeles was changing, with an increase in immigrants from Mexico. In addition to discrimination in employment and housing, the Latino community experienced brutality and discrimination at the hands of the police. World War II added another volatile element, as many U.S. Navy personnel were usually on leave in the city. The news media encouraged the idea that young Mexican Americans were responsible for an increase in crime and juvenile delinquency. And because many Latino youth wore the so-called zoot suit, it became both a stereotype and a symbol of the violence that erupted in 1943. The riots broke out on June 3, 1943, and lasted for a week. Although recommendations were made to improve police-community relations, little was done in the years that followed.\(^{56}\)

The riots of the 1940s gave birth to the modern police-community relations movements. A number of departments created special police-community relations units and offered the first training programs on race relations. The most significant progress occurred in California. These reforms, however, were very limited and did not prevent the even more serious race relations crisis of the 1960s.

J. Edgar Hoover and the War on Crime

The most important new figure in American law enforcement in the 1930s was the director of the Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover. He was appointed director of the Bureau in 1924 after a series of scandals. Capitalizing on public fears about a national crime wave in the 1930s, he increased the size and scope of the Bureau’s activities. In 1930 he won control of the new Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) system. In 1934 a set of new federal laws gave the FBI increased jurisdiction, including authority to arrest criminals who crossed state lines in order to avoid prosecution. The following year the FBI opened its National Police Academy, which trained Bureau agents and, by invitation, some local police officers.\(^{57}\)

Hoover was a master at public relations, skillfully manipulating the media to project an image of the FBI agent as the paragon of professionalism: dedicated, honest, trained, and relentlessly efficient. Some of Hoover’s reputation was deserved. FBI agents were far better educated and trained than local police officers. There was an ugly underside to Hoover’s long career (1924–1972) as leader of the Bureau, however. He exaggerated the FBI’s role in several famous cases—John Dillinger, Pretty Boy Floyd—and manipulated crime data to create an exaggerated impression of the Bureau’s effectiveness. He concentrated on small-time bank robbers, while ignoring organized crime, white-collar crime, and violations of federal civil rights laws. Even worse, Hoover spied on citizens in violation of their constitutional rights,
compiling secret files on political groups. The most notorious case involved his secret attempt to destroy Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as a civil rights leader. Hoover’s misuse of power did not become known until after his death in 1972.\textsuperscript{58}

Hoover’s FBI had a powerful impact on local police. The emphasis on education and training established a new model for personnel standards. The introduction of the UCR, the development of the Ten Most Wanted list, and the creation of the FBI crime lab all served to emphasize crime fighting at the expense of other aspects of policing.

---

**The Police Crisis of the 1960s**

**The Police and the Supreme Court**

Ernesto Miranda was just an ordinary career criminal. Between the ages of 14 and 18 he had been arrested six times and imprisoned four times. On the evening of March 2, 1963, he raped a young woman in Phoenix, Arizona. His arrest 11 days later set the stage for one of the most famous Supreme Court decisions in American history. In *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966), the Court overturned his conviction and ruled that police officers had to advise suspects of their right to remain silent and their right to an attorney before being interrogated.\textsuperscript{59}

In a postscript to the famous decision, Ernesto Miranda himself was re tried, convicted, and sentenced to prison for the original 1963 rape. After he was paroled, he returned to Phoenix and worked as a deliveryman. On the night of January 31, 1976, at age 34, he got into a fight while playing poker in a bar and was stabbed to death. When one of his two assailants was arrested, the police officers followed the law and read him his *Miranda* rights.

The *Miranda* decision was only one of several famous cases where the Supreme Court established constitutional standards for the police and for other parts of the criminal justice system. In *Mapp v. Ohio*, the Court held that evidence gathered in an illegal search and seizure could not be used against the defendant. These

---

**EXHIBIT 2–5**

**Conflicting Pressures of the Police, 1960 to Present**

- Intervention of the Supreme Court
- High crime rates; fear of crime; political reaction
- Riots; PCR crisis; PCR programs
- Research and experimentation
- Traditional professionalization (recruitment standards, patrol management)
- Affirmative action (race and gender)
- Administrative control of discretion (deadly force, domestic violence, pursuits)
- Community policing
- Problem-oriented policing
- Citizen oversight
decisions provoked an enormous political controversy. The police and their supporters claimed that the Court had “handcuffed” them in the fight against crime. Conservative politicians accused the Court of favoring the rights of criminals over the rights of victims and law-abiding citizens.60

The Police and Civil Rights

The civil rights movement entered a new militant phase in the 1960s, challenging race discrimination in all areas of American life. On February 1, 1960, African American college students launched sit-ins to protest segregated lunch counters in the South. This inspired civil rights groups to challenge employment and housing discrimination in all parts of the country. Activists also attacked race discrimination and physical brutality by the police.61

As civil rights protests rose, the white police officer in the black ghetto became a symbol of white power and authority. Studies of deadly force found that police officers shot and killed African American citizens about eight times as often as white citizens. Because of employment discrimination, meanwhile, African Americans were seriously underrepresented as police officers.

Tensions between the police and the African American community finally exploded in a nationwide wave of riots between 1964 and 1968. Many riots were sparked by an incident involving the police. The 1964 New York City riot began after a white off-duty officer shot and killed a black teenager. The 1965 riot in the Watts district of Los Angeles was sparked by a simple traffic stop. The Kerner Commission, appointed to study the riots, counted over 200 violent disorders in 1967 alone.62

In response to the crisis, police departments established special police–community relations (PCR) units. PCR programs included speaking to community groups and schools, “ride-along” programs that allowed citizens to view police work from the perspective of the police officer, and neighborhood storefront offices to facilitate communication with citizens. A Justice Department report, however, found that these programs had little impact on day-to-day police work and did little to improve police–community relations.63

Civil rights leaders demanded the hiring of more African American officers and the creation of citizen review boards to investigate citizen complaints of excessive force. Although the 1964 Civil Rights Act outlawed race discrimination in employment, minority employment made little progress until the 1980s. The demand for civilian review was also unsuccessful at first. The Philadelphia Police Advisory Board (PAB), created in 1958, was abolished in 1967 under pressure from the police union. The police union in New York City succeeded in abolishing a citizen-dominated Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) in 1966. By the end of the 1960s, even though the riots had stopped, relations between the police and minority communities remained tense.64

The Police in the National Spotlight

Rising public concern about crime, riots, and the police–community relations crisis stimulated a series of national reports on the police that greatly enhanced knowledge about policing and made a set of recommendations for improving the American police.
The American Bar Foundation (ABF) conducted the first field observations of police work (1955–1957) and found that police officers exercised broad discretion and that most police work involved noncriminal activity.\textsuperscript{65}

The President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (known as the \textit{President’s Crime Commission}) (1965–1967) conducted a comprehensive study of the entire criminal justice system, including the police, and sponsored some important police research. The Commission’s \textit{Task Force Report: The Police} included a thoughtful analysis of the complexity of the police role and the fact that only a relatively small part of police work was devoted to criminal law enforcement. The commission sponsored Albert Reiss and Donald Black’s observational study of patrol officers, which produced important findings on police discretion. The Commission’s report, \textit{The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society} (1967), endorsed the traditional agenda of professionalization: higher recruitment standards, more training, and better management and supervision, but also called for controls over police discretion.\textsuperscript{66}

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, popularly known as the Kerner Commission, was created after the riots of 1967 to study the national crisis in race relations (see Sidebar 2–4). Its report found “deep hostility between police and ghetto communities as a primary cause of the disorders.” It recommended that routine police operations be changed “to ensure proper individual conduct and to eliminate abrasive practices,” that more African American police officers be hired, and that police departments improve their procedures for handling citizen complaints.\textsuperscript{67}

The Kerner Commission questioned some of the traditional assumptions about police professionalization. It noted that “many of the serious disturbances took place in cities whose police are among the best led, best organized, best trained, and most professional in the country.” It pointed out that the patrol car removed the officer from the street and isolated the police from ordinary citizens.\textsuperscript{68}

Chief William Parker of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) illustrated the commission’s point about how aggressive crime fighting aggravated
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\textbf{Exercise:} Compare the report on the 1919 Chicago race riot and the Kerner Commission report on the racial disturbances of the 1960s.

1. Are there any significant differences in the causes of the riots?
2. Are there any differences in the recommendations related to improved police–community relations in the two reports?
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police–community relations. Parker was nationally recognized for turning the LAPD into what was then widely regarded as the most professional department in the country. Parker took command of a notoriously corrupt LAPD in 1950 and quickly asserted strict control over it. He instituted high personnel standards, modern management principles, and an aggressive anticrime approach to policing. Like J. Edgar Hoover, Parker was a master of public relations. Working closely with Jack Webb, he helped the television program “Dragnet” become one of the top-rated programs, and it projected an image of the LAPD as flawlessly professional and efficient.69

Parker’s style of policing came at a price, however. The aggressive law enforcement tactics aggravated conflict with minority communities, and the LAPD’s famous disciplinary system overlooked officer use of excessive force. Historian Martin Schiesl argues that officers “under the direction of strong-willed chiefs, confused professional obligations with the unrestrained use of power and undermined the civil liberties of racial minorities and politically active groups.70 Civil rights groups protested, but Parker tolerated no criticism and accused the NAACP and the ACLU of supporting the criminal element. Parker’s legacy lived on in the LAPD long after he retired. The LAPD generated national controversy as a result of the 1991 beating of Rodney King and again in 1999 with the Rampart scandal. In both cases the LAPD was accused of tolerating excessive use of force, particularly against racial and ethnic minorities, and of failing to discipline its officers.71

In 1973 the American Bar Association (ABA) published its Standards Relating to the Urban Police Function. Most important, the Standards recommended policy guidelines to control the exercise of police discretion. This proved to be very influential, and in the years ahead police departments developed written policies over use of deadly force, high speed pursuits, and the handling of domestic violence incidents.72

Finally, to help raise the standards of police departments, a process for accrediting police departments was established. Accreditation had long existed as a means of professional self-regulation in other occupations claiming status as a profession: law, medicine, and education, for example. The Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) published its first set of Standards for Law Enforcement Agencies in 1983.73

The Research Revolution

An explosion in police research began in the 1960s, producing a substantial body of knowledge about patrol work, criminal investigation, police officer attitudes, and other important aspects of policing.

Much of this research was funded by the federal government, first through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) (1968–1976), and later the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). In 1970 the Ford Foundation established the Police Foundation with a grant of $30 million. The foundation sponsored some of the most important police research, including the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment. Later, the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), a professional association of big-city police managers, emerged as the leader of innovation in policing.

Some of the most important research undermined traditional assumptions about policing. The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment (1972–1973)
tested the effect of different levels of patrol on crime, and found that increased patrol did not reduce crime, while reduced patrol did not lead to an increase in crime or public fear of crime. These findings had a profound effect on thinking about the police, and laid the foundation for the development of community policing a few years later.  

Other studies, meanwhile, questioned the value of rapid police response. Faster response time did not result in more arrests. Few calls involved crimes in progress, and most crime victims did not call the police immediately. The Rand Corporation study of criminal investigation, meanwhile, shattered traditional myths about detective work. Most crimes are solved through information obtained by the first officer on the scene, using information from victims or witnesses. Follow-up detective work, of the kind portrayed in the movies and on television, is actually relatively unproductive, and involves routine paperwork.

With respect to police officers’ attitudes and behavior, William Westley identified a distinct police subculture, characterized by hostility toward the public, group solidarity, and secrecy. Jerome Skolnick followed up on this insight and found that policing has a distinct working environment, dominated by danger and exercise of authority. The pressure to achieve results in the form of arrests and convictions, moreover, encourages officers to violate legal procedures. Other studies also found that police officers’ attitudes are shaped by the nature of police work, including the culture of the organization, and not by their personal background characteristics such as education or race.

The mounting body of research had a significant effect on police reform. The studies that questioned the deterrent effect of patrol and identified the important role of citizens in solving crimes laid the foundation for the community policing movement. James J. Fyfe’s pioneering study of deadly force, meanwhile, indicated that written policies could effectively control police discretion in the use of firearms.

New Developments in Policing, 1970–2010

The American police changed significantly from the 1970s to the present. The characteristics of officers changed dramatically; officers worked in a very different organizational environment; and new ideas about the police role emerged.
The Changing Police Officer

The profile of the American police officer changed significantly beginning in the 1970s. The employment of racial and ethnic minority officers increased significantly. Underrepresentation of African American officers on big-city police departments was one of the major complaints raised by civil rights groups. The Kerner Commission found that in 1967 African Americans represented 34 percent of the population of Cleveland but only 7 percent of the police officers; in Oakland, they were 31 percent of the population but only 4 percent of the officers. As a result of aggressive minority hiring efforts, the number of African American officers increased significantly. Similar progress was made in the employment of Latino officers in many departments. By the 1990s African American officers were a majority in Detroit, Washington, and Atlanta. In 2006, the San Antonio, Texas, police department consisted of 48 percent white officers, 46 percent Hispanic officers, and 6 percent African American officers. African Americans served as police chief in New York City, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Chicago, Houston, and many other cities.80

Felicia Shpritzer made history in breaking down the barriers against women in policing. She joined the New York City police department in 1942 and, following the model established by Alice Stebbins Wells and the other pioneer policewomen, served almost 20 years in the juvenile unit. In 1961, she and five other female officers applied for promotion to sergeant. Their applications were rejected, and in fact they were not even allowed to take the promotional exam. They sued, and in 1963 the courts declared the NYPD policy illegal and ordered the department to allow them to take the exam. The following year, 126 policewomen took the exam; Shpritzer and one other woman passed. The other woman, Gertrude Schimmel, became the first female captain in the NYPD in 1971. Shpritzer died in December 2000 at age 87.81

Traditional barriers to women in policing collapsed under the impact of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which barred discrimination on the basis of sex, and the women’s movement. By the mid-1990s, the percentage of female officers in most big-city departments was about 13 percent. Additionally, departments eliminated requirements (such as minimum height or special strength tests) that had discriminated against female applicants. In an important breakthrough, female officers were assigned to routine patrol duty for the first time in 1968. Evaluations of female officers on patrol in Washington DC, and New York City found their performance to be as effective as that of comparable groups of male officers.82

Penny Harrington broke another barrier in 1985 when she was appointed chief of the Portland, Oregon, police department. She was the first woman to head a large police department. (There had been several female chiefs since 1919, but all involved small agencies, according to historian Dorothy Schulz.) Harrington was followed by Elizabeth Watson, appointed chief of the Houston, Texas, police department in 1990. Since then a number of women have served as chiefs of large city and state law enforcement agencies.83

Police departments also began to recruit college students. In the early 1960s, the typical officer had only a high school education. The federal government, meanwhile, encouraged the development of college criminal justice programs. While only 20 percent of all sworn officers had any college education in 1960, the figure had risen to 65 percent by 1988.84
Preservice training improved dramatically. The length of training increased from an average of about 300 hours in the 1960s to over 1,000 hours in many departments by the 1990s. The more professional departments added a field training component to the traditional academy program. Police academy curricula added units on race relations, domestic violence, and ethics. New York and California had introduced mandatory training for all police officers in 1959, and eventually every state had a training and certification requirement. Previously, many small police and sheriff’s departments offered no preservice training whatsoever.\(^{85}\)

**The Control of Police Discretion**

In response to recommendations by the ABA and the President’s Crime Commission, police departments instituted procedures to control police discretion (see Chapter 11). These involved written policies covering search and seizure, interrogations, and other aspects of police work. Particularly important were the policies on the use of deadly force, handling domestic violence, and high-speed pursuits. Policies were collected in the standard operating procedure (SOP) manual, which became the basic tool of police management. They were part of a general movement to control the exercise of discretion in all criminal justice agencies.\(^{86}\)

The control of deadly force was one of the most important reforms. Research indicated that police shot eight African Americans for every white citizen. The racial disparity was especially great with respect to unarmed citizens. Many of the 1960s riots were sparked by a shooting incident. Most police departments at that time either had no policy on deadly force or relied on state statutes that permitted the shooting of unarmed suspects under the fleeing-felon rule. In the early 1970s, they began to adopt a more restrictive “defense-of-life” rule. Pioneering research by James J. Fyfe found that the New York City police department’s new policy in 1972 reduced firearms discharges by 30 percent. Within just a few years, other departments adopted similar policies. As a result, the number of citizens shot and killed by the police nationwide dropped substantially between 1970 and 1984. Even more important, the ratio of blacks to whites shot and killed fell by 50 percent.\(^{87}\)

Rising public concern about domestic violence led to a revolution in police policy in that area as well. Women’s groups sued the police in New York, Oakland, and other cities for failing to arrest men who had committed domestic assault. These suits produced departmental policies prescribing mandatory arrest. Soon, other departments across the country adopted similar policies. This trend received a strong boost when a Police Foundation study found that arrest deterred future violence more effectively than either mediation or separation. Although subsequent studies failed to confirm this effect, mandatory arrest policies remained popular.\(^{88}\)

**The Emergence of Police Unions**

Police unions spread rapidly in the 1960s and by the 1970s were a powerful force in American policing. Officers were angry and alienated over Supreme Court rulings, criticisms by civil rights groups, poor salaries and benefits, and arbitrary disciplinary practices by police chiefs.\(^{89}\)
Unions had a dramatic impact on police administration. They won significant improvements in salaries and benefits for officers, along with grievance procedures that protected the rights of officers in disciplinary hearings. The result was a revolution in police management. Police chiefs were no longer all-powerful, and now had to negotiate with unions over many management issues. Many reformers were alarmed about the growth of police unions. Unions tended to resist innovations and were particularly hostile to attempts to improve police–community relations. 90

The Spread of Citizen Oversight of Police

Citizen oversight of the police also spread beginning in the 1980s. The creation of civilian review boards to handle citizen complaints was one of the major demands of civil rights groups since the 1960s. They argued that because of the police subculture, police departments were not capable of conducting independent and fair investigations of complaints. In the 1990s a new form of citizen oversight appeared: the police auditor. Police auditors in San Jose and Portland, Oregon, examined police department policies and procedures, and recommended changes that would help to reduce citizen complaints. By the late 1990s, almost every major city had some form of citizen oversight of the police, either a review board or an auditor. 91

The Special Counsel to the Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department has the longest record of oversight. Between 1993 and mid-2009 it had issued 26 reports on the department, covering a wide range of subjects. They included use of force, the cost of litigation against the police, foot pursuits of suspects, recruitment procedures, and the status of women in the department. In each case, the Special Counsel made recommendations for improvement. Sheriff Lee Baca in 2002 created the Office of Independent Review as an additional form of oversight. The OIR investigated critical incidents and made recommendations for changes in policies where they were needed. 92

A New Paradigm: Community Policing and Problem-Oriented Policing

The most important new development in policing in the 1980s and 1990s was the advent of community policing (COP) and problem-oriented policing (POP). Both represented a new paradigm for policing.

Community policing holds that police departments should develop partnerships with neighborhood residents, develop programs addressing specific problems, and give rank-and-file officers more decision-making freedom with regard to how to deal with particular problems on their beats. In the seminal article “Broken Windows,” James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling summed up the recent research on policing: that patrol had only limited deterrent effect on crime, that faster response times did not increase arrests, and that the capacity of detectives to solve crimes was limited. This research suggested two important points: that the police could not fight crime by themselves, but were very dependent upon citizens, and that the police could reduce fear by concentrating on less serious quality-of-life problems (e.g., “broken windows”). 93

Departments all across the country adopted COP. The most ambitious program was in Chicago, where Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) was a citywide
effort. The core element of CAPS was a series of regular neighborhood meetings between police and residents for the purpose of identifying neighborhood problems and developing solutions. An evaluation of CAPS found that it did result in greater citizen involvement with the police, improved cooperation between the police and other government agencies (e.g., sanitation), a decline in neighborhood problems, and improved public perceptions of the police department.  

The concept of problem-oriented policing was developed by Herman Goldstein. It holds that instead of thinking in terms of global concepts such as “crime” and “disorder,” the police should address particular problems and develop creative responses to each one. Instead of crime fighters, officers should be problem solvers, planners, and community organizers.  

In the first POP experiment, officers in Newport News, Virginia, attacked crime in a deteriorated housing project by helping the residents organize to improve conditions in the project itself. This included pressuring both government agencies and private companies to fulfill their responsibilities regarding building conditions and sanitation. The Center on Problem-Oriented Policing in Madison, Wisconsin, provides resource materials on POP and organizes an annual POP Conference. Police departments compete for the Herman Goldstein Award for the outstanding POP project each year.  

Advocates of community policing hailed it as a new era in policing. As early as 1988 Kelling argued that “a quiet revolution is reshaping American policing.” The U.S. Justice Department encouraged the growth of community policing through the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (known as the COPS office), which distributed the money for hiring 100,000 new officers. Many police departments received federal funds for additional officers and established community policing programs. Several studies attempted to measure the impact of the additional officers on crime, but they reached conflicting findings. Some departments, like Chicago, made serious COP efforts. Others, however, adopted the label COP or POP, but did not really change police operations.  

Whatever the impact of community policing, by the late 1990s the American police were in the midst of an extraordinary period of innovation. Police chiefs across the country were open to experimentation and evaluation. David Bayley argues that “the last decade of the twentieth century may be the most creative period in policing since the modern police officer was put onto the streets of London in 1829.”  

### Racial Profiling and Discrimination  

Despite the many positive gains made by the police in the previous 30 years, tensions between the police and racial and ethnic minority groups reemerged as a serious problem in the late 1990s. A report by Human Rights Watch in 1998 concluded that “race continues to play a central role in police brutality in the United States.” Several incidents gained focused national attention on the issue of police and race. The 1991 beating of Rodney King by Los Angeles police officers was videotaped by a bystander and provided dramatic visual evidence of police use of excessive force. Massive riots broke out in Los Angeles and other cities in 1992 when four officers involved in the beating were acquitted of criminal charges (three were
subsequently convicted on federal criminal charges). A vicious assault on Abner Louima by New York City officers in 1997 and the fatal shooting of the unarmed Amadou Diallo inflamed the police–community relations problem. Many observers blamed the race relations crisis in New York City on its zero-tolerance policing policy that involved aggressive enforcement of laws against minor crimes such as public urination and graffiti.

On the morning of May 8, 1992, Robert Wilkins was driving on Interstate 95 in Maryland with three members of his family. They were returning to Washington DC, from the funeral of a family member in Chicago. They were stopped by an officer of the Maryland State Police who told them to get out of the car and then asked for permission to search the car. Wilkins, an attorney and a graduate of Harvard Law School, informed the officer that without an arrest of the driver a search would be illegal. The officer ignored this advice and made the four family members stand in the rain while they waited for the agency’s drug dog to arrive. The dog eventually found no trace of drugs, and Wilkins was finally given a $105 speeding ticket. Wilkins believed not only that the traffic stop was illegal but that he was stopped only because he is African American. This traffic stop eventually led to a major lawsuit (Wilkins v. Maryland) that sparked national controversy over the practice of racial profiling, or what some people called “driving while black.”

Civil rights leaders charged that the police stopped African American drivers solely on the basis of their race and not on the basis of any suspected criminal activity. Data presented as part of an ACLU lawsuit against the Maryland State Police indicated that while African Americans represented only 17 percent of all drivers on Interstate 95 and 18 percent of all observed traffic law violators, they represented 72.9 percent of all drivers stopped by the state police. Additionally, among those drivers stopped, 81.3 percent of those searched after being stopped were African American. Many observers argued that racial profiling, particularly on interstate highways, was a result of the national “war on drugs,” and that police officers stereotyped both African Americans and Hispanics as drug dealers.

Several strategies developed to combat racial profiling. Civil rights groups advocated the collection of data on traffic stops for the purpose of documenting police practices. Some states passed laws requiring all law enforcement agencies to collect data. The San Diego Police Department began collecting data voluntarily, and issuing reports on the data. Other departments did the same. The Police Executive Research Forum published a report with a recommended policy on when race can and cannot be used in law enforcement. A number of departments adopted new policies to prohibit racial profiling (see Ch. 12).

**Police Reform Through Federal Litigation**

A race riot erupted in Cincinnati in April 2001 after the fifteenth fatal shooting of an African American male in five years. In response, the U.S. Justice Department brought a “pattern or practice” suit against the Cincinnati Police Department. Meanwhile, the ACLU and other groups had already filed racial profiling suits against the department. The suits resulted in two settlement agreements. The Justice Department suit ended with a Memorandum of Agreement in 2002 that required
the department to institute a number of management reforms designed to control the use of force and to improve the supervision of officers and the citizen complaint process. The settlement of the ACLU suit required the Cincinnati Police Department to adopt problem-oriented policing as a way of ending police practices that encouraged use of force incidents.  

Federal litigation against police departments was authorized by the 1994 Violent Crime Control Act. Section 14141 of the law allowed the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department to sue law enforcement agencies if a “pattern or practice” of violations of citizens’ rights existed. The Justice Department sued the Pittsburgh Police Department, the New Jersey State Police, the Los Angeles Police Department, Cincinnati, and other agencies under the law. Settlements of these suits resulted in consent decrees or memoranda of agreement that required the departments to improve their use of force policies and citizen complaint procedures, and to implement an early intervention system (EIS) that would track officer performance. Each settlement also included a court-appointed monitor to oversee implementation of the required reforms.

By 2009, the court-appointed monitors had found substantial improvements in the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Washington DC police departments and the New Jersey State Police. The monitor for the Cincinnati Police Department, for example, concluded in late 2008 that “The City of Cincinnati is now in a very different situation than it was in 2002.” The Cincinnati Police Department “has improved its training, its policies and procedures, its investigations of uses of force and citizen complaints, its risk management and its accountability.” The Monitor for the Washington DC police department, meanwhile, concluded in 2008 that as a result of the court-ordered reforms, “the department has substantially transformed itself for the better since the late 1990s.” Monitors in Pittsburgh and for the New Jersey State Police reported similar positive results.

### Into the Twenty-First Century

In the first decade of the twenty-first century, the American police faced a number of challenges. Community policing and problem-oriented policing were important innovations that in some cases had brought about genuine change. Sustaining those reforms remained a challenge, however. Some progress had been made in reducing excessive use of force and ending racial discrimination, but racial and ethnic tensions continued to plague many departments.

The war on terrorism following the attack on September 11, 2001, presented the police with new challenges. Homeland security efforts diverted attention and resources away from traditional police priorities. The war in Iraq, meanwhile, resulted in the temporary loss of many officers who served in the military Reserves or National Guard. Finally, the economic crisis that struck the nation in 2008 strained police department budgets, causing them to delay the hiring of new officers or in some cases even to lay off existing officers.

Much had changed since the first American police departments were created in the 1830s. Policing was completely different from what it had been as recently as the 1960s. In most respects, policing was far more professional than ever before. Major challenges still remained, however.
Although police administrators may take steps to attempt to eliminate misconduct by individual police officers, many departments have adopted patrol practices that, in the words of one commenter, have “replaced harassment by individual patrolmen with harassment by entire departments.”

These practices, sometimes known as “aggressive preventative patrol,” take a number of forms, but invariably they involve a large number of police–citizen contacts initiated by police rather than in response to a call for help or service. One such practice utilizes a roving task force, which moves into high crime districts without prior notice and conducts intensive, often indiscriminate, street stops and searches. A number of persons who might legitimately be described as suspicious are stopped. But so also are persons who the beat patrolman would know are respected members of the community. Such tasks forces are often deliberately moved from place to place, making it impossible for its members to know the people with whom they come in contact.

In some cities aggressive patrol is not limited to special task forces. The beat patrolman himself is expected to participate and to file a minimum number of stop-and-frisk or field interrogation reports for each tour of duty. This pressure to produce, or a lack of familiarity with the neighborhood and its people, may lead to widespread use of these techniques without adequate differentiation between genuinely suspicious behavior and behavior that is suspicious to a particular officer merely because it is unfamiliar. Police administrators, pressed by public concern about crime, have instituted such patrol practices often without weighing their tension-creating effects and the resulting relationship to civil disorder.

Motorization of police is another aspect of patrol that has affected law enforcement in the ghetto. The patrolman comes to see the city through a windshield and hear about it over a police radio. To him, the area increasingly comes to consist only of lawbreakers. To the ghetto resident, the policeman comes increasingly to be only an enforcer.

Loss of contact between the police officer and the community he serves adversely affects law enforcement. If an officer has never met, does not know, and cannot understand the language and habits of the people in the area he patrols, he cannot do an effective police job. His ability to detect truly suspicious behavior is impaired. He deprives himself of important sources of information. He fails to know those persons with an “equity” in the community—homeowners, small businessmen, professional men, persons who are anxious to support proper law enforcement—and thus sacrifices the contributions they can make to maintaining community order.

Summary: The Lessons of the Past

American policing has changed dramatically throughout its history. Viewed from the perspective of three hundred years, the major change was the creation of the modern police: a large, specialized bureaucratic agency devoted to crime control and order maintenance. From the perspective of 100 years, American police departments have changed from inefficient and corrupt political organizations to enterprises with a nonpartisan professional mission. From the perspective of the last 30 years, we can see vast improvements in personnel standards and systems of accountability, including the values of due process and equal protection. The research revolution has produced an impressive body of knowledge about policing. There is a new candor about police discretion and about the limits of the police’s ability to control crime. And, as David Bayley argues, the police are remarkably open to innovation and experimentation.¹⁰⁸

The legacy of the past continues to weigh heavily on the police. Problems of abuse of authority—excessive force, corruption—continue to plague many departments. Conflict between the police and racial and ethnic minority communities remains a problem in nearly every city. And despite the many community policing experiments, routine police work in most cities has not changed that much in 30 years: Officers patrol in cars and answer their 911 calls. In a comprehensive review of recent developments in policing, Stephen Mastrofski concludes that “the patrol officers of today can be expected to do their job by and large as they did a decade ago and as they will do a decade hence.”¹⁰⁹

History offers many lessons about the American police. It dramatizes the fact that policing is always changing. Some of these changes are the result of planned innovation, while others are the result of external social changes. At the same time, history illustrates the extent to which many aspects of policing, including some serious problems, endure.
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For Discussion

The 1968 Kerner Commission Report on urban riots identified a number of police practices that created problems with racial and ethnic minority communities. Has anything changed in the years since? Specifically:

1. Do some police departments still engage in “aggressive preventative patrol”? Can you identify any departments that do? Is the New York City zero-tolerance anticrime program the same thing with just a different name? Find some articles on zero tolerance and examine the similarities.

2. Do some departments use roving anticrime task forces? What about the Street Crime Unit in the New York City police department? Did the
policies of the SCU lead to the controversial shooting of Amadou Diallo in 1999? Find some articles on the Diallo case and discuss whether there are any similarities.

3. The Kerner Commission concluded that automobile patrol alienated officers from the community. Have any departments taken steps to overcome this problem? How? Do some departments use more foot patrol than they did in the 1960s? Is it effective in improving police–community relations? Find an evaluation of a foot patrol program. Did it make a difference in terms of citizen attitudes toward the police?

4. Are community-policing programs effective in improving police–community relations? Can you find specific examples? Find some material on community policing in San Diego. What, exactly, does it consist of? Is there persuasive evidence that it is effective in both controlling crime and maintaining good police–community relations?

### Internet Exercises

Many police departments include material on the history of the department in their annual report and/or on their Web site.

**Exercise 1** Go to [www.officer.com](http://www.officer.com) and click on “Agencies.” Select several police departments and check their Web sites for historical material.

**Exercise 2** Find several department history pages on local police department web pages. What subjects do they cover? What do they not cover? In your opinion, do they cover the really important changes in policing discussed in this chapter?
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