

**PRINCIPLES**

---

**OF**

---

**SECURITY**

---

**SECOND EDITION**

**Truett A. Ricks**

**Bill G. Tillett**

**Clifford W. VanMeter**

# **PRINCIPLES OF SECURITY**

## **SECOND EDITION**

**Truett A. Ricks, CPP**

Dean,  
College of Law Enforcement,  
Eastern Kentucky University

**B.G. Tillett, CPP**

Professor and Chair,  
Department of Loss Prevention and Safety,  
Eastern Kentucky University

**Clifford W. VanMeter, Ph.D.**

Director,  
Police Training Institute,  
University of Illinois

## **PRINCIPLES OF SECURITY Second Edition**

Copyright © 1988 Anderson Publishing Co.

Fifth Printing—May 1989

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced by any means without written permission from the publisher.

### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Ricks, Truett A.

Principles of security.

(Criminal justice studies)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Private security services—United States.

I. Tillett, B.G. (Bill G.) II. Van Meter, Clifford W. III. Title.

HV8290.R5 1987

362.8'8

87-12159

ISBN 0-87084-745-7

---

Kelly Humble *Managing Editor*

# Preface Introduction

Six years ago when we wrote the first edition, we prepared a preface in which we stated our objectives and focus for the book. In reviewing the preface, we find that the observations we made are as relevant today as we felt they were six years ago. Thus, other than the comments contained in this paragraph, the preface to our second edition is the same as the first edition.

June, 1987

## Preface

In recent years it has become increasingly apparent that public law enforcement agencies cannot provide the needed resources nor the manpower to protect private property. Thus, the role of private security has become more visible and important as the reality of self-protection and loss prevention has been recognized and accepted by the businessman and property owner.

It is the objective of this book to provide the reader with the basic principles of security and loss prevention that are common and fundamental to all areas of business and asset protection. After presenting a brief look at the history of security, the text provides coverage on the security industry, the threat environment, risk analysis, fundamentals of physical security, common security problems, safety and accident prevention, and the basic elements of fire prevention and protection.

The materials and information that are presented in this text will serve to provide an introduction to a field of study that is undergoing rapid change and enlargement. It is designed for those students interested in a career in security, for those in other fields of study incorporating loss prevention activities such as manufacturing, commerce, finance, health care, national defense, government, architecture, law enforcement, and so on, and for the security practitioner who needs to check, evaluate, or apply the fundamental principles of this text to a particular situation.

In general, private security will progress according to the quality of information and personnel that are available and utilized. If properly educated, trained, and selected, professional security personnel will be the rule rather than the exception. We hope this text will serve to provide a needed step in that direction.

Truett A. Ricks  
Bill G. Tillett  
Clifford W. Van Meter  
January, 1981

# Acknowledgments

Writing of this text has been a rewarding experience for the authors from many standpoints. First, it has provided us an opportunity to continue our research in the ever-changing and dynamic field of private security. As the research was conducted we had the challenge of bringing current and reliable information to our readers. Second, it forced us to work closely with our academic colleagues at Eastern Kentucky University and the University of Illinois in reviewing our manuscripts from a critical yet supportive point of view.

However, as in any undertaking of this scope, there are several people who provided extra assistance and support. Mr. Clarence H. A. Romig, CPP, Adjunct Faculty Member, University of Illinois Police Training Institute provided that extra assistance by writing Chapters 10 and 14. Dr. Larry K. Gaines, Associate Professor, Ann Duerson, Joyce Simpson, Verna Casey, and Priscilla Ray of the College of Law Enforcement at Eastern Kentucky University provided invaluable editorial, research, and clerical assistance. And the authors would like to acknowledge the support and patience provided by their families: Judy, Bill, and Tracey Van Meter; Linda, Terri, Tim, and Lori Tillett; Betty and Tammy Ricks.

# Table of Contents

Preface	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Chapter 1. Historical Development of Security	1
Chapter 2. Current Status of Security Services	23
Chapter 3. The Threat Environment	51
Chapter 4. Perimeter Security	61
Chapter 5. Security Lighting	77
Chapter 6. Locks	91
Chapter 7. Electronic Intrusion Detection Systems	111
Chapter 8. Security Storage Containers	141
Chapter 9. Security Personnel	157
Chapter 10. Risk Analysis and Security Surveys	177
Chapter 11. Internal Threat and Crime	197
Chapter 12. External Threat and Crime	215
Chapter 13. Fire Prevention and Safety	233
Chapter 14. Emergency and Disaster Control	253
Chapter 15. Private Security Education	269
Chapter 16. Legal Aspects of Private Security	285
Chapter 17. Career Orientation and Conclusions	301
Appendix A Selections from the Private Security Task Force Report	319
Appendix B A Commentary and Checklist for Security Surveys	353
Appendix C College Security Program List	373
Index	379

# Chapter 1

## Historical Development of Security

### Introduction

The history of man can be seen as a series of mankind's attempts to provide for his safety, security, and freedom from fear and danger. Mankind has developed weapons, built barriers around dwellings, and devised codes of conduct to protect property and welfare.

Many of these efforts have been uncovered by archaeologists, and some are still visible and even functional after hundreds of years. They are illustrative of man's attempt to isolate, separate or secure himself from others. Evidence of ancient *pole* dwellings has been uncovered where houses and even entire villages were constructed on lakes. Even today this method of home building is still apparent in certain parts of Africa and the Far East. Cave dwellings, often high on cliffs, indicate that early man utilized whatever was natural to his environment for his protection. Many ancient cities have been uncovered to reveal high walls that surrounded the entire town. The Great Wall of China was built centuries ago by the Chinese to keep out the Mongols. Throughout Europe are hundreds of medieval castles encircled by moats, and connected to land by drawbridges. In the United States, the historic movement westward required the construction of forts to provide security for the early settlers from hostile Indians.

History illustrates the ability of mankind to innovate and adjust to changes in the environment. Security needs were first recognized and accomplished by the individual and his family, but ultimately his basic needs became the same as those of the community and the nation. Social customs and relationships expanded beyond the ties of kinship until the informal activities of early man became the formal regimentations and rules of a larger, more complex society.

### Early European Developments

The beginnings of formal security activities developed from the crude and unsophisticated survival tactics utilized by early family groups and the

## 2 PRINCIPLES OF SECURITY

more elaborate tactics utilized once families began to form tribes or clans. The small family groups blended into larger groups where organizational unity was reinforced by kinship and common traditions, customs, language, and common interests. The entire tribe or clan assumed a collective responsibility for taking care of the family, the tribe, and the village. Tribal security customs developed from this rudimentary system which provided security for the individual and the group.

Historically, security responsibilities have followed social and economic developments and the basic principles of law and justice. The culture of the prehistoric hunter and food gatherer limited security to the safety and integrity of persons, their social arrangements within the group and their few possessions, which consisted of limited provisions and a few tools of stone and bone. With the advent of agriculture and the domestication of animals, security took on new dimensions. The cultivation of plants added the need for continuous possession of land. Instead of roaming the land in search of food and shelter, man settled down to build shelters for himself and his animals. The land, animals, buildings, and crops became coveted possessions with economic value. Throughout the ancient world, the dealings in agriculture, commerce, the crafts, and the professions became regulated as societal rules and codes evolved to protect life and property in a changing agricultural society with an increasingly complex social order.

### *The Anglo-Saxons*

Around 400 A.D., as land began to be scarce on the European continent, the Anglo-Saxons, a people of German origin, began to migrate to England in large numbers. They brought a security system of compulsory communal responsibility for protecting and taking care of the security needs of individuals, families, tribes and villages. Under this system the people were organized into groups of ten families, or householders called a *tithing*, and further into groups of ten tithings called a *hundred*. Each tithing selected a *tithingman* to represent the group. Ten tithingmen represented a hundred and had a King's *reeve* to speak for them. Several hundreds made up a *shire* (a geographical administrative district) and a *shire-reeve* (the title *sheriff* is derived from this office) was the spokesman for the entire shire. Several shires constituted an *earldom*, headed by an *earldom-man*.

The feudal tithing system stressed social stability and hierarchical control. It was considered the duty of every citizen to be a policeman. The members of the group were themselves responsible for whatever offenses were committed within their borders. The tithingman who was elected from the group was given the responsibility for calling the group to ac-



tion, i.e., raising the “hue and cry,” and meting out punishment. The English common law’s process, wherein every able-bodied man was required to join in the communal pursuit of law breakers, was the origin of citizen’s arrest.

The basic economic and societal ties of feudalistic society were kinship and the relationship between an individual and his landlord. The kinship philosophy required the kindred to seek vengeance and compensation for an act against a relative. The servant-landlord philosophy was a bilateral (though unequal) agreement: the landlord would protect his servant from outside forces, and in return the servant would till the land to provide the necessary substances for life.

### *The Norman Era*

The dual system of the landlord-servant relationship and strength of kindred justice was completely changed in 1066, when William, Duke of Normandy, invaded and conquered England. William dispossessed the old English nobility and initiated a comprehensive political, economic, and social survey of England. A national system which placed emphasis on collective and community security at the expense of individual freedom was initiated. William placed England under martial law, divided the country into fifty-five military districts and placed a *tenant-in-chief* in charge of each district. The Anglo-Saxon system of security through shire-reeves and courts of shires was modified as judicial processes were centralized under the King’s judges who traveled throughout the country. These traveling judges were the forerunners of modern day circuit judges.

Around 1100 A.D. the office of *constabuli* was established within the shire system. The word was derived from the Latin *comes stabuli* meaning an officer of the stable. A constable was appointed to every hundred to aid the reeve in the conduct of his duties.

In 1116 A.D., Henry I, son of William the Conqueror, issued the *Leges Henrici* in which he gave himself the title of Law Giver. The *Leges Henrici* originated the idea of a separation between those crimes judged to be serious or felonious and the lesser offenses deemed to be misdemeanors. If a felony was committed, both officers of the crown and citizens had equal authority to make an arrest for crimes committed in their presence. In the case of misdemeanors only officers of the crown had the right to arrest.

The Assize of Clarendon in 1166 revived the Anglo-Saxon system of mutual security or *frankpledge*. A section of this code established the *grand jury*, and initiated the end of the trial-by-ordeal and trial-by-combat. The creation of the jury system brought about a change in the fundamental concepts of justice by establishing rules of evidence and new

## 4 PRINCIPLES OF SECURITY

protections for the rights of individuals and the security of persons and property.

### *English Reforms and Change (1200-1700)*

King John, a hated ruler of England, was forced by the barons to sign the Magna Carta (Great Charter) in 1215. This document established a clear separation between local and national government and established the principle that the King was subject to the law. The Magna Carta also promulgated *due process*, the course of legal proceedings to protect individual rights and liberties. It served to strengthen the importance and role of local grand juries, circuit judges, coroners, and justices of the peace.

William the Conqueror's innovative national security system had deteriorated by the time the Statute of Winchester (also known as the Statute of Westminster), issued in 1285, reestablished a formalized law enforcement system throughout England. This document required that every area of England implement a security force, which was specified according to time, place and number of personnel. It established a system of patrolling called *watch and ward*. Every district was to control crimes within its boundaries; the gates of all towns were required to be closed at dusk, and all persons not residing in the town were required to check in with local authorities. The night watch and the office of bailiff were initiated by the Statute. Bailiffs checked on strangers and lodgers at inns in the town, and guards manned the city gates from sunset to sunrise to secure the city. Additionally, these *watchmen* grouped into a marching watch to limit the movement of townspeople during certain hours, establishing the concepts of mobile patrol and curfew as security measures. Every able male of the community had to serve his turn on the watch and, like the constables, members of the watch were unpaid.

A slow but continuous change in pattern of the European economy from the fourteenth to the end of the seventeenth century, termed the commercial revolution, contained many changes and trends including increased trade, exploration, and the rise of the merchant class. Advances in transportation expanded trade throughout the known world. An elaborate system of international markets, trade, and colonization required increased productive capacity and surplus from agriculture, animal husbandry, and the skilled trades.

Large land holdings were essential to the production of economically feasible amounts of agricultural products. The landlords consolidated the small holdings of the peasants, who were excluded by enclosure acts from open grazing privileges, into large *manor* farms. Tenants displaced by the consolidation of lands migrated to the cities. Cultural patterns and family

traditions were in upheaval as the constraints of medieval society were disintegrating. Mass unemployment, poverty, health and welfare needs caused social unrest and dynamic changes and increases in security problems. There was no civil force which could effectively protect persons and property. The protection of production goods while in storage and transit became a critical concern of the merchant class. To combat the problem, individual merchants and tradesmen hired men to guard their buildings, shops, stores of goods, and caravans. The use of the forerunners of private detectives to locate and identify stolen property began during this period. The parochial police also came into existence, as many English cities arranged in distinct population and geographic districts by religion or ethnic background hired their own police to protect them and their property. These private police performed essentially the same function as would a police officer except that their responsibility extended only to the boundary of the district.

Thus, for some 300 years the cities and countryside of England were policed by a fragmented system of constables and watchmen. The first police officials were the shire-reeve (sheriff) and, later, the parish constable. The parish constables were charged with maintaining law and order, and were responsible to the Justice of the Peace. Since there was no central authority coordinating this justice system, justice was often fragmented and of inferior quality, and there was a great deal of corruption within the system. The Justices of the Peace, appointed by the Crown, were unpaid and usually selected from the gentry. The appointees frequently used their positions to better their own needs, maintaining the status quo by enforcing the laws in favor of their own social class.

Prior to 1737, all personnel who received pay for watch duty were paid exclusively by individuals or private groups. In that year George II began to pay watchmen with tax monies collected specifically for security protection.

Thus, the period of the commercial revolution was one of great turmoil and social upheaval, and provided the first real evidence that the English public protective system was unable to cope with the task of providing a minimal amount of protection for emerging business and commercial enterprises.

## **The Eighteenth Century**

Eighteenth Century England, leading the way toward the Industrial Revolution, saw an almost complete breakdown of the constable system of law enforcement. The rural population began to move to the cities to find jobs. Weaving and knitting machines and new methods of metal produc-

tion resulted in enormous industrial progress and the creation of previously nonexistent jobs. The capacity to produce expanded as never before, yet there was also poverty and suffering among masses of people. Crime grew to alarming proportions as the displaced, the poor, and disoriented increased in number.

The noted English author, Patrick Pringle, in *Hue and Cry*, had the following to say about Eighteenth Century England:

No one thought our policemen wonderful in the eighteenth century. What struck foreigners as remarkable was that we had none. London was the greatest town in the world; it was also the most lawless. This was not because the British were too soft with criminals, although being British they naturally thought they were. In fact, Britain not only had the most criminals; it also had the harshest Criminal Code. Men, women, and children were liable to be hanged for offences that in other countries were considered quite trivial: associating with gypsies or cutting hop-binds, for example, or entering land with intent to kill rabbits; impersonating a Chelsea Pensioner, or chipping bits out of Westminster Bridge. A boy or girl of seven could be sentenced to death for stealing a pocket handkerchief. The law got steadily harsher throughout the century, while in other countries it was getting steadily more humane . . .

When England emerged from feudalism she did not need a standing army, for she had no land frontiers; and one result of this geological accident was that England had no men-of-arms to use as police. Her only security legacy from the feudal era was the amateur parish-constable system. This continued to work adequately in country parishes, but it was not suited to larger units, such as towns. By 1700 the population of the metropolis (London), as it was called, was well over half a million. During the first half of the century it hardly increased at all, in spite of considerable immigration from the country; for deaths greatly exceeded births. Between 1740 and 1742, for example, there were twice as many burials as baptisms. The main check on the growth of population was the wholesale murder of children by their parents and parish authorities. After a careful investigation, Jonas Hanway estimated that over 75 per cent of all children died before they were five, and that infant mortality among illegitimate children was over 95 per cent. Some illegitimate children were murdered at birth by their mothers or, more commonly, laid out in the streets to die of exposure; others starved to death in workhouses or in the care of nurses who specialized in taking them off the hands of the parish. Some nurses, however, kept children alive to use them for begging after first blinding or maiming them to increase their value.<sup>1</sup>

Such was the world of Jonathan Wild. In 1743, Henry Fielding, later to become the chief magistrate of the Bow Street area of London, wrote a political satire entitled, *Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild, The Great*. While not a factual biography of the life and times of Jonathan Wild, the events of Fielding's book were drawn from Wild's career as one of England's most notable criminals. Fielding, through the personage of Wild, characterized the aggregate nature of crime and justice in Eighteenth Century England. The corruption and ineptness of the English system of justice was evidenced in Wild's criminal ventures as a fence, smuggler, thief taker and criminal mastermind.

In 1748, when Henry Fielding became chief magistrate of Bow Street, crime had become rampant, counterfeit money was more common than good money, and there were over 100 offenses punishable by death. Fielding set himself two tasks: to eliminate existing crime, and to prevent fresh outbreaks in the future. To achieve these aims he considered three things necessary: the active cooperation of the public, a stronger police, and the removal of the causes of crime and of conditions in which it flourished. In his five years at Bow Street, Fielding's significant contributions included a foot patrol to make the streets safe, a mounted patrol for the highways, the Bow Street Runners (special investigators), and police courts.

Fielding's scheme was to thwart criminals by actively seeking them out and investigating their activities:

Citizens, he (Fielding) realized, might combine together collectively, to go into the streets, trace the perpetrators of crimes in their haunts and meet the instigators of mob gatherings before they had assembled a following and caused destruction. He saw that it was possible to prevent, instead of repressing crime and disorder . . .<sup>2</sup>

This was in complete contrast to the constables and watchmen who could not be found when trouble erupted.

Fielding formed a band of volunteers who arrested numerous criminals in the Bow Street area. These early crime fighters (detectives) became known as the Bow Street Runners, and their success was known to all in London. In 1752, Fielding, an author prior to becoming a magistrate, began publishing *The Covent Garden Journal* to circulate crime news. This literary paper was used as a platform for Fielding's crusade against misery, vice and crime.<sup>3</sup>

Even though Fielding's efforts had immense effects in the Bow Street area, his ideas were not applied throughout London. Crime continued to be a major problem, and society's only weapon against crime was the ineffective constable. Fielding's proposal to have salaried magistrates with a preventive force of paid constables went unheeded.

In 1796, Patrick Colquhoun published *A Treatise on the Police of the*

*Metropolis*, which detailed the crime problem in and around London. Colquhoun estimated that the losses from various forms of theft, coining, forgery and swindling amounted to £2,000,000. He called for the formation of a large police force to combat crime in London. In 1785, William Pitt introduced a bill resembling Colquhoun's plan in Parliament. Pitt was met with a storm of protest and was forced to withdraw the proposal. The citizenry was adamantly opposed to the formation of any formal police for fear that such a force would be used by the government, or certain elements of the government, to spy on the people, infringe upon liberty, and possibly to aid in the formation of a totalitarian government.<sup>4</sup>

Colquhoun, however, did get a chance to implement some of his ideas. In 1798, a number of West India planters and merchants asked him for suggestions to alleviate the problem of massive thefts from ships and the London docks. Colquhoun developed a plan for a police organization to control the docks. The merchants, with the approval of the government, financed the organization. A river police office was inaugurated with 80 permanent and 1,120 part-time police. The police not only watched and patrolled the docks, they also participated in the unloading of cargo from ships. The experimental police department was a success. Savings as a result of the reduction of thefts was estimated to be £66,000 in the first eight months. The government assumed control of the department in 1800 and operated it until 1829 when it was incorporated into the Metropolitan Police Department.<sup>5</sup>

### The Peelian Reform

In 1822, Robert Peel was appointed Home Secretary, and he immediately set out to reform the police. In addition to eventually being responsible for reforming the police, he did make other contributions:

During Peel's first few years in office, he concerned himself primarily with social reform. First, he consolidated the laws dealing with theft and the destruction of property into one volume. He then did the same thing with all laws dealing with offenses against persons. In England at this time there were more than 200 offenses bearing the death penalty. Peel abolished more than a hundred of these. Benefit of Clergy, where a clergyman could escape punishment for a first offense in certain felonies, was abolished. He made it easier for victims of sexual offenses to get justice by abolishing prior-required embarrassing evidence.<sup>6</sup>

In 1828, Peel appointed a Select Committee to study the police, and on July 27, 1828, they issued their report. The report called for the formation of an Office of Police under the Home Secretary, and all magistrates without bench duty would report to the Home Secretary. All police, con-

stables and watchmen would be incorporated into the Office of Police. London proper was not placed under the structure, which aided in its acceptance by Parliament.<sup>7</sup>

The Bill passed Parliament without serious argument; the most important provision of the Bill was that it made Parliament responsible for finances and administration, eliminating weak, fragmented local control.<sup>8</sup> The Bill also addressed a number of other important areas. For example, there was a section on discipline directed to both the police and the citizenry:

No policeman on duty could go into a public house except in pursuit of duty. A . . . keeper of any house, shop, room, or other place for the sale of any liquors, whether spirituous or otherwise, who entertained or sold to a policeman could be fined up to five pounds.<sup>9</sup>

Peel appointed Sir Charles Rowan and Sir Richard Mayne as the first Commissioners for the Metropolitan Police. Rowan was selected for his military background, and Mayne, a former Magistrate, was probably selected because of his legal background.<sup>10</sup> One of their first actions was to prepare a book of *General Instructions* delineating the constables' duties and responsibilities.

One of Rowan and Mayne's important contributions was the list of nine principles which guided their department.<sup>11</sup>

- 1) To prevent crime and disorder, as an alternative to their repression by military force and severity of legal punishment.
- 2) To recognize always that the power of the police to fulfill their functions and duties is dependent on public approval of their existence, actions and behavior, and on their ability to secure and maintain public respect.
- 3) To recognize always that to secure and maintain the respect and approval of the public means also the securing of the willing cooperation of the public in the task of securing observance of law.
- 4) To recognize always that the extent to which cooperation of the public can be secured diminishes proportionately the necessity of the use of physical force and compulsion for achieving police objectives.
- 5) To seek and preserve public favor, not by pandering to public opinion, but by constantly demonstrating absolutely impartial service to law, in complete independence of policy, and without regard to the justice or injustice of individual laws; by ready offering of individual service and friendship to all members of the public without regard to their wealth or social standing; by ready exercise of courtesy and good humor; and by ready offering of individual sacrifice in protecting and preserving life.

## 10 PRINCIPLES OF SECURITY

- 6) To use physical force only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient to obtain public cooperation to an extent necessary to restore order; and to use only the minimum degree of physical force which is necessary on any particular occasion for achieving a police objective.
- 7) To maintain at all times a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and that the public are the police, the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen, in the interest of community welfare and existence.
- 8) To recognize always the need for strict adherence to police executive functions, and to refrain from even seeming to usurp the powers of the judiciary or avenging individuals or the State, and of authoritatively judging guilt and punishing the guilty.
- 9) To recognize always that the test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, and not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with them.

The principles enumerated by Rowan and Mayne focused on a system of policing where the police were partners with the public. Rowan and Mayne realized that survival of their new police system was dependent upon the public's acceptance. They emphasized cooperation, justice and equality, and crime prevention. The Metropolitan Police represented the first modern police force in history.

The establishment of the police department was not without opposition. Hostility to the new police ranged from brutal murders of the newly-appointed constables to public denunciation by judges, magistrates, cabinet members, the public, and on occasion by King George IV himself.<sup>12</sup> Frequently, the constables were referred to as "Peel's bloody gang" and "blue devils." The police were constantly in fear of their lives, and it was only through the efforts of Rowan and Mayne that the police were able to succeed. They impressed upon the officers to be polite at all times and to use physical force as a last resort. This minimized negative interactions with the public.

Eventually, the police were a success. By June of 1830, the force consisted of 3,314 men. Between 1829 and 1831, 8,000 men had been enrolled, and over 3,000 had been discharged for unfitness, incompetence, or drunkenness.<sup>13</sup> The police brought a reduction of crime, control of riots, and orderliness to London. The police concept was extended to the boroughs in 1835 and to the counties in stages in 1839 and 1856. Gradually, it spread throughout the British Empire.<sup>14</sup>



## Early American Police Development

When the colonials arrived in America, they promptly instituted a police system similar to the English system. The Massachusetts Bay Colony installed the office of constable whose duties centered around keeping the peace, raising the hue and cry, controlling drunks and apprehending criminals. Over time his duties were expanded.

. . . by 1658 they included informing the magistrate of “new comers,” taking charge of the Watch and Ward, raising the hue and cry, tallying votes for deputies to the general court, summoning jurymen for duty, bringing accused before the court, bringing before the court men and women not living with their spouses, collecting taxes, and other sundry duties including the hanging of sheepkilling dogs where the owners refused to do so themselves.<sup>15</sup>

As the small colonial settlements developed into cities, night and day watches appeared. In 1631, Boston established a night watch, and in 1643 a burglar watch was established in New Netherlands (New York).<sup>16</sup> In 1700, Philadelphia established a night watch where all citizens were obligated to take their turns.<sup>17</sup> These early watchman systems were not without their problems. As early as 1642 the town government of New Haven proclaimed “It is ordered by the court that, from hence forward, none of the watchmen shall have liberty to sleep during the watch.”<sup>18</sup> Many cities experienced difficulty in inducing citizens to take their turns at the watch, and when on duty, many of the watchmen would drink or sleep.

Fosdick analyzed the evolution of the New York watch force, and found the following conditions:

Its ranks were made up for the most part of men who pursued regular occupations during the day and who added to their incomes by serving the city at night. “Jaded stevedores, teamsters and mechanics” comprised the New York force. No standards except those of a political nature were applied in selection. One Matthew Young was appointed watchman in Boston “in order that he and his children do not become town charges.” An investigating committee of the Board of Aldermen in New York made the finding that the incumbents were selected for political opinions and not for personal merit and that the term of service of the incumbent was uncertain and often very brief, depending on the change of political party. Another investigation in 1838 showed the watchmen dismissed from one ward for neglect or drunkenness found service in another.<sup>19</sup>

In 1844 the legislature of New York abolished the watchman system and created a police force. The act established a force of 800 men under