

## M3 – HOW DID WE GET HERE?

### LECTURE 2 - THE LMPD AND THE POLITICAL ERA

#### THE FATHER OF MODERN POLICING & THE LMPD

In the early 19th Century, the **Industrial Revolution** unleashed powerful economic, political and social forces that brought with them burgeoning problems of social disorder, especially in large cities.<sup>64, 65</sup> And the idea of governments using the army to maintain order by killing its own citizens was never very popular, especially in decentralized governments.

To deal with this problem in England, modern policing organizations began to emerge. In 1829, London was one of the largest and busiest cities in the world, and it suffered increasingly from growing social problems. It was there that the first formal professional police department was created, under the auspices of **Sir Robert Peel**, last name spelled P-E-E-L, who is often referred to as the "**father of modern policing.**"<sup>68</sup>

As the British Home Secretary and Prime Minister, Peel implemented a number of social and CJ reforms, but his creation of the **London Metropolitan Police Department (LMPD)** is the one we're interested in here. He was very big on trust, accountability and ethics, and he was noted especially for saying that "**the police are the public, and the public are the police.**" Sounds eerily like what the more recent research showed about cooperation between the public and the police being the major factor affecting crime reporting and clearance rates – but **what did he know?** He didn't even have any research or hard data to base his claims on.

Anyway, based on that, he used **nine principles** to guide the establishment of the LMPD, and they were as follows:

1. The **basic mission** for which the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder.
2. The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon **public approval** of police actions.
3. Police must secure the willing **cooperation of the public** in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the respect of the public.
4. The degree of **cooperation** of the public that can be secured **diminishes** proportionately to the necessity of the use of **physical force.**
5. Police seek and preserve public favour not by catering to the public opinion but by constantly demonstrating absolute **impartial service** to the law.

6. Police use **physical force** to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient.
7. Police, at all times, should maintain a **relationship with the public** that gives reality to the historic tradition that the **police are the public and the public are the police**; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence.
8. Police should always direct their action strictly towards their functions and never appear to **usurp** the powers of the judiciary.
9. The **test of police efficiency** is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it.

Not exactly the diktats of the Nazi **Gestapo**, the **STASI**, or the Soviet **KGB** are they? (Besides, they were all Continental models of policing, anyway). Actually, they sound a little **wussy**, eh?

In any case, they're known as the "**Peelian Principles**," and are quoted even today in the US as reminders of what police work should be focused on. Actually, from what I hear, he never really wrote these down on paper (**failure to document!!! Didn't I say don't do that???** How can other people know exactly what you said if you didn't write it down?). So his authorship and original intent may not be clear-cut. Nevertheless, their relevance to modern policing is uncanny, as we shall later see.

While the LMPD received money from, and responded to the needs of, the centralized English Parliament (because one of its jobs was to maintain order around the Parliament buildings), it was primarily a **locally controlled organization with publicly paid officers**. The localized control, along with the wearing of blue uniforms helped the police officers avoid public suspicion of being the dreaded Government Spies.<sup>63</sup> **Heh-what? Oh, rats!!** The blue uniforms and high hats (or custodian helmets, as they were called, which made them look taller) made the officers highly visible and distinguishable from the killer red army uniforms of the British. The police were affectionately called "bobbies" and "peelers," after Sir Robert Peel, and "coppers" in reference to the copper badges they wore on their uniforms.;

However, while these tactics were generally effective in maintaining public order, and even in preventing crime in some instances, they were **not particularly useful in detecting or solving crime**, as one can easily imagine.

In order to uncover crime, catch criminals, and effectively prosecute them, the police found it necessary to resort to some of the **traditional Government Spy tactics** – i.e., using plainclothes officers (officers wearing **civilian clothes, or “civvies,”** rather than uniforms); using them in discreet or covert roles in order to obtain information about crime from people in all phases of the crime continuum. This was not exactly in full accordance with the 9th Peelian Principle, but it apparently was deemed to be necessary enough by the police for them to do it anyway.

So what we’ve got here is the first-ever police agency recognizing a **need to prevent, detect and investigate** crime in **all five phases** by using **plainclothes officers to work offenders**, not cases. <sup>67</sup> Put all that in the CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK and see how that looks.

Then, once again, apparently driven by what they saw as their internal organizational needs, they created the **first investigation branch**, which allowed them to assign and control the plainclothes officers separately from the uniformed officers. Their duties ranged from catching pickpockets to follow-up investigations of reported crimes. However, they were still looked upon with great suspicion by the public. <sup>65</sup> **Sneaking** around in **“civvies,”** and all that.

In order to make the idea of plainclothes officers more palatable to the public, the LMPD had to **overcome** the three negative stereotypes of the Government Spy. 66

With regard to the **“Informer,”** who betrayed people, detectives were assigned to work the most serious crimes, such as murders, and to work equally as hard to prove the innocence of persons wrongly accused of crime, as well as to catch crooks. This engendered strong public sympathy and support. Didn’t do much for lesser crimes, though.

To overcome the **“Thief Taker”** stereotype, detectives eventually became paid civil servants (so they wouldn’t have to take bribes, etc., to make a living). As such, they worked in a fair and equitable manner to investigate serious social threats that affected both the rich and the poor. Trusty civil servants, **eh?**

The problem of the **“Agent Provocateur”** was overcome by closely supervising detectives and assigning them mainly to serious crimes that had already been committed. Sound familiar yet? **Hint** – Traditional Investigation Process. Well, let’s continue.

In other words, in order to minimize the perceived threat of the Government Spy to the citizenry, the **GOAL** of detectives was no longer to prevent or detect crimes, but merely to **solve** the crimes reported to them (**CUISC**). Their **STYLE** changed from being proactive, overt and covert, to essentially being **reactive and overt** and **means-oriented**, and their **FOCUS** changed from the offenders to the **cases** (specific incidents of crime) that were assigned to them by supervisors, and to **reacting** to the ACTION and ESCAPE phases after the offender was in the FUGITIVE phase. **No more CUIPDSC. Just CUISC.** Try saying that three times. Now put all that in the CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK and see how that looks.

In other words, detectives were **constrained** in their ability to collect information from people in all five crime phases to prevent and detect crime. Instead, they were limited to waiting until after the PLAN, ACTION and ESCAPE phases of a crime had already occurred.

Then, usually when the offender was in the FUGITIVE phase, and also if, and after, someone reported crime to them, they **reacted** by responding to the spatial location (crime scene) where the ACTION and ESCAPE phases reportedly occurred. Once at the scene, they then had to try to locate and identify people who may have been present and observed the criminal behavior during the past ACTION and ESCAPE phases, and who were also willing to provide information to the detective about what they knew. As these two phases are usually of limited time duration and had already occurred before they were reported, the likelihood of developing sources of information decreased as time passed and people moved on (**the ol' me-knife-body thingie**), particularly for the less serious property crimes involving minimal personal contact.<sup>65</sup>

While detectives might also have attempted to develop new sources or collect information regarding crimes during the FUGITIVE phase (where, as we know from the Conceptual Framework, the most information sources were likely to exist in the neighborhood areas for the longest periods of time for the most crimes, whether or not they were ever reported to the police), this type of investigative activity was **difficult**. It was resource-intensive and time-consuming, and it also raised the specter of the dreaded activities of the Government Spy.

So, at the risk of redundancy, and at the risk of boring you, DEAR, SCRUPULOUS reader of every written word, it is becoming painfully clear (at least to me) that the **seeds** for the development of the so-called inefficient, ineffective traditional investigation process of today's modern police agencies reaches back centuries to the very first formation of police organizations.

In other words, **it's all the Brits' fault!!!** They are the "**offender**" who screwed everything up that I was looking for! Well, **I sure do feel better** about that now. Don't you?

It was then that our forefathers were first trying to construct, or invent, a means of social control that **balanced** the worst public fears of the Government Spy model of investigator against a modicum of service to help protect public interests. And it seems that they managed to control the one at the expense of the other. And that seems to have been driven by **public pressures**.

To me, this part of history is like a **light in the dark**. Part of my counterintelligence duties in the US Air Force included Political crimes that used Government Spy techniques, as well as Visible crimes, where we couldn't hardly use any of the Government Spy tactics at all. Now I more clearly understand the forces that drive these decisions even today, as much as they did two centuries ago. I hope you begin to see this also. (**Hint:** community interests vs. individual liberties drives CC vs. DP, which drives CUIPDSC vs. CUIISC. Big community interest concerns support CUIPDSC tactics, and big individual liberty concerns tend to constrain CUIPDSC to CUIISC.)

So let's march on to the **US** and see what happened there. I enjoy this part the most because it affected my career so greatly, and it continues on today even as we speak.

### **THE POLITICAL ERA (1840s – EARLY 1900s)**

In the US, the Industrial Revolution brought about tremendous growth in our **cities** in the 19th Century, and also brought social control problems very similar to those which occurred in England (both of our governments were more decentralized than centralized at that time). So the creation of police agencies as social control organizations was heavily influenced by - you guessed it – the British model! <sup>65, 66</sup> See, I told you it was all their **fault! Bloody uncles – or whatever!**

The development of police agencies in the US has been described in terms of **three separate eras** – the Political Era (1840s to the early 1900s), the Reform Era (early 1900s to the 1970s), and the Community Policing Era (1970s to the present). <sup>64, 69</sup> We will follow the growth of policing and investigations in each of these eras.

Just as in England, the strains on the system of decentralized sheriffs and constables that had been brought over from England during colonial times in the US became **overwhelming** by the early part of the 19th Century as we shifted from an agrarian and rural society to an increasingly industrialized, urban-centered one.<sup>64</sup>

It did not take long before the idea of the decentralized, **locally controlled formal policing** type of organization that had been created in London began to catch on in the US, and in **1845**, the New York Police Department (**NYPD**) was created in our largest city.<sup>66</sup> It took 16 years to get to the US from London, but remember, the SST (the French Concorde SuperSonic Transport aircraft) and texting hadn't been invented yet. In fact, these were still the early days of electricity and the telegraph. Some of you more YOUTHFUL TRAVELERS may Google the word "telegraph" if you are not familiar with the term. **Hint – it was like the beta model for Twitter~~**

Thus began the **Political Era** of the US police, and by **1880**, the local governments of **most major American cities** had created public police forces. These new organizations were mainly general-purpose agencies that were formed and controlled by local politicians, ostensibly to satisfy the interests of the people they served (per Sir Peel), but more often primarily to get the politicians who created them re-elected.<sup>64, 65</sup>

Of course, the story didn't end here, but this lecture did. To be continued in the next lecture.