

1968

## Hand That Holds the Baton

Hillard J. Trubitt

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

Hillard J. Trubitt, Hand That Holds the Baton, 58 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 414 (1967)

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.

## THE HAND THAT HOLDS THE BATON

HILLARD J. TRUBITT

Hillard J. Trubitt has been an Associate Professor of Police Administration at Indiana University since 1959. Mr. Trubitt is a graduate of the University of Illinois and the Indiana University Law School. At the present time he is Project Director for an OLEA grant to evaluate pilot training programs to prepare disadvantaged youth for patrolman positions, a program sponsored by the United States Department of Labor.—EDITOR.

A recent newspaper article revealed that the curriculum of the College of Police Science of New York now the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, included a course in classical music appreciation. It cited Leonard Reisman, President of the College, as defending the course as being sound and necessary to the development of well-rounded police personnel.

The article then reported, with considerable levity, the essentially negative reaction of police executives of some of our larger cities. Aside from actual quotes, as "music might help if they would let us use the instruments as clubs", it contained innuendoes which made the suggestion that its proponents were ill-informed and somehow not really in touch with the flesh-and-blood problems of American police training. The sole voice raised in defense of the idea was that of a Chicago police sergeant who saw the training as sensitizing the police ear to the nuances of sound, which he considered an important police attribute. Nothing was said in behalf of the original point of cultural value. Indeed, the point was denigrated, and none too gently. The concensus seemed to be that culture might be nice but we do not have time for it, and its value as a professional tool is at best limited—if it has any value at all.

How wrong can the police be? This is simply wearing the scratchy hair shirt of a "tough cop" who purports to know the world without glamour, without false poetry, without music, without "hoity toity" cultural trimming. This is the policeman's place at the concert—out in front, directing traffic. But never inside, unless it be on a pickpocket or jewelry protection detail. The poor officer who is assigned "inside" the concert hall often gets an unmerciful ribbing from his colleagues. He is generally expected to indicate that he would rather pound his beat than ponder Beethoven.

What, may we ask, do police have against Beethoven? And, more specifically, against people who like Beethoven? For this is really the argument; by rejecting an activity out of hand one also rejects its adherents. They cannot afford to reject summarily the middle-class concert-going crowd, for these are the people who, in addition to going to concerts, also pay police salaries, sit on courts and in legislatures that make policies affecting the police, and generally set the pace and value structure which our society and its laws are supposed to protect and preserve. It goes without saying that this same group passes the budgets that set the police salary schedule and thereby the caliber of officer that can be attracted into a field that wants to "bootstrap" itself into a profession. And as night follows day no professional level salary schedules will be appropriated to a group of public employees who appear culturally in the same league as menials.

The painful point in the entire issue is that no one asked the police to become music lovers. All Mr. Reisman did was to set up an educational curriculum pattern, in an institution of higher education, that would produce a basis of understanding why people *might like* music. The Chicago sergeant's idea was good, but even he missed the essential thesis; to learn something about people, not sounds! Who can quarrel with Alexander Pope's "the proper study of mankind is man"? And how better to learn of man than by learning of his works, his dreams, his aspirations—in short, what makes him tick.

This is the very essence of a liberal arts education. The arts and humanities include many fields which we study not for their intrinsic economic value but because they enable us to relate to the socio-cultural makeup of mankind. These fields include literature, drama, painting, and many others besides music. Until we recognize

that music moves many people and that it is worthwhile studying the phenomenon for that reason—if no other, then we shall not have learned what policemen *must* know—our society in its totality. The police job of protecting the total society necessarily requires knowing something about every part of it—including music and its *aficionados*.

It is unfortunate enough that the policeman should be cast in the role of the anti-cultural oaf. It is doubly tragic that weight should be added to that image by police executives. To dislike music is one thing, essentially personal; to exclude it from a college curriculum requires some public inspection of just how our police leaders think about education and think generally. Any analysis will quickly show that too many of our police chiefs think and react like high-priced patrolmen.

There is good reason for this in the benighted heritage of adopting the military system's faults and little of its virtues. Police service has long paid homage to, and aligned itself with, the concept of a quasi-military character and structure of the police service and the Police Establishment. It is an unvarnished hard truth that traditional obeisance to the military hierarchial structure has obscured the fact that we have assimilated into police thinking most of the worst elements of the military system and precious few of its good points.

Of all the hierarchial shibboleths inherited from the military, the concept of seniority ranks as paramount. It is by seniority that men rise in the field from entry-level patrolman to executive of multi-million dollar agencies. The police seniority system insures that none will get to the top save that they enter by the bottom many years earlier. But, unlike modern military personnel procedures, little is done to prepare men for leadership and "big picture" roles. The entry level standards are designed to produce patrolmen for the here and now. Any really good leaders that may filter through the system are serendipitous. What a city often gets is either a veteran officer who, while versed in the peculiar skills of policing, cannot shake his old role of "doer" and take on the new part of "planner", or a man who simply cannot conceive of, much less perform, the tasks incumbent upon a public administrator. Exceptions to these descriptions are few and far between. The body may be in the executive chair, but the heart and mind are back out "on the street".

This scarcity of true executive ability is an open secret in American policing. No realistic police scholar today would quarrel with the premise that inadequate leadership is one of the most, if not *the* most, serious defects of law enforcement in the United States. This is not stated to impugn publicly present leadership personalities. For argument's sake concede that present executives are eminently qualified by all standards. The real argument focuses on how we are preparing the leaders who will follow. To argue that we were fortunate enough to get our present crop of experts and the problem is thereby solved is to suggest that the breed extant cannot be improved. As an abstract commentary on the ability of education to produce leaders this is ridiculous; as a reality of American public life it is beyond discussion.

We are dealing today with the products of a rigid hierarchial system who see themselves as the flowers of the system. It is so easy to argue that if the present system produces adequate leadership than we have found the mold from which all future executives should be cast. Unhappily this is not so, and in many cases present leaders hold their positions by virtue of having outlived the competition! Such is the actual effect of the seniority system. The only effective arguments for seniority are (1) it rewards the faithful; and (2) it compels a certain amount of job seasoning, euphemistically called "experience".

In an age of specialization and preparation for vocation through formal education it seems imperative that alternate methods of finding leaders for our activities must be discovered. The police service has existed on an apprenticeship basis for a long, long time. A good apprenticeship system will produce skilled journeyman, but within the confines of the police service, what kind of journeymen do we want? Is the journeyman police officer equally skilled as a public executive? If he is, we are not seeing the fruits very often on the American scene today. If he is not, then we had better face up to the fact that executive development is a real problem.

We can reward the faithful laborer in the police vineyard by some means other than promotion into positions of rank and responsibility. The most obvious way of doing this is to pay a realistic scale for tenure without artificially elevating the pay scales by inserting the concept of rank. This then takes the form of wider salary brackets for patrolmen or comparable entry grade. The

federal classified service has been doing this for years; within law enforcement the FBI and the various Treasury agencies have long made a distinction at the pay table between the supervisor and the long-term skilled technician. Financially they both come away well-rewarded, and we do not frustrate men who want financial reward but do not wish to take on the role of an executive. Readjustment of salary schedules to provide a wide range of salary classification grades for a given rank will solve the problem. This will enable a technician to spend an entire career in essentially one rank grade but have his income increased regularly as he becomes a more valuable employee through tenure and experience. This is in direct contrast with the rather standard police practice nowadays of rapid increase to the top of the entry grade salary bracket with no hope of further emolument except by promotion in rank.

The second attribute of seniority, the acquisition of "experience" also can be questioned. What is the nature of experience? To what end is this experience, i.e., empirically-acquired knowledge, to be put? Does it really relate to the job to be done? Police service has long indulged itself in the myth that experienced, veteran officers are the only persons capable of truly understanding the problems of police. We do not advocate rank neophytes taking over police leadership. But we can question the myth that the road to executive-ship must take a lifetime of police operational experience and only by this road may one become the executive.

There is a difference between "experience" and "internship". The difference lies in length of exposure, degree of exposure, and structuring of exposure to insure progressive learning experiences. An officer with twenty years experience may often be a man with his first year's experience repeated twenty times. This is the essential problem with experience as the great preparer of leaders, and the differences are not subtle.

Let us use the example, the proper example, of the military analogy that we are so fond of. How does the career officer of the armed services become qualified for high command? The career management pattern is obvious; a carefully balanced combination of formal education and progressively more responsible assignments. We do not promote from private to Chief of Staff simply on the basis of the man having worn the uniform

for thirty years! We establish separate career patterns for officers and enlisted men, permitting each to follow their professional trails to the logical end point and rewarding each. We provide opportunities for enlisted technicians to cross over into the commissioned ranks. We do many things, but the one thing we do *not* do on the American military scene is unilaterally assign executive responsibilities and duties to a man simply because he has been on the payroll for a long time.

In short, we do not think that executive development is a product of osmosis. Outside the military system we train other professionals in the same fashion. Medicine also recognizes that their system of education produces excellent medical specialists but not necessarily good medical administrators. As a consequence we have seen the rise of a new class of specialist called the hospital administrator. They are not physicians. Neither do they reach their jobs by having spent twenty years in the boiler room of the hospital. One may not like the analogy, but it fits too many police agencies in our country today. We long ago learned that you cannot pin a badge and a gun on a man and call him a policeman. Why do we think that installing a man in a panelled office will make him an executive?

In the long run, the final answer to the problem of police personnel career patterning may be a division analogous to the enlisted-commissioned division of the military, or the specialist-generalist division of industry. However it may be called, we must recognize that the job of being a police officer is not the same as being a public administrator. The fact that both work in the same organizational structure is the same as saying that the surgeon and the hospital orderly are both in medicine.

If we adopt this answer, and this writer thinks we must, then we must address ourselves to proper preparation of these executive trainees for their eventual roles. Education is without question part of the answer. We do not want executives who are totally unknowledgeable about their work product. So why not seriously employ an "internship" system? We must isolate those men who can command, find them early, and groom them for executive posts. They need not spend years in operational exercises when we want them to get ready for other tasks. Segregating these people is not discriminating against the others who stay in the ranks. They too will have their

rewards; theirs will be in cash while our designated leaders will have theirs in greater responsibilities with corresponding salary structures.

Such a system will permit police service to attract and retain young men (and women) who are interested in preparing themselves for a management career. These are the students of the newly emerging field of police administration in our colleges and universities. They study many things, but the graduates of the better programs are well grounded in social and behavioral sciences and oriented toward the legal social control system of our society. Why stifle this talent for years on the night shift when by some changes in our personnel practices we can attract these people, bring them into police service as officers, test them in the crucible of patrol *for an internship period* and groom the successful ones for management? Every major American corporation today does this as a matter of fact executive development program. It manifests itself by recruitment efforts in our colleges. On career day, save a few notable exceptions, everyone visits the campus, *except* the police! And there is no more important sphere of activity in our government today that needs the talents, brains, and energy of college-trained youth than the police service.

The whole point here is to change our personnel climate in policing so we can bring in the "middle-class" young men and women who will be sensitive social engineers. This is actually what policing in the metropolis is today; social-engineering management of the highest possible order. And it must be done by people who know what they are doing! By people who are not literally hampered by a lifetime of experience that stultified their thinking, stereotyped their reactions, dulled their sensitivities.

Our society seems to have drifted into a strange dichotomous relationship of "we's" and "they's". In terms of police-public relations this is not good. Police are *of* our society; not *opposed* to it. A combination of public apathy and police traditionalism have produced this "them-us" philosophy. We must break this idea and break it

quickly if our society is to manage itself as a free society. The necessity of consideration of citizen review boards is itself a recognition of estrangement that never should have happened. It came about because "middle-class" people disdained public service and police service in particular. Their abrogation of responsibility left a void which the police career group filled. The "we-they" overtone is our legacy.

A college curriculum that will produce men and women ready to see all these nuances of behavior management will by necessity be a liberal one. The authority for this is Alexander Pope, for this is the curriculum for the proper study of mankind. It will have career-oriented materials in it because, after all, these students will enter a legal system that has definite functions and techniques of which they must be aware. But the education process has to produce a *police* man and a *whole* man. One is the technician, the other is the reservoir of talent and thought from which sensitive social engineering springs. And the curriculum that produces that kind of much-needed talent will include subjects that will enrich the whole man—subjects such as music appreciation!

In our integrated and sophisticated society we must of necessity get along together or we die. A symphony orchestra gets together under the guidance of its conductor. A mass society looks to some law control for their source of harmony. In many respects the policeman is the conductor of our society. Conductors and policemen both carry batons. It is to our essential interest to insure that the best possible man wield them, whether on the bandstand or the beat. And the hand that holds the baton must belong to a sensitive, well-trained, well-educated man, who knows his job and his purpose. The finest symphony is discordant under a poor baton. The greatest society is equally discordant under insensitive guidance.

If we want beautiful music in our world, perhaps we had better take a good look at our batons and the hands that hold them.