



**THE PAST,
PRESENT,
AND FUTURE
OF
AMERICAN
CRIMINAL
JUSTICE**



**BRENDAN MAGUIRE
POLLY F. RADOSH**

The Past, Present, and Future of American Criminal Justice

Brendan Maguire and Polly F. Radosh

Western Illinois University

GENERAL HALL, INC.

Publishers

5 Talon Way

Dix Hills, New York 11746

The Past, Present, and Future of American Criminal Justice

GENERAL HALL, INC.
5 Talon Way
Dix Hills, New York 11746

Copyright © 1996 by General Hall, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, except for the inclusion of brief quotations in a review, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Publisher: Ravi Mehra
Composition: *Graphics Division*, General Hall, Inc.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 96-77556

ISBN: 1-882289-40-4 [paper]
1-882289-41-2 [cloth]

Manufactured in the United States of America

Preface

With the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1965, the subsequent creation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP), a concerted effort was undertaken by justice authorities and American universities to expand the educational diversity of recruits into law enforcement professions. While the goal of broadly based educational qualifications for law enforcement and criminal justice professionals has outlived the programs created to foster the goal, the commitment to high educational qualifications among law enforcement personnel remains intact. For this reason, expansion of criminal justice programs in American universities has continued for over two decades. At Western Illinois University, which is our professional home, about 10 percent of all undergraduate students (roughly 1,100 students) major in law enforcement. This creates an obvious demand for courses that examine the criminal justice system. Criminal justice departments traditionally have provided factual information about law enforcement, judicial procedures, correctional strategies, and criminal justice careers, while sociology departments have attempted to explain the relationship between crime and social structural variables. As a result of the demand for courses in criminal justice, there has been a proliferation of textbooks that examine virtually every aspect of the criminal justice system and the social problems that underpin the need for criminal justice. The present book does not duplicate what is already available. Like many other works, it highlights the police, courts, and corrections as the principal components of American criminal justice; unlike other books, it offers historical, contemporary, and future-oriented analyses.

Organization of the Book

The Past, Present, and Future of American Criminal Justice brings together nine selections, three each for the police, courts, and corrections, plus an introductory chapter. Seven of the chapters were written especially for this book. The aim of all the chapters is to provide a description of historical, current, and future trends in criminal justice while critiquing the impact of these trends on American society in general. For each of the three substantive topics (police, courts, corrections) there is a historical chapter, a chapter that discusses current patterns, and a chapter that offers informed speculation about what the future might hold. Each historical chapter uses case-study methods to examine historical priorities in the three topic areas. The chapters that focus on current patterns survey the issues and controversies common to each of the three topics in the 1990s. And

the future-oriented chapters review contemporary trends to predict likely future directions for the three criminal justice topic areas.

The scholars who have written chapters for this book are recognized experts in the fields covered by them. Taken as a group, the authors have impressive academic and scholarly credentials, as well as relevant experiential backgrounds in criminal justice professions. All offer critical insight based on years of study and experience in each of their fields of expertise.

Themes of the Book

One of the perennial problems in studying any social phenomenon is the tendency to accept the current status of the phenomenon under study as representative of all that is known about it. That is, we tend to think that the problems we see in the American criminal justice system exist in isolation from other significant social events. Contemporary criminal justice is a product of change, adjustment, and reappraisal of the policies and practices of a society that has had to adjust to evolving social conditions. As Paul Eisenhower points out in Chapter 8, the development of the modern prison system descended directly from practical accommodation to overcrowding in nineteenth-century prisons. Issues such as parole and early release of prisoners have been controversial for 150 years. Likewise, as Brendan Maguire illustrates in Chapter 2, animosity between the police and ethnic minorities is characteristic of nineteenth-century policing as well as contemporary policing.

Many issues in contemporary criminal justice have been discussed and studied for a hundred years or more. A common tendency, however, is to think that current crime trends, violence in prisons, overcrowding of prisons or court dockets, and other issues are contemporary because of some social criteria that cause the problems. One of the underutilized resources available to our modern society is historical reflection. Many of the future problems in American criminal justice might be avoided by reflection on historical trends or current directions. The purpose of this book is to knit together themes and trends that endure beyond the isolation of a particular time.

We have not attempted to put together a definitive collection of extant research on the historical, contemporary, and future trends of criminal justice, but to illustrate through example the threads of continuity that connect the past to the present and the present to the future. Further research is needed to connect other examples of enduring issues and trends in criminal justice. Our project aims, simply, to state where we have been, where we are, and where we are going. Readers may not agree with all that is written, but it is expected that each chapter will be thought-provoking and illuminating. Taken as a whole, the book should be of value to those with an academic or applied interest in American criminal justice.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the many people who helped bring this project to completion. There would be no book of readings without the contributors, and we wish to thank each of the authors for their submissions. Larry T. Reynolds gave us the opportunity to put this book together, and he, along with the reviewers for General Hall, provided us with useful critiques. Francis T. Cullen and Richard T. Schaefer offered us encouragement and good counsel on several occasions. We have relied heavily on Carol Skiles and her impressive word-processing skills. Finally, the everyday support of our colleagues at Western Illinois University has been appreciated. We hope that the final product will do justice to the contributions made by all the people just mentioned.

Contents

1.	A Sociological Introduction to American Criminal Justice <i>Brendan Maguire and Polly F. Radosh</i>	1
2.	The Police in the 1800s: A Four-City Analysis <i>Brendan Maguire</i>	31
3.	Current Issues in Policing <i>Christopher Daskalos</i>	57
4.	The Future of Policing: From a War Model to a Peace Model <i>Gene Stephens</i>	77
5.	The Criminal Courts in “Young America”: Bucks County, Pennsylvania, 1820–60, with Some Comparisons to Massachusetts and South Carolina <i>Craig B. Little</i>	94
6.	The Politics of the American Court System with a Special Emphasis on the Supreme Court <i>Kevin O'Regan</i>	113
7.	The Future of American Courts <i>Anita Neuberger Blowers</i>	139
8.	From Pardon to Parole <i>Paul Eisenhower</i>	156
9.	Contemporary Corrections in the United States <i>Polly F. Radosh</i>	173
10.	Two Futures for American Corrections <i>Francis T. Cullen and John Wright</i>	198
	About the Authors	220
	Index	223

Chapter 1

A Sociological Introduction to the American Criminal Justice System

Brendan Maguire and Polly F. Radosh

Many university courses may strike students as too abstract or even irrelevant to their everyday lives. Typically, this is not true of crime and criminal justice courses. Here students often have strong opinions about the subject matter and view crime and justice issues as part of their real world. This makes it both easier and more difficult to teach such a course. On the one hand, when students have a personalized interest in the subject matter of a course, it usually results in increased attentiveness to course lectures and reading materials. On the other hand, in courses that treat crime and justice issues, students frequently have fixed opinions that may or may not be consistent with actual facts. Hence, course lectures and readings must be able to penetrate individual and ideological barriers. The present book seeks to do just that. A good case in point concerns the definitions of crime and criminal justice, the subject to which we now turn.

Definitions of Crime and Criminal Justice

Crime is law violation. This is known as the *legalistic* definition of crime and is probably the most common way in which behavior is defined as criminal. Not only is this a generally popular definition of crime, it is the definition used by the criminal justice system. The most conspicuous examples of legalistic crimes are the “index crimes.” Dating back to the 1930s, the government has collected official police statistics on certain crimes thought to be the most serious criminal offenses. Today there are eight such crimes: murder/nonnegligent manslaughter, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. It is important to note that these crimes tend to be acts of interpersonal violence or lower-class stealing offenses, with the latter category representing about 90 percent of the total. There is virtually no attention given to the violence perpetrated by powerful corporations or agencies, or for middle- and upper-class stealing.

Because the legalistic definition of crime is limiting, many sociologists and criminologists have argued for a *social harms* definition of crime. The most influential figure in this regard was sociologist Edwin Sutherland (1940), who

introduced the concept of “white-collar crime” in the 1940s. Sutherland (1940, 7) argued that people of the upper class and the corporations they run were generally able to elude criminal prosecution because of “the class bias of the courts and the power of their class to influence the implementation and administration of the law.” Frequently, behaviors that produce social harm are covered by civil law when penalties for law violation are financial, or the behaviors go unchallenged altogether. The most important point for us at present is that a social harms definition of crime is theoretically inviting but difficult to apply in practical terms. The formal criminal justice system is set up to combat legal wrongs, not socially harmful behavior, unless, of course, the behavior is also prohibited by statute.

These issues are crucial to understanding the mission and functioning of the criminal justice system. The American criminal justice system is a multibillion-dollar industry with three primary components: police, courts, and corrections. The principal aims of the criminal justice system are all crime related. The police act to prevent, or at least control, crime; to investigate reported cases of crime; and to apprehend criminal suspects. The courts determine the guilt or innocence of criminal defendants and impose a sentence (punishment) on those convicted. Finally, the corrections component of the criminal justice system works with and secures convicted offenders. Currently, corrections policy is most likely to be identified with the incarceration of individuals in jails or prisons.

This is a simplified description of American criminal justice. What is essential to appreciate, however, is that each component of the system embraces the legalistic definition of crime. This fact is largely responsible for the emergence of a perspective within academic sociology and criminology known as *critical* or *radical* criminology (see, especially, Bohm 1982; Quinney 1977). With regard to the legalistic definition of crime, radical criminologists are particularly associated with these basic propositions: (1) laws are made by the powerful; (2) laws advance and protect the interests of the powerful; and (3) laws are enforced unequally in ways that disadvantage the powerless (Chambliss and Seidman 1971). Hence, according to this view, crime is more a product of social structure than individual agency, and correspondingly, criminal justice serves more of a class-control function than it does a crime-fighting function (Reiman 1990). Given this theoretical starting point, it is no surprise that radical criminology’s policy recommendations for American criminal justice have not enjoyed widespread adoption (Maguire 1988b).

It is hoped that these points will provide background information for the remainder of this chapter and the chapters that follow. Many chapters address these concerns explicitly or implicitly. Next to be discussed is the popular concern with crime and criminal justice.

Everyday Relevance of Crime and Criminal Justice

The purpose of the present book is to contribute to sociology and criminology; the book's appeal is likely to be related directly to the fact that crime and criminal justice are topical and important issues. But why is crime such an immediate and personalized concern for most Americans? Moreover, why is there so much popular interest and debate about our criminal justice policies? There are no satisfactory short answers to these questions, but a good beginning would be to focus on the fact that crime breeds both fear and outrage. Humans are likely to be concerned about that which they fear or about those things perceived as socially outrageous. Let us now look more closely at why crime is such an everyday issue for most Americans.

The Immediacy of Crime

Few would disagree with the proposition that crime is a ubiquitous part of social life in the United States. The index crimes alone account for 14 million to 15 million offenses each year. Even more alarming, crime victimization studies consistently show that many more crimes occur than official police records identify. The point is, when accounting for kinds of criminal offenses, it is probably safe to say that hundreds of millions of crimes are committed each year in the United States. It stands to reason, then, that most people have been personally victimized by a crime or at least have known a family member, close friend, or work associate who has been victimized. This helps explain the personal relevance of the problem of crime and why people fear criminal behavior.

Personal victimization is not the only, or even necessarily the most significant, factor explaining the sense of urgency generally associated with the topic of crime. Arguably, the mass media influence our perception of crime more consequentially than personal knowledge. Crime is a central theme in the newspapers, news magazines, and television and radio news programs (Sheley and Ashkins, 1987). There has also been a proliferation of television news magazines, the most famous of which are "60 Minutes," "48 Hours," and "Prime-Time Live," which feature crime-related stories. In addition to the news media, the entertainment industry, defined principally by films and prime-time television programs, also focuses on crime. Research over several decades concludes that television crime/police programs, a main staple of prime-time programming, distort the realities of crime and policing (see, e.g., Smythe 1954; Gerbner 1972; Garofalo 1981; Maguire 1988a). Viewers are bombarded with one violent crime after another, with nearly all criminal offenses described or portrayed as

acts of interpersonal violence. It is no wonder, then, that people commonly report to pollsters that violent crime is *the* most serious problem in the United States.

It is not just fear that keeps crime uppermost in people's minds; outrage and anger also play a role. Numerous cases express the significance of this point, but one will suffice. In 1986 four Chicago teenagers raped and murdered twenty-three-year-old Lori Roscetti. Ms. Roscetti, a medical student, had been studying for midterm examinations and was driving home late at night. The teenage offenders subsequently told police that they had decided to rob the first person they saw that night. The following account describes in some detail what happened when Roscetti's car stopped at an intersection:

... the four pulled Roscetti into the back seat. One of them drove to the railroad yard embankment, where the 16-year-old pulled the woman from the car, forced her to remove her clothes and raped her.

Afterward, while the assailants argued, Roscetti broke free and ran a short distance before they grabbed her. . .

She was dragged back to her auto and was stabbed approximately 40 times with a butcher knife and a stick Roscetti kept in the car for protection. She was also hit with a concrete block and a metal tool box that she kept in her car. . . . The four then dragged the victim back into the car and put her clothes back on before dumping Roscetti's body back on the railroad embankment alongside the car. They fled with a small amount of money taken from her purse. (Houston and Wattley 1987, 7)

Regrettably, this is not an isolated example. Thousands of incidents each year are every bit as gruesome as the Roscetti rape and murder. Not all of the worst cases are street crimes or violent interpersonal offenses; many of the most hideous offenses involve corporate actions that result in the injury, disease, or death of employees or consumers. Some of these actions are crimes, while others are not in technical violation of any statute. The most notorious illustration of the latter is the Ford Pinto case in which executives dispassionately calculated that the probable burning of motorists in car crashes was preferable (financially) to retooling a minor auto design (Cullen et al. 1987). In any event, whether interpersonal or corporate in nature, and whether they violate the law or are just perceived as criminal, offenses that are blatantly antagonistic to social standards of propriety are likely to make a long-lasting impression. They are not easily forgotten or forgiven. For the millions of people who are outraged by such acts, crime will remain a high priority.

Because crime is an inescapable social phenomena, it is reasonable for people to be concerned. Unfortunately, the nature and extent of crime has been distorted and exaggerated beyond all realistic proportions by the media. While

all indications from official data sources suggest that the most prevalent type of crime is a property offense, the predominant media message is that we are all likely to be victimized by a violent interpersonal attack. Furthermore, an exaggerated emphasis on street crimes has limited society's attention to corporate crimes, which may actually have more devastating consequences at both personal and property offense levels (Coleman 1994). This is an important point and one explicitly or implicitly addressed in all the chapters of this book.

The Continuing Interest in Criminal Justice

People remain concerned about crime because of personal fear and/or outrage. The reasons that explain the persistent interest, and at times preoccupation, with American criminal justice are a bit different. Three factors, in particular, merit elaboration: the cost of criminal justice in the United States; the idea that no criminal justice policies seem to work well; and the fact that politicians use the topic area of criminal justice for political ends. Each factor helps explain why books on criminal justice have a widespread appeal.

Criminal justice expenditures in the United States are extraordinarily high and have been escalating rapidly in recent years. The total sum of money spent on the police, courts, and corrections has risen to about \$75 billion per year (Lindgren 1992).¹ These expenditures include all federal, state, and local spending for police officers, probation and parole officers, public defenders, judges, jails, and prisons. About 40 percent of total expenditures is spent for police protection, while 33 percent and 22 percent are used for corrections and judicial services respectively (Lindgren 1992). The small residual figure results from overlapping and duplicative payments and transactions. It is also worth noting that a vast proportion (87 percent) of the \$75 billion spent annually on criminal justice is expended at state and local government levels. States allocate most of their criminal justice funds to the corrections area, while local governments spend most of their money on police protection (Lindgren 1992). The federal government's share is relatively small in all three areas of criminal justice.

Another way of conceptualizing the cost of criminal justice is to consider its per capita expense. In 1990 the total per capita cost for criminal justice in the United States was \$299 (Lindgren 1992). Because criminal justice is such an expensive commodity in the United States, there is a demand for accountability. Taxpayers want a criminal justice system that works. Oddly enough, American police, courts, and corrections have seldom been proclaimed great successes. The police themselves admit that they are unable to prevent most crimes, unable to detect the occurrence of most crimes, and unable to apprehend most criminals. The police do a poor job of crime prevention, crime detection, and criminal

apprehension, not because they lack skill or motivation, but because the job mandate is insuperable—the police have an impossible occupational mission (Manning 1977).

In fact, one could make a persuasive argument that the two other components of American criminal justice—courts and corrections—also have impossible job mandates. Both systems are incredibly overloaded. For example, if every criminal defendant demanded his or her constitutional right to a full-blown trial, the judicial system would become so jammed that there would be neither justice nor order in the courts. Currently, most defendants do not demand a trial; quite the opposite, about 90 percent agree to a plea bargain, which is a prearranged agreement between the prosecuting attorney and defense counsel (Langan and Dawson 1993). Even with plea bargaining the norm, however, most American courts are backlogged for months. Corrections is in a similar bind. There are simply too many convicted and sentenced offenders for the limited number of jail and prison cells available throughout the country—and approximately half of all jail cells are occupied by individuals awaiting trial (Beck et al. 1993). Currently, in most states, inmates are released early to make room for new arrivals—sometimes with disastrous consequences—and prisons are overcrowded at rates beyond those for which the buildings were designed. This level of overcrowding has severe negative consequences for inmates, those who work in correctional services, and society. The overcrowding produces greater objectification of inmates, increased job stress for correctional officers, and reduced safety for society as dangerous offenders are released early to satisfy court requirements concerning holding capacity.

Sheer volume is one reason why our criminal justice system does not work well, but this is not the only reason for the failure of the police, courts, and corrections in the United States. It is also true that American criminal justice orientations and punishment philosophies have often been confused and/or extreme in their orientation. For example, in the 1960s the rhetoric, if not practice, of corrections was dominated by rehabilitation strategies that assumed that the offender had a flaw that could be diagnosed and remedied. By the late 1970s, rehabilitation was largely displaced by the more penal “lock them up and throw away the key” philosophy that has prevailed through the 1980s and into the present.

Even within a given historical period the different components of the criminal justice system sometimes lurch from one extreme to another, depending on popular sentiment and political expediency. Specific police departments, for example, may go months or years emphasizing crime control and then suddenly shift toward a service and peacekeeping orientation. Likewise, our court system tends to vacillate between a philosophy that furthers individual rights and due process to a judicial orientation that curtails the rights of suspects and defendants.

Procedural and ideological tilting is the norm for American criminal justice and has been for centuries.

With so much ideological and political fluctuation, it is no wonder that our criminal justice system has been ineffective (neither crime rates nor offender recidivism rates have shown any improvement over the past several decades). It is apparent that inconsistent policing, judicial, and correctional strategies are a poor framework for success in the criminal justice sphere. Inconsistency may not be the only problem. It seems evident that, for decades, America has chosen to adopt some of the worst conservative criminal justice proposals and some of the worst liberal criminal justice proposals.² For example, one could argue that our criminal justice system is too tough on some offenders (e.g., drug offenders) and not tough enough on other offenders (repeat violent offenders and corporate offenders). In 1991, of all admissions to state prisons, 72,423 were convicted drug offenders and only 18,301 persons were convicted of assault; further, both categories of offenders had a median sentence of 48 months. Apparently, drug use and drug trafficking is taken as seriously, or more seriously, than physical assault (Perkins 1994, 9, 17).

A third reason why criminal justice policies remain of interest to most people living in the United States is that politicians have a lot to say about the issues. At least as far back as 1968, crime and criminal justice have been pivotal issues in presidential campaigns. In 1968 the Republican candidate, Richard Nixon, offered this assessment: "By now Americans, I believe, have learned the hard way that a society that is lenient and permissive for criminals is a society that is neither safe nor secure for innocent men and women" (quoted in Quinney and Wildeman 1977, 114).

One of the great political ironies of the twentieth century, of course, is that Nixon subsequently declared himself "not a crook"—a declaration met with skepticism in many quarters. In any event, Nixon's political use of the crime and justice issue set the stage for the 1988 presidential campaign between George Bush and Michael Dukakis, where the topic of specific deterrence became one of the most consequential issues of the election. Bush was critical of Dukakis because, as governor, the latter supported a Massachusetts program that allowed convicted felons still serving prison time to be free on furlough. Let us consider Bush's exact comments: "Some people need to be taken off the streets and kept off the streets. . . . That's why I think it is disgraceful that my opponent supported the only furlough program in all 50 states, and throw the federal program in too, that furloughed murderers who had not served enough time to be eligible for parole" (quoted in Rosenthal 1988, A16).

Bush further chided Dukakis with this comment: "Clint Eastwood's answer to crime is: Go ahead, make my day. . . . My opponent's answer is: Go ahead, have a nice weekend, (quoted in Rezendes 1988, A25).

Democrats have traditionally viewed crime and criminal justice differently. They have preferred to focus on widespread problems of social life (e.g., poverty, lack of health care, unemployment, racism) rather than the putative flaws of individuals. To cite one prominent example of this line of reasoning, in 1979 President Jimmy Carter advanced the notion that America was in a moral malaise: "All the legislation in the world can't fix what's wrong with America. What is lacking is confidence and a sense of community" (quoted in *Time* 1979, 20).

More recently, the liberal Democratic senator from New Jersey, Bill Bradley (1992, I:15), linked inner-city violence, drug use, gang participation and births to single women to a crisis of meaning:

Without meaning, there can be no hope; without hope there can be no struggle; without struggle there can be no personal betterment. Absence of meaning derived from overt and subtle attacks from racist quarters over many years and furthered by an increasing pessimism about the possibility of justice offers a context for chaos and irresponsibility.

It has been observed many times that in addressing crime, Republicans are most interested in *criminal* justice, whereas Democrats are most interested in *social* justice. As of 1994, however, even Democrats have taken tougher social policy positions:

Heavy spending on new prisons, "three strikes and you're out" sentencing laws, "deadbeat dad" statutes, "boot camps" for youthful offenders, "two years and you're out" welfare reform, denying welfare benefits to unwed mothers, police sweeps through housing projects, even local caning and curfew ordinances—all are ideas being supported by Democrats. (Fineman 1994, 36)

Of the proposals cited above, perhaps the most popular is the "three strikes and you're out" philosophy legislated in many states and championed by politicians of all stripes. Usually this slogan is interpreted to mean that anyone convicted of three felonies will be sent to prison for life with no chance of release. This is a stern measure to take, but not one that is entirely sensible, given what is known about age and the crime rate. It has been documented time and again that most serious crime is committed by youthful offenders. Persons under twenty-five years of age account for nearly 60 percent of all arrests for serious crimes (Reid 1994, 69). At the other extreme, of all new state prison admissions for 1991 only 1.3 percent were age fifty-four or over (Perkins 1994, 9). As age increases, then, crime perpetration decreases. Criminologists call this the "ag-

ing-out phenomenon” (Adler et al. 1994, 26). Therefore, confining offenders into their fifties, sixties, seventies and eighties is an excessively costly venture with little to be gained in terms of public safety. Nonetheless, this aptly illustrates the intrusion of politics into the workings of American criminal justice. Neither political party wishes to be seen as “soft on crime,” so both Republican and Democratic politicians embrace the harshest-sounding criminal justice proposals advanced.

The high cost of criminal justice practices, paired with the low success rate of these practices, has resulted in numerous evaluative studies by criminologists and sociologists. Criminal justice researchers focus almost exclusively on current programs and policies because that is where the money is—everyone wants to know what does and does not work. Unfortunately, this myopic orientation tends to exclude from consideration relevant lessons from history as well as important future prospects. By taking the long view (past, present, and future), the chapters in this book offer readers a comprehensive critique of American criminal justice. The chapters also provide a scientifically informed backdrop to current popular (and political) explanations and proposals concerning American criminal justice. What follows now is an introductory exposition of the sections and chapters contained in this book.

The Past, Present, and Future of American Policing

Carl Klockars (1985) begins his book on the police by reviewing selected definitions of police, as submitted by his students. In abbreviated form here are the definitions cited by Klockars (1985, 7–8):

—The police are handsome young men and women who fight the forces of evil.

—The police are a bunch of hot shots who get their kicks from hassling people.

—The police are an agency of government that enforces the law and keeps the peace.

—The police are a weapon the state uses to oppress the working classes, the poor, and minorities.

—The police are the people who come into my father’s restaurant to get free food.

—The police are the people who drive police cars.

Each of these definitions is partially correct, but each is also incomplete, if not directly misleading. With this in mind, Klockars (1985, 13) advances a more acceptable definition:

—Police are institutions or individuals given the general right to use coercive force by the state within the state's domestic territory.

For our present purposes, it is useful to add to this definition the idea that coercive force is granted to police *in order to enforce the law*. While there is no consensus between or within groups of citizens, researchers, and the police themselves as to what the most basic police functions are, all groups would probably agree that the police are charged with law enforcement. The process by which the community (state) has ceded coercive authority to the police in order to enforce the law has been slow and evolutionary. While we cannot trace with accuracy the exact nature of early police work, it was probably not formalized but rather subsumed under the largely informal social control that members of society exerted over one another. By the thirteenth century in England, as noted in Chapter 2, the "night watch" police format had developed. Colonial America also adopted the night watch, which demanded that adult males assume civic responsibility for protecting the community. Such individuals had to take their turns at being a watchman or purchase the services of someone else to do it for them. It became increasingly clear, however, that this kind of policing was both inefficient (e.g., the watchmen were nonprofessionals who served only in the evening hours) and corrupt (e.g., rich men could pay derelicts or alcoholics to serve their rotations).

The response to the failing night-watch system was an attempt to professionalize the police and formalize their job functions. In 1829 the London Constabulary, the first modernized police force, was established by the English Parliament. Sir Robert Peel, Britain's home secretary, led a long legislative fight to create the London "bobbies"—so named because of Peel's founding role (Walker 1983). The signal historical event in the development of the modern police in the United States, then, actually occurred outside this country.

The London Constabulary began with a force of 1,000 men, chosen from among 12,000 initial applicants (Pursley 1977). In the early 1830s the force expanded to about 3,300 men. Between 1830 and 1838 there were 5,000 dismissals and 6,000 resignations, most of them not of a voluntary nature (Lee 1971, 240). Although there was strong initial opposition to the London police (their military-style presence was viewed as a threat to freedom), the officers were quickly embraced as congenial professionals. From the beginning, London bobbies were instructed to keep their tempers under control. For example, Peel stated: "No constable is justified in depriving any one of his liberty for words only and language however violent towards the P.C. himself is not to be noticed (quoted in Miller 1975, 87–88).

Twelve principles were formulated by Peel and served to guide the organization and operation of the London police. These principles are paraphrased below (Kirkham and Wollan 1980, 29):