

Winter 1932

Factors Influencing the Future Development of State Police

Bruce Smith

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bruce Smith, Factors Influencing the Future Development of State Police, 23 Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 713 (1932-1933)

This Criminology is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

which now makes it nearly impossible for him to give any time to larger questions of organization and policy.

With so many progressive measures carried through or in process of adoption it is a matter of real regret that little or no progress is being made in one highly important matter—the establishment of a real and effective training school for police recruits and ultimately for those promoted to higher ranks. In this matter Chicago lags far behind other large American cities and is simply not in the same class with such as New York and Detroit. The old Chicago “school” was inadequate in what it set out to teach and inefficient in teaching that limited field. There is no school at present as financial reasons prevent adding any men to the force, even to fill vacancies, but this, of course, is only a temporary state of affairs. Sooner or later the problem of training new men will again become a live one, and it will then be too late to lay training plans. The occupation of police officer is calling for more and more specialized knowledge. He may be called on to face responsibilities beyond those of any other man, extending even to the possible deliberate taking of human life. We have, or at least we should have, passed beyond the hit-or-miss method of the past, of putting our new man into a blue uniform, giving him a loaded revolver, and practically without more assuming that he can now handle his job. It is most unfortunate that in this matter at least (and almost alone) the recommendations of the Citizens’ Police Committee have been disregarded, without adopting any other adequate program as a substitute.

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF STATE POLICE

BRUCE SMITH¹

State police organizations vary so widely in their structure, powers and methods, that no discussion of them is possible unless we define, at least in general terms, what *kind* of state police we are talking about. For although forty states have provided state-wide police forces of some description, only eleven states have a permanent body of police, clothed with full police powers, which serve as

¹Institute of Public Administration, New York City.

an executive arm of the state government.* Eight other states have highway police forces which, though clothed with general police powers, are operated as subordinate units of state administrative departments and are normally confined to the control of traffic on state highways. Another considerable group is represented by sixteen states, which operate highway police forces, but strictly confine their powers to traffic regulation. The remainder comprise emergency bodies, small supervisory staffs, and some which are even more frankly "paper organizations."

There is a pronounced tendency for the minor police forces to develop into regular state police departments, with the result that there are always a few borderline cases which defy accurate classification. Such difficulties need not concern us here. It will be sufficient for present purposes if we understand that the term "state police" is an inclusive term which can only be clearly defined in terms of specific police forces.

For the older and more highly developed state police departments, the past twenty-five years have seen the difficulties, first experienced in Pennsylvania, repeated in one commonwealth after another. Thus the opposition of organized labor has been fairly continuous; sometimes of a qualified character and furtively exercised, sometimes open and strenuous. It appears probable, however, that the opposition of important labor groups will tend to become less determined as time goes on. Already there are unmistakable signs that labor executives are inclined to modify their earlier positions. A part of this shift in sentiment is due to their acknowledgment of the value of state police service in rural districts. In a few instances, this has resulted in organized labor directing its efforts solely towards a restriction of state police powers when employed in suppressing industrial disturbances. Yet even as to this aspect of police duty, there is some modification of labor's position, because the passing years have gradually multiplied instances of state police protecting peaceful demonstrators against the attacks of industrial guards, and similar examples of equal enforcement. If this process is continued, and the state police consistently adhere to a policy of equal protection without fear or favor, organized labor's opposition may be still further modified to a point where some procedure can be developed for handling industrial disturbances which will adequately protect

*The forces in this major group are maintained by the following states: Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, Connecticut, Michigan, West Virginia, Texas and Oregon.

the interests of the employer, the employee, and the public, alike. Thus far, no such formula has appeared, and despite efforts in a few states to overcome the opposition of organized labor through moderate restrictions upon the use of state police on strike duty, the problem remains unsolved for the present. Public sentiment on the realities of strike duty is far from being crystallized, although so much as exists seems favorable to the use of state police in suppressing all manner of urban disorders.

So while labor opposition has not destroyed the state police, it has prevented their establishment in a few commonwealths, and in others has succeeded in controlling the direction of their development. Many of our state highway patrol forces, with powers restricted to traffic regulation and control, have been set up as a means of overcoming the objections of organized labor. As already noted, the powers of these limited agencies tend constantly to expand, and in some instances they come to approximate general police jurisdiction. Nevertheless, this type of development has been unfortunate. It generally involves the subordination of the police force to state officials (such as state commissioners of public works, of highways, or of motor vehicles) whose police outlook is rather narrow, and whose knowledge of the principles of police administration is certainly not extensive. Thus far, no outstanding state police force has been developed under such auspices.

Another problem which has repeatedly appeared, arises from the fact that the state forces are superimposed (in a territorial sense) upon a wide variety of local police agencies such as municipal police departments, sheriffs, constables, and town marshals. Here are all of the influences making for professional jealousy, petty strife, and occasional head-on collision. The state police have generally avoided difficulties with municipal forces by such simple expedients as omitting urban areas from their routine patrols, and soliciting the assistance of the local police when it becomes necessary to cross corporate boundaries in search of a witness or in pursuit of an offender. This procedure has been almost universal, the only important exceptions consisting of instances involving the use of state police in suppressing riots, or conducting local "clean-up" campaigns at the behest of the governor. In the long view, some of the cases falling within the latter category have been of doubtful wisdom, and in a very few instances have impaired an otherwise amicable relation between the state and municipal police forces. Despite such occasional difficulties, municipal police in recent years have favored extension of the state

police idea to their own commonwealths, and their favorable attitude has frequently been expressed in the form of resolutions unanimously adopted at state and national meetings of local police administrators.

The same cannot be said concerning relations of the state police with rural police agencies. The breakdown of the sheriff-constable system has been one of the chief influences stimulating the creation of state-wide police organizations. It would, therefore, defeat the whole purpose of the new system, if its functioning were made dependent upon the attitude of the traditional peace officers. So the state police, while seeking to cultivate the good will and cooperation of local rural police, have not hesitated to take an active hand in cases falling under the joint jurisdiction of both the state and local forces, without waiting upon the formalities which have characterized their relations with municipal police departments.

Sheriffs, township constables, and village marshals have not been slow to understand that the very existence of the state police is an implied reproof for the manner in which rural police duties have been performed in the past. To a considerable extent these traditional officers have been displaced by the state police, and some of them are apprehensive that the day may not be far distant which shall see the complete overthrow of the sheriff-constable system. To expect wholehearted cooperation under such circumstances would be unreasonable. In some few instances, lack of team work between state and local agencies has brought results unfavorable to the interests of public justice, but there is no thoroughgoing cure for such incidents except the elimination of the sheriff-constable system as a factor.

Still another problem which has appeared in several jurisdictions is the matter of partisan political influence. A distinguishing characteristic of the more highly organized state police forces has been their essential freedom from political domination. Yet despite many early successes in resisting pressure of this kind, the administrative heads have quite generally found it necessary to be on the alert in order to prevent such considerations from intruding. If they relax their vigilance, or through no fault of their own are forced to succumb to political manipulation, the future of state police, and of American police administration generally, will acquire a far less favorable outlook than it now enjoys.

Finally, the state police are confronted with the disposition of legislatures and governors to burden them with all manner of miscellaneous duties. In pursuing this course, the states are but following

in the well-worn path prepared by the cities in dealing with their own local police. The resulting diffusion of effort is often serious in our cities—in the state police forces the effect of too many regulatory and inspectional duties is quite likely to involve an even more substantial loss of their effectiveness as protective agencies. For it must be remembered that the state police are not large bodies—New York, with less than six hundred men being far in the lead so far as numerical strength is concerned—and that they must cover vast stretches of territory and patrol tens of thousands of miles of highway and byway, in every nook and corner of the state. Thus it is quite clear that either the process of adding regulatory duties must stop, or the numerical strength of the authorized establishments must be very substantially increased above present quotas.

The foregoing factors influencing state police development, while not exhaustive, nevertheless include all of major importance and general application. In them may be found not only the seeds of future growth, but also the dangers of eventful disintegration. The long range future, while bright, is not absolutely assured to them. A few forecasts may, however, be offered with some confidence.

The sheriff-constable system is already tottering—it arose in obscurity and is not plunging headlong to oblivion; certain also, that the state police, almost alone of all the police forces in this country, enjoy public confidence in sufficient degree to make really sterling police work possible.

Yet a great revolution in police administration impends, and it is by no means certain that the state police will survive it in their present form. County constabularies may spring up—have already begun to appear in fact—which may seem to warrant some permanent place in the scheme of police protection. Certain unfavorable aspects of our county governments, however, render it unlikely that such as these will provide an ultimate solution.

The regional police problems throughout extensive areas surrounding our great cities are also pressing for some effective attention. If the absurd patch-work of overlapping police agencies in metropolitan areas should be cast aside, the way would lie open towards a decentralized state-wide scheme of protection, to which the state police might easily prove adaptable. Perhaps a thoroughgoing and highly centralized plan of organization will be adopted, in which event the state police will quite certainly provide the nucleus for some of the largest police bodies that have ever been known. In a number of our states which are characterized by a widely diffused