Origins and Evolution of American Policing

“Police officers and police activities receive intense scrutiny by everyone.”

1. Outline the origins of policing.
2. Summarize various eras of policing.
3. Outline the emergence of state and federal law enforcement agencies.
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THE EMERGENCE OF EVIDENCE-BASED POLICING

In 2011, Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, in conjunction with the National Institute of Justice, released an important new publication entitled “Police Science: Toward a New Paradigm.” The publication’s authors, George Mason University Professor David Weisburd and Peter Neyroud, Chief Executive of the National Policing Improvement Agency in the United Kingdom, called for “a radical reformation of the role of science in policing.” Their purpose was to facilitate the start of a new era of evidence-based policing. As we shall see in numerous places throughout this book, evidence-based policing, which refers to the use of high-quality social science research to guide police practice, is rapidly becoming an important theme in twenty-first century law enforcement, and may be the most important innovation in policing since Sir Robert Peel formed the world’s first modern-day police force.

“Advance of science in policing is essential,” the Kennedy School authors wrote, “if police are to retain public support and legitimacy.” Unfortunately, however, the authors point out that “evidence-based policing is [still] not the rule” today, and that “science is [still] not an essential part of [today’s] police world.” Worse, say Weisburd and Neyroud, today’s police leaders have failed to take ownership of police science, allowing outside institutions to dictate the nature of policing studies, and to produce findings that may not even be relevant to day-to-day enforcement operations. Weisburd and Neyroud call upon police leaders to correct the situation by stepping up their use of science, and by familiarizing themselves with contemporary best practices in law enforcement agencies around the country and around the globe. It is essential, say the authors, to determine what policing programs actually work, and to use that knowledge to become wise decision-makers when asking for public moneys.

“Police Science: Toward a New Paradigm,” is one of a series of articles in the Kennedy School’s New Perspectives in Policing series, and is available on the Web at http://justicestudies.com/policing/newparadigm.pdf. It was published as part of the Kennedy School’s Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety, which met from 2008 to 2010. An older series consisting of 17 articles, published between 1988 and 1993, comprise the original Perspectives on Policing series, and are also available on the Web. You can access them at http://tinyurl.com/6b8faze.

As you read through this text, you will learn more about evidence-based policing (see a more formal definition of the term later in this chapter) and about its relevance to policing in the twenty-first century. A good introduction to the applicability of the modern social sciences to policing and to the field of criminal justice in general can be found in National Institute of Justice Director John Laub’s Web-based video presentation entitled “Embracing A Culture of Science,” at http://nij.ncjrs.gov/multimedia/video-laub1.htm.

The Origins of Policing

For students of policing, an appreciation of history is essential in order to understand the contemporary structure of law enforcement in the United States today. As a result of historical circumstances, the American system of policing is nearly unique in the world. Most countries today rely on one or only a few agencies for law enforcement. In the United States, however, there are thousands of law enforcement agencies with hundreds of thousands of employees. No other country has a policing system that looks quite like ours.

The study of policing history is important for another reason: For better or for worse, history often repeats itself. History repeats itself for worse when policy makers make decisions in a vacuum, without regard for those who have faced the same problems before. In other words, the failure to appreciate what was once tried without success leads to a costly repetition of past mistakes. Some critics of recent changes in American policing, such as the shift toward community policing, for example, argue that what we are now doing signals a return to days of old, which may not be desirable.

Alternatively, a technique or program that looks totally innovative and desirable today may have been purposefully avoided in the past. An example, which we will later cover more thoroughly, is federal–local law enforcement partnerships, which some see as especially important in the fight against terrorism. Critics of such efforts suggest that we are inching toward a national police force, a notion that, to the minds of many, is antithetical to our nation’s system of government.

History can repeat itself for the better when we revisit the successful strategies of the past. The decentralization that served policing early on in our nation’s history, for example, is now part and parcel of recent reforms in policing around the country.

The American system of policing is nearly unique in the world.

From Private to Public Policing

One of the earliest known methods of policing, called kin policing, involved families, clans, and tribes enforcing informal rules and customs. Each member of the group was given authority to enforce the established rules, and individuals who deviated from
community norms were often dealt with harshly. This method of policing changed during the rise of the Greek city-states and the Roman Empire, and law enforcement evolved from what was essentially a private affair to a public one.

Greece and Rome began to use appointed magistrates to enforce the law. These unpaid individuals were largely responsible for law enforcement until about the third century BCE in Rome and the sixth century BCE in Greece. The first paid law enforcement official was the praefectus urbi, a position created in Rome about 27 BCE. By 6 CE, Rome had a large force of these individuals who patrolled the streets day and night. Once the Roman Empire fell, though, law enforcement became the responsibility of the individual monarchies throughout Europe.

Kings used military forces for law enforcement, but they also relied on so-called night watches, or groups of citizens who roamed the streets looking for signs of trouble. Members of the night watch were given the authority to investigate crimes and to make arrests. The night watch system eventually evolved into the frankpledge system, which became more formalized around the twelfth century when kings appointed individuals known as chief-pledges to ensure that the system worked. In the frankpledge system, ten households were grouped into a tithing, and each adult male member of the tithing was held responsible for the conduct of the others. Ten tithings were known as a hundred, or parish, and a group of several parishes eventually came to be called a shire. Shires resembled modern-day counties in terms of their size. The term sheriff comes from the old English word shire-reeve, which means “the keeper of the shire.” The shire-reeve was granted authority by the Norman kings to levy fines against criminals and also to levy fines against the parishes for failing to capture criminals.

In England, the Second Statute of Westminster (1285) required that each parish appoint two constables. Their duties were to inspect the arms of the parish and to assist the sheriff with law enforcement. Men over the age of 15 formed the posse comitatus, which assisted with the pursuit and capture of dangerous criminals. Magistrates, who eventually came to be known as justices of the peace, began to be appointed by the king or the sheriff around the thirteenth century. They had primary responsibility for adjudicating crimes, not unlike modern-day judges. In England, from which we derive many of our traditions, this was the predominant model of law enforcement until the nineteenth century.

What set early approaches to policing apart from modern policing practices is that most of the officials charged with enforcing laws were volunteers. If paid, they were not salaried as police officers are today. Sheriffs, for example, were allowed to appropriate a portion of the money collected in the king’s name. Even though these developments signaled a shift from private to public policing, much of the job of enforcing the law remained largely private; there simply were not enough public officials to do the job. As the years passed, though, policing took ever greater steps in the direction of becoming a governmental function.

One of the most significant steps toward fully public policing occurred in 1735, when two London parishes were given authority to pay their watchmen out of tax collections. Then, toward the middle of the eighteenth century, John and Henry Fielding, two Bow Street magistrates, started to pay men to serve as constables and patrol the streets at night. These Bow Street Runners, or thief takers, patrolled the city on foot and the surrounding areas on horseback. They also performed investigations, and for that reason they have been described as the first known detective unit.

In 1800, the Thames River Police were paid by public moneys. Private police forces did not disappear, however. Outside London in more rural areas, much law enforcement was still the responsibility of churches, communities, parishes, magistrates, and a variety of other individuals. Moving beyond England, other countries also started to form public police agencies. France, Prussia (Germany), Russia, China, and India all made the gradual shift from private to public law enforcement. As police officers came to be paid with public funds, the shift away from private policing became more apparent.

The Origins of Policing

**Policing in London became the model for policing in America.**

**The Influence of the English Model**

To a large extent, policing in London became the model for policing in America. Historians have called attention to various forces behind the emergence of American policing, several of which we will consider shortly, but what early American policing looked like stemmed a great deal from the English approach.

In 1822, British home secretary Sir Robert Peel criticized the state of policing in London. Some years later, he was responsible for passage of the “Act for Improving the Police in and Near the Metropolis,” otherwise known as the Metropolitan Police Act.
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Adopted by Parliament in 1829, this legislation created the world’s first large-scale organized police force in the city of London. As others have noted, the Metropolitan Police Act “introduced a centralized and unified system of police in England” and constituted a revolution in traditional methods of law enforcement. The legislation heralded the end of the old, fragmented, and ineffectual system of parish constables and represented the dawn of a whole new era of policing.

Two men, Charles Rowan and Richard Mayne, were appointed to oversee development of the force. They adopted a military organizational model. This was resisted to a large degree by British citizens out of fear that the line between policing and the military would be too thin, and that police might behave like an occupying army. Rowan and Mayne, however, went to great lengths to ensure that their officers behaved properly, and the police force eventually gained widespread acceptance.

Sir Robert Peel’s contribution lies not just in the creation of the first organized police force, however. He was among the first to envision a broader role for officers than just crime fighting. Peel emphasized the prevention of crime. He also felt that uniforms were necessary because they would make officers stand out in a crowd and thus discourage crime. Beyond that, Peel identified a series of principles that he said ought to characterize any police force (Figure 1.1).

Policing Comes to America

The first North American colonists settled along the eastern seaboard. They hailed from a number of countries, including Spain, France, Holland, Sweden, and of course England. The first of these settlements, Jamestown, was established in 1607 in what is now Virginia. The colony at Plymouth, Massachusetts, followed, set up by the Pilgrims in 1620. Swedish and Dutch citizens settled around what is today New York City. The Spanish claimed land in what is now the southern United States and in the Caribbean. All of these people had visions of expanding their settlements, but given their distance from the European mainland, doing so was difficult. Expansion was particularly difficult for the English and French because Spain’s presence was significant.

Bow Street Runners  An early English police unit formed under the leadership of Henry Fielding, magistrate of the Bow Street region of London. Also referred to as thief takers.

Sir Robert Peel (1788–1850)  A former British home secretary whose criticisms of the state of policing in London led to the passage of the Metropolitan Police Act and the establishment of the world’s first large-scale organized police force in that city in 1829.

Metropolitan Police Act  The legislation adopted by the British Parliament in 1829 that established the world’s first large-scale organized police force in London.

FIGURE 1.1 Sir Robert Peel’s Nine Principles of Policing.  

Early on, churches in America were heavily involved in crime control, though without a formal criminal justice system. People who strayed from acceptable forms of conduct were often shunned by their congregations. According to one historian, church congregations functioned as the “police and courts of first resort.” Moreover, when corporal punishments were used, they were often carried out in public. The use of stocks, floggings in the public square, and even public hangings were common methods of dealing with wayward individuals. Public punishments, often witnessed by hundreds of people, made clear to everyone the consequences of inappropriate behavior.

As more colonists moved to the New World, however, they “brought the law in their baggage.” That is, they brought knowledge of English criminal codes, law enforcement agencies, and methods of punishment, and they adapted them to serve the needs of their new communities.

**Chaos in the Cities**

As America came of age, more immigrants arrived and settled in urban areas. Cities became increasingly crowded, dangerous, and dirty. For example, from 1850 to about 1880, New York City’s population grew until almost a million people were crowded into the two-square-mile center of the city. The city’s East Side housed nearly 300,000 people who lacked toilet facilities, heat, fire protection, and other essentials. Unemployment levels were high, and sickness abounded. Cholera outbreaks were common, killing thousands of people at a time.

By the mid-1800s, crime had become commonplace throughout many American cities. People stole and looted to survive. Organized gangs formed, fought for territory, and contributed to the violence and mayhem within the city. By one account, by 1850 New York City had become America’s most terrifying city. Other large cities like Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia hardly fared better.

Early efforts to control crime fell on the shoulders of appointed constables and citizen volunteers. The constables patrolled during the daytime; citizens patrolled at night. But as the cities grew and became more dangerous, this system could not keep pace with crime. In 1844, the first metropolitan police department was formed in the New York City area. It initially patrolled only during the daylight hours, leaving the preexisting night watch to patrol the city during darkness. The early New York City force was modeled after London’s Metropolitan Police and consisted of only 16 officers appointed by the mayor. The force was reorganized and expanded to 800 officers in 1845 under Mayor William Haveremeyer, who divided the city into three police districts. This period also saw the elimination of the old night watch system and the construction of station houses and local courts. Twelve years later, in 1857, the police in Manhattan, Brooklyn, Staten Island, Westchester County, and the Bronx were consolidated into one department under a governor-appointed board of commissioners, becoming what we think of today as the New York City Police Department (NYPD).

Prior to the consolidation, 18 separate police forces patrolled within the area that comprises present-day New York City. Some of them were better equipped and organized than others. Lacking, however, was a centralized police mandate, good communications, and coordinated efforts.

On the one hand, the combined force of 1857, which initially consisted of 6,396 members, was welcomed by people who were distressed about problems of social disorganization and crime within the city. On the other hand, there was concern that the new police force might become a standing army (recall that our nation was founded, in part, out of frustration with overreaching, centralized government). Other large cities quickly followed the New York example, establishing their own police forces. They did so in response to surges in violence, conflict, multiple riots, and citizen fears that America’s experiment in self-governance might not survive.

London’s police, as we have already seen, served as something of a model for policing in many American cities. Reformers in America were impressed with what London’s **bobbies** did to prevent, and not just respond to, crime. London’s police stressed highly visible patrols intended to discourage crime. But the police forces of New York and other large cities differed from their English counterparts in at least two important ways. First, unlike police in London, America’s first police officers were heavily involved in politics. Most police officers at the time answered to political leaders or ward bosses in the areas they served. Officers’ very jobs were dependent on remaining in the good favor of whatever political figure was in charge at the time. Second, in stark contrast to their counterparts in London, American police officers were more willing to use force. These two unique features of American policing contributed in no small part to policing as it is known today.
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Throughout the West, an example was Stephen Austin’s corps of fighters, a group of tough men he enlisted to protect the settlers he was bringing into the Tejas, Mexico, area. This corps of rangers eventually aided in the Texas revolution against Mexico, providing scout services for the U.S. Army during the Mexican-American War. They came to be known as the Texas Rangers, and their efforts ushered in a period of enhanced border patrol in Arizona and New Mexico as well as the formation of state police forces throughout the Southwest.33

Organized police forces in early America were born of necessity. A single law enforcement official rapidly became inadequate as populations surged. Densely populated cities could not realistically be patrolled with one or even a few officers. But unlike the evolution of policing in other nations, Americans rejected centralized power and shunned any national police force. Law enforcement became a local effort that reflected local priorities and issues. That is why today we see thousands of distinct police agencies at various levels of government all across the United States. Even if there had been a desire during this period for a centralized police agency, it is doubtful it could have succeeded, given the size of the territory for which it would have been responsible. Early police agencies could not have survived without some connection to the communities they patrolled.

The decentralized policing model (which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3) has been hailed as representing the American ideal, but there was a downside. As police agencies proliferated across America, they varied widely in terms of quality and professional commitment. Some may argue that policing today is not as highly regarded an occupation as it could be, but in the late nineteenth century, policing was generally viewed as routine, unglamorous work. Officers were held in low regard and, because the pay was poor, cities had difficulty recruiting qualified candidates. So desperate
As we have just seen, from the colonial period to the late nineteenth century, organized police forces of various kinds emerged across America. Like early policing on the other side of the Atlantic, law enforcement began as a private affair and eventually became public. Once police agencies were an established presence, they grew in number and influence. They also evolved in response to the demands and pressures of the time. Most researchers agree that these changes occurred in three distinct eras: the political era, the reform era, and the community era.36

### The Political Era

In 1895, “the realities of patrol work mocked Robert Peel’s dream of a continuous visible presence … police patrol barely existed at all.”37 Corruption was widespread, and some cities assigned unmanageable beats to their officers. In 1880, for example, Chicago officers patrolled more than three miles of streets—on foot. Large portions of other major metropolitan areas were not patrolled at all. Residential districts were all but ignored in most cities.38 In addition, communication systems were inadequate, making it next to impossible for sergeants and other command officials to call officers to crime scenes. We refer to this period as the political era.

### Policing the Slaves

Unique circumstances existed in the American South during this early period. There, slave patrols represented a crude form of policing. Slave patrols were created in the eighteenth century to apprehend runaway slaves and to ensure that slaves did not rise up against their owners. The slave patrols were largely a private activity carried out by citizen volunteers, leading to a serious lack of control of the slave patrols’ actions. When they apprehended runaway slaves, they often meted out “justice” on the spot, frequently using violence. Due process of law was a distant concern. Slave patrols could (and did) arbitrarily enter private residences for the purpose of rounding up those who fled from bondage. The patrols were largely an outgrowth of fear on the part of wealthy white landowners that slaves were a dangerous group in need of careful scrutiny and control. With the end of the Civil War came the dissolution of the slave patrols. They did, however, provide the impetus for the Ku Klux Klan, whose mission of terrorizing black families and black communities was not entirely different from that of the slave patrols.

### Policing Eras

As we have just seen, from the colonial period to the late nineteenth century, organized police forces of various kinds emerged across America. Like early policing on the other side of the Atlantic, law enforcement began as a private affair and eventually became public. Once police agencies were an established presence, they grew in number and influence. They also evolved in response to the demands and pressures of the time. Most researchers agree that these changes occurred in three distinct eras: the political era, the reform era, and the community era.36

### The Reform Era

In 1970, the New York Times published a series of articles critical of the Los Angeles Police Department’s training and discipline policies. This led to a new era in policing, the reform era.39 The police were forced to adopt modern policing techniques to maintain their legitimacy in the community. The Police Academy Act of 1973 was passed in California, establishing the police academy as a requirement for police officers. The police academy was designed to provide a standardized level of training for police officers, which was intended to improve the professionalism of the police force. This period was characterized by the adoption of modern policing techniques, such as community-oriented policing.

### The Community Era

In the 1990s, the community era began. This era was characterized by the adoption of community-oriented policing, which emphasizes building positive relationships between the police and the community. The focus of policing shifted from crime control to community service. The broken windows model of policing emerged, which emphasized the importance of maintaining law and order in the community. This model was based on the idea that a small number of disorderly people could have a significant impact on the community if they were not controlled. The community era was characterized by the shift from crime control to community service and the adoption of community-oriented policing.

---

Think About It…

**An Introduction to Evidence-Based Policing** Evidence-based policing is a hot topic in contemporary law enforcement. Its goal is to use research to guide practice and evaluate practitioners. There is little consensus about what is effective in policing. Many practitioners have an almost unshakable faith in the ability of police officers to prevent crime by simply driving around and keeping a watchful eye on the community. But evidence-based policing isn’t about opinions; it’s about the facts, about what the data and rigorous research show. How does evidence-based policing differ from the way in which policing was performed in times past? In what ways does it improve policing? Might it in some ways distract from the police mission?
Regulating Criminals

Historians generally agree that police officers of the political era did more to regulate criminal activity than to control it. “Officers established relationships with professional criminals, especially pickpockets, tolerating certain kinds of crime in return for information or stolen goods.” They were also heavily involved in providing essential services for those in need. The recently discovered diary of a Boston police officer from 1895 reveals that one of the most common services officers provided was shelter for the homeless. In Cincinnati, for instance, the police station was “a place of last resort for the desperately poor.”

Police stations came to be dirty, disease-ridden places as a result of this practice, so the sheltering of the homeless came to a halt near the end of the nineteenth century.

Many police officers, along with the politicians and ward bosses they served, were corrupt. By one account, jobs in some early police departments were sold as investment opportunities. Corruption flourished at all levels of government as a result of restrictions on various “vices.” Laws limiting drinking, gambling, and sex provided ample opportunity for the criminal element to provide much-desired products and services. Such illegal activities could only thrive, of course, with support from local law enforcement. The payoffs to officers who provided protection for criminals were significant. Detective Thomas Byrnes, head of the New York City Detective Bureau from 1880 to 1895, and widely said to have been corrupt, acquired a fortune of more than $350,000 by the late 1880s (that's about $5 million today).

Patronage Problems

To get elected, political candidates at the turn of the twentieth century made promises to the voters, especially promises of employment. Once a candidate was elected, jobs of various sorts, including police jobs, were used to reward the politician's supporters. Newly hired police officers adopted a number of measures to ensure that their “bosses” remained in power. There are many accounts of police officers, assigned to maintain order at polling stations, who pressured voters to support particular candidates.

An example of political patronage run amok was Tammany Hall in New York City, the name given to the Democratic Party “machine” that played a significant role in the city's politics from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries. The most notorious Tammany leader was William M. “Boss” Tweed. Tweed's control over the political machine was so complete that he was eventually elected to the New York Senate. By most accounts, he and his cronies were corrupt and heavily involved in a wide range of criminal activities. His career eventually ended in a storm of corruption controversy, and he was ultimately sent to prison. During his heyday, though, he relied heavily on police officers to keep him in office and in control of the ward.

The Reform Era

Frustrations over the likes of Boss Tweed ushered in an era of profound reform. In early 1892, Reverend Charles Parkhurst described New York City's mayor and his aides as “a lying, perjuring, rum-soaked, and libidinous lot of polluted harpies.” He also claimed that the police existed for no reason other than “to protect and foster crime and make capital out of it.” Using his church as his forum, Parkhurst began a crusade to bring reform to the political system in New York City. He and a number of other like-minded individuals were largely responsible for the appointment of Theodore Roosevelt as commissioner of the New York City Police Department (NYPD).

Once Roosevelt took charge, he forced corrupt officers to resign and launched a series of unannounced nighttime inspections of the police department. He even took to the streets and approached officers in civilian attire. He initiated disciplinary action against officers who were asleep or away from their posts. Roosevelt resigned in 1897, claiming that the NYPD had been reformed; the reality was that little had actually changed. Nonetheless, Roosevelt's efforts were quickly duplicated in a number of other cities that were experiencing similar problems. Reform efforts failed in these places, too. According to historian Sam Walker, “the reformers never came to grips with the basic problems of police administration.” They claimed that corrupt officers lacked moral character but ignored some of the deeper issues, such as how the department's rank structure (or absence of one) contributed to the problems reformers lamented. Reform efforts floundered for several years until police reformer August Vollmer changed their focus.
August Vollmer was the leader of America’s police reform movement of the early 1900s.

August Vollmer’s Legacy

August Vollmer—the first police chief of Berkeley, California, and perhaps the foremost presence in America’s police reform movement—argued that policing should be regarded as a public service, as a profession focused on improving society. During his address to the International Association of Chiefs of Police in 1919, Vollmer argued that the police had “far greater obligations than the mere apprehending and prosecution of lawbreakers.” The police, he claimed, should go “up stream a little further” by trying to prevent crime by working with families, schools, and other influential institutions. He called for organizational reforms in police agencies, elevated standards of recruitment and retention, and the adoption of modern management techniques, such as those used in the business sector and military.

There was something of a contradiction in Vollmer’s message, however. On the one hand, he called for the expansion of the police role to include crime prevention. On the other, he called for increased crime-fighting efforts. It was crime fighting that won out in the end, leading to “a centralized, authoritarian bureaucracy focusing on crime control.”

Vollmer did more than call for reforms. As chief of the Berkeley Police Department during the early twentieth century, he transformed his department in the following ways:

- Increased the size of the force, from three officers to twenty-seven
- Put officers on bicycle and motorcycle patrol
- First to adopt fingerprinting technology to aid in criminal investigations and collaborated with University of California in making other advances
- First police leader of note to hire officers with college degrees
- Created the Berkeley Police School in 1908

In short, Vollmer’s reforms were consistent with a reform mentality intended to move policing toward professional stature. He took his ideas beyond Berkeley by evaluating numerous police agencies around the country, including the scandal-ridden Los Angeles Police Department. In 1921 Vollmer was elected president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), a position he used to spread his ideas about police reform.

The Crime Commissions

As one of the authors of the 1929 Illinois Crime Survey, a series of influential reports on homicide, juvenile justice, and justice operations in Chicago, Vollmer criticized “the corrupt political influence exercised by administrative officials and corrupt politicians.” He was also the lead police consultant to the 1931 National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, popularly known as the Wickersham Commission after its head, George W. Wickersham. The commission was appointed by President Herbert Hoover in 1929 to investigate the real operations and problems of the criminal justice system. Again, Vollmer called attention to corruption, excessive political influence and meddling in criminal justice, poor leadership and management, ineffective recruitment practices, poor-quality training programs, and other issues.

The work of the Wickersham Commission and others not mentioned here, coupled with Vollmer’s reformist vision, led to some consensus that a professional model of policing would greatly benefit America. It was hoped that policing would become a civil service profession divorced from politics. Reformers had faith in centralization, crime fighting, scientific investigations, and above all else police work that followed the letter of the law.

Interestingly, one of the most significant developments that fueled this change was the Great Depression. With less money to spend, many cities had to cut back on services, which included the closing of some police precincts. This brought police officers under the control of a central police station, consistent with the managerial model Vollmer had envisioned. Some have called this the professional era, others the legalistic era, and still others the reform era. Regardless of what it was called, what occurred was a dramatic change in the way policing was practiced in the United States. It did not happen quickly, though. The process played out over decades, leading up to the 1960s and the third of America’s key policing eras: the community era.

The Community Era

The community era is, by most accounts, the era of contemporary law enforcement. It stresses service and almost a customer-friendly element to police work. Routine and traditional police functions such as patrol, investigations, and the like remain, but many police agencies have changed their mission statements to reflect a new way of thinking epitomized by O. W. Wilson.

O. W. Wilson and the Limitations of Professionalism

August Vollmer’s protégé, O. W. (Orlando Winfield) Wilson, served as chief of the Wichita, Kansas, Police Department between 1928 and 1939. As chief, he clamped down on corruption and brutality, firing 20 percent of the officers on the force. His department’s mission statement, the “Square Deal Code,” eventually became the template for the code of ethics of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. His reforms, many of which were quite radical, were not necessarily welcomed with open arms, even by some...
The community era strongly influences contemporary law enforcement.

people outside the police department. For example, his efforts to aggressively enforce vice laws met with so much resistance that he resigned in 1939.

Despite Wilson's resignation, he went on to gain national prominence. His 1938 textbook, Municipal Police Administration, became a leading work (its eighth edition was published in 1979). A year later, he became a professor of police administration at his mentor's old stomping grounds, the University of California, Berkeley. He remained there until 1960, during which time he started the nation's first doctoral program in criminology and wrote another successful policing text, Police Administration. He went on to write other influential works, including a manual on how to allocate police patrols according to calls for service. More importantly, he called for a shift from foot patrol (the dominant mode of patrol at the time) to automobile patrol. On top of that, he called for one- rather than two-officer patrols to maximize police resources.

Although O. W. Wilson was certainly a progressive reformer, he may have done more to usher in the community era than many realize. In 1960, during the twilight of his career, Wilson was appointed by Chicago Mayor Richard Daley to reform the city's police department in the wake of a scandal. Wilson used many of the same tools as he did in Wichita, Kansas, including reorganization of the department, widespread firings, improved personnel standards, and improved communications. Despite his best efforts, however, civil rights leaders continued to criticize the department, citing police brutality and discrimination in police employment. Wilson was defensive about the discrimination allegations because he had taken significant steps to diversify the predominantly white police department.

These problems led to a great deal of resentment of police in the African-American community, vestiges of which remain today in various cities. Wilson retired in 1968, marking the end of a notable career. What he did not, or could not, fix became abundantly clear in 1969, when some Chicago police officers appeared to run amok on national television, brutally beating protestors outside the Democratic Party's national convention. Wilson was clearly a progressive era reformer, but his actions (or, as some would say, failure to act) in Chicago started the push for something else.

Toward Customer Service

It is perhaps a simplification to say that the community era is characterized by customer service, but at its core, this new era of policing is about connecting the community and the police in a way that was not accomplished during the reform era. Following the public outcry in the wake of the Chicago fiasco and other publicized instances of strained police-public relations, it was no mystery why a new era emerged. Research began to reveal that the police could not reduce crime by their own efforts alone, another reason the dawn of the third era was at hand.

The sentiments of the community era were expressed in a prescient article authored by University of Alaska Professor John Angell at the beginning of the 1970s. Angell argued that traditional police management practices were culture bound, that they were inconsistent with the humanistic democratic values of the United States, that they demanded that employees demonstrate "immature" personality traits, and that they couldn't cope with environmental pressures. In his view, a more community-centered model would (1) improve community relations, which suffered under the bureaucratic, military model of law enforcement; (2) improve officer morale by allowing them a measure of flexibility in the performance of their duties; and (3) improve interagency coordination.

Some aspects of the community era look remarkably similar to policing near the turn of the twentieth century, but without the corruption, patronage, and other problems that characterized the political era. Community era reformers have sought authorization from community members and extensive citizen support; a broad mandate that stresses the provision of services; a decentralized, responsive organizational structure; and close relations with citizens. A strong tie to citizens would be achieved through foot patrol, problem solving, the preservation of quality of life, and a host of other tactics—all of which were designed to ensure citizen satisfaction and all of which look remarkably similar to practices that were in place before the birth of the reform era.

Since, by most accounts, we are in the midst of the community era, much more needs to be said about it. Accordingly, we will devote a full chapter to this topic. In Chapter 8 we will look in depth at why the community era came to pass, what it looks like today, and what its prospects are for the future.

A New Era?

Few people would deny that the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States changed the world. The attacks led...
to one of the most dramatic reorganizations of the U.S. government, including the formation of the cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security. They also led to untold numbers of changes in America’s police agencies. When, for instance, the nation’s terrorist alert level is elevated, it is the local law enforcement agencies that take on most of the responsibility for increased vigilance.

Local police agencies are entering uncharted territory with multiagency partnerships, terrorist response training, and the like. Whether the community era can survive the more militaristic style of law enforcement that followed September 11 remains to be seen. We cannot be certain a new era is upon us, but it very well could be. For the time being, however, local police agencies are struggling to fit their new antiterrorist responsibilities within their community focus and are using intelligence gathered through good community relations to further the goal of terrorism prevention.

**Beyond Local Law Enforcement**

Most of our discussion of police history thus far has focused on local law enforcement: municipal police and sheriff’s departments. There is also an interesting history behind state and federal law enforcement, but the story is much shorter. With the exception of the U.S. Marshals Service, which was founded in the late eighteenth century, the history of state and federal law enforcement goes back only to the nineteenth century.

**The Emergence of State Agencies**

When Texas declared its independence from Mexico in 1836, the Texas Rangers were already an established law enforcement agency. As discussed earlier, they did not begin as a state-level organization. Their initial focus was defending the community, but they adopted policing responsibilities after Texas independence was declared. The early Rangers often took the law into their own hands and were not as concerned with equal treatment and due process as police are today. In 1935, Texas created the Department of Public Safety (DPS), which remains in existence to this day. The Texas Rangers are part of the Texas DPS, as are the troopers of the Texas State Patrol. Once the Rangers came under the supervision of the DPS, conduct problems, excessive force, and the like were reined in. This hasn’t stopped Hollywood from giving the impression that the Rangers are very special, as evidenced by the long-running television show *Walker, Texas Ranger*. For an overview of the Texas Rangers’ real responsibilities, see Figure 1.2.

The other states eventually formed their own state-level police agencies, but they often took unique forms. The Pennsylvania State Police, for example, was founded in 1905 in response to the difficulty local police were having resolving state-specific issues. For example, the western Pennsylvania mining region attracted scores of immigrant workers and experienced ethnic violence and labor disputes. A major coal strike in 1902 prompted President Theodore Roosevelt to appoint a commission to look into the problems of maintaining order in the mining region. This led to the establishment of the state police. Unlike the Texas Rangers and other state agencies, the Pennsylvania State Police consisted largely of men with National Guard and army experience. The Pennsylvania State Police also had their share of problems in the beginning, just like the Rangers, but they gradually assumed greater law enforcement responsibilities and adopted professional standards.

As automobiles became more common and highways were built, state police agencies shifted much of their focus toward the enforcement of traffic laws. What we see today, then, is a mixture of state agencies, some with general law enforcement responsibilities, and others with a traffic enforcement focus. Today, nearly every state has at least one state-level police agency. We will look at them in more detail when we discuss the organization of law enforcement in America in Chapter 3.

**The First Federal Agencies**

**U.S. Marshals**

In 1789, President George Washington appointed the first 13 U.S. Marshals in accordance with the Judiciary Act. Until the Secret Service was established in 1865, the U.S. Marshals focused their efforts on apprehending counterfeiters. Between 1790 and 1870, the marshals were also required to take the national census every ten years, a responsibility that was eventually transferred to the Bureau of the Census. During the nineteenth century, the marshals did everything from arrest fugitive slaves to confiscate property used to support the Confederacy.

More than anything, though, in the latter part of the nineteenth century the marshals and their deputies were responsible for maintaining law and order in the Old West. On October 26, 1881, in Tombstone, Arizona, Marshal Virgil Earp and his deputies (brothers Wyatt and Morgan Earp and John H. “Doc” Holiday) gunned down Frank and Tom McLaury and Billy Clanton in a vacant lot just down the street from the O.K. Corral. Movies like *Tombstone* and *Wyatt Earp* have recounted this series of events. Since the nineteenth century, the U.S. Marshals Service has taken on a range of duties quite distinct from those of days past. We will look at both the history and the modern duties of the U.S. Marshals in Chapter 3.

**Postal Inspectors and Secret Service**

Another early federal law enforcement effort involved U.S. postal inspectors, whose job it was to target crimes committed via the mail. In 1865, the Secret Service was established with the mission to suppress counterfeiting. That responsibility remains today, along with a number of others, including the protection of the president.

**The FBI**

The Bureau of Investigation, now known as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), was formed in 1908. The agency began with 8 Secret Service agents, 14 newly hired investigators, and 12 accountants; their task was to investigate antitrust land fraud and similar matters. The agency grew rapidly and became the...
primary investigative agency for federal crimes. It ascended to a position of high visibility during the 1920s, when J. Edgar Hoover was appointed to lead the agency. Under Hoover’s charge from 1924 to 1972, the FBI apprehended a number of dangerous offenders and engaged in numerous high-profile investigations, perhaps most notably the kidnapping of ace flyer Charles Lindbergh’s baby.

Hoover was a controversial director. He routinely fired agents who displeased him, and it is alleged that he blackmailed political leaders and illegally disrupted the activities of the Black Panther Party; Martin Luther King, Jr.’s, Southern Christian Leadership Conference; the Ku Klux Klan; and other groups. Today, FBI directors cannot serve more than a ten-year term due to concerns that they may become too powerful. To his credit, though, Hoover did a great deal to usher in the professional policing era through his insistence on a crime-fighting role for FBI agents. The FBI is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

The activities of the Texas Ranger Division consist primarily of making criminal and special investigations, apprehending wanted felons, suppressing major disturbances, the protection of life and property, and rendering assistance to local law enforcement officials in suppressing crime and violence.

The Texas Ranger Division will, through investigation and close personal contact with all federal, state, county, and city law enforcement agencies, be responsible for the gathering and dissemination of criminal intelligence pertaining to all facets of organized crime. The Texas Ranger Division joins with all other enforcement agencies in the suppression of the same.

Under orders of the Director, Rangers suppress all criminal activity in any given area when it is apparent that the local officials are unwilling or unable to maintain law and order.

Upon the request or order of a judge of a court of record, Rangers serve as officers of the court and assist in the maintenance of decorum, the protection of life, and the preservation of property during any judicial proceeding.

When called upon, Rangers provide protection for elected officials at public functions and at any other time or place when directed to do so by a superior officer.

The Texas Ranger Division will establish direct personal contact and maintain close liaison with all agencies, or branches thereof, concerned with the investigation and suppression of criminal activities. These contacts are not to be limited to the state but shall be nationwide. Every effort will be exerted to maintain a full and free flow of information on active offenders and offenses among all interested agencies.

Rangers will participate in educational training programs and provide specialized instruction to local, state, and federal law enforcement representatives.

With the approval of the Director, Rangers conduct investigations of any alleged misconduct on the part of other Department personnel.

A Ranger will be the primary Department investigator when a Department member is killed or suffers serious bodily injury, attributable to an intentional act.

The Texas Ranger Division will provide Forensic Hypnotists for use as an investigative tool in gathering additional information.

The Texas Ranger Division will provide forensic artwork for use as an investigative or procedural tool in major criminal cases.

The Texas Ranger Division will assist the Governor’s Protective Detail in providing security for the Texas Governor during his official travel throughout the state, as well as other dignitaries.
Illegal immigration is a hot-button issue today. U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agents routinely apprehend undocumented immigrants crossing the U.S.-Mexico border, but there are not enough agents to effectively stop the massive influx of illegal immigrants. In response to this concern, citizen groups are volunteering their time and energies to help with border protection. One of these groups, the Minuteman Project, rose to national prominence in the early years of the twenty-first century. Its members claim to be working in collaboration with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, but that agency has not officially teamed with or endorsed the Minuteman Project’s efforts. The Minuteman Project (and its sister organization, the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps) consists mostly of civilian volunteers who literally watch portions of the U.S.-Mexico border (employing foot, car, and helicopter patrols) and alert CBP agents to possible illegal crossings. The Minuteman Project calls itself a “vigilance operation” and says that it does not advocate altercations between volunteers and those seeking to cross the border illegally; instead, it aims to provide information to officials whose legitimate responsibility is securing the border. Some volunteers, however, work together in armed patrols and sometimes detain suspected illegal immigrants until CBP agents arrive. Whether the Minuteman volunteers are a “vigilance” group or a “vigilante” group is open to debate. There is no shortage of critics who claim that the Minutemen are concerned with anything but “vigilance.” The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has denounced the detentions of suspected illegal immigrants by Minuteman volunteers, and some members of the ACLU ride out into the Arizona desert to keep an eye on the Minutemen.  

The Minuteman Project raises several interesting questions:

1. Should any civilian volunteers get involved in actively patrolling our borders?
2. What should organizations like the Minuteman Project be allowed to do in terms of policing the borders?
3. Are the Minutemen vigilantes? If so, is there a place for vigilante groups in contemporary law enforcement?
4. Should civilian organizations be involved with general issues of crime prevention and security?
5. Where should the line be drawn between civilian and “official” law enforcement?
6. To what extent is private policing and security helpful or harmful to society’s interests?
Outline the origins of policing.

Policing in the Western world began as a private affair and became a public, or governmental, responsibility. Policing in America looks as it does today largely because it was inherited from the English, beginning with the frankpledge system, the watchman system, and Henry Fielding’s Bow Street Runners.

1. What were the major milestones in the historical development of policing in the Western world?

2. What is the significance of due process of law for American policing?

**frankpledge system** The ultimate outgrowth of the night watch system of social control, dating to the twelfth century, in which ten households were grouped into a tithing, and each adult male member of the tithing was held responsible for the conduct of the others.

**tithing** Under the frankpledge system, a group of ten households.

**parish** Under the frankpledge system, a group of ten tithings. Also referred to as a hundred.

**shire-reeve** The Old English term for sheriff. Literally, “the keeper of the shire.”

**watchman** An early officer on foot patrol who, during the hours of darkness, watched for fires and criminal activities. Upon detecting such events, the watchman’s role was to sound the “hue and cry” to evoke a defensive response from the citizenry. This style of policing dates back to the early to mid-eighteenth century in England.

**Henry Fielding (1707–1754)** An English magistrate who founded what some have called London’s first police force, the Bow Street Runners.

**Bobby** The popular British name given to a member of Sir Robert Peel’s Metropolitan Police Force.

**Texas Rangers** A militia originally formed by Stephen F. Austin in 1823 to protect the territory of Texas against Native American raids, criminals, and intruders. Today, the Rangers serve as part of the Texas Department of Public Safety.

**slave patrol** A crude form of private policing, often carried out by citizen volunteers. Slave patrols were created in the eighteenth century to apprehend runaway slaves and to ensure that slaves did not rise up against their owners.

**due process of law** A right guaranteed by the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments and generally understood, in legal contexts, to mean the due course of legal proceedings according to the rules and forms established for the protection of individual rights. In criminal proceedings, due process of law is generally understood to include the following basic elements: a law creating and defining the offense, an impartial tribunal having jurisdictional authority over the case, accusation in proper form, notice and opportunity to defend, trial according to established procedure, and discharge from all restraints or obligations unless convicted.

**Bow Street Runners** An early English police unit formed under the leadership of Henry Fielding, magistrate of the Bow Street region of London. Also referred to as thief takers.

**thief taker** An alternative name for Henry Fielding’s Bow Street Runners.

**Sir Robert Peel (1788–1850)** A former British home secretary whose criticisms of the state of policing in London led to the passage of the Metropolitan Police Act and the establishment of the world’s first large-scale organized police force in that city in 1829.

**Metropolitan Police Act** The legislation adopted by the British Parliament in 1829 that established the world’s first large-scale organized police force in London.
Summarize various eras of policing.

American policing has evolved through three distinct eras: the political, reform, and community eras. We may be on the cusp of a fourth policing era, which some are calling the homeland security era.

### Political Era
The period of American policing during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries during which police forces served more to regulate crime pursuant to the wishes of corrupt politicians (who used patronage to give police jobs to handpicked loyalists) than to control crime in the interests of the public good.

### Reform Era
The period of American policing during the early to mid-twentieth century, during which efforts were made to professionalize police forces and to eliminate the influence of corrupt politicians.

### Community Era
By most accounts, the contemporary era of U.S. law enforcement, which stresses service and an almost customer-friendly approach to police work.

**Illinois Crime Survey** A series of influential reports, published in 1929, on homicide, juvenile justice, and justice operations in Chicago that criticized the corrupt political influence on the justice system.

**Wickersham Commission** A commission appointed by President Herbert Hoover in 1929 to investigate the operations and problems of the criminal justice system. Formally known as the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement.

**Orlando Winfield “O. W.” Wilson (1900–1972)** A progressive era reformer, professor of police administration, and protégé of August Vollmer whose writings and teachings continue to influence contemporary U.S. law enforcement.

Outline the emergence of state and federal law enforcement agencies.

State and federal law enforcement agencies have their own, unique histories. With the exception of the U.S. Marshals Service, which was founded in the late eighteenth century, the history of state and federal law enforcement goes back only to the nineteenth century. Among the earliest organized state police agencies were the Texas Rangers and the Pennsylvania State Police.

1. Illustrate the development of state and federal law enforcement agencies in the United States.
2. How did the development of those agencies parallel the development of local police forces?
3. How did it differ from the pattern of development seen in local agencies?
Additional Links

This website directs visitors to detailed information about the Wickersham Commission, including its position on the historic issue of prohibition: [www.druglibrary.org/schaffer/Library/studies/wick/index.html](http://www.druglibrary.org/schaffer/Library/studies/wick/index.html). The site breaks down information through a table of contents on the home page for easy selection of material.

This link provides a PDF version of a Bureau of Justice Statistics publication covering police statistics for local departments: [http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/lpd07.pdf](http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/lpd07.pdf).

This website provides a directory of all state police agencies: [www.officer.com/links/Agency_Search/United_States/](http://www.officer.com/links/Agency_Search/United_States/).

This website provides a directory of federal law enforcement agencies: [www.officer.com/links/Agency_Search/Federal](http://www.officer.com/links/Agency_Search/Federal).


A history of British policing is available at [www.met.police.uk/history](http://www.met.police.uk/history).
