

Chapter 2

Historical Perspective: British Policing and the Democratic Ideal

John G. D. Grieve

Introduction

The title of this piece is taken from Charles Reith's 1943 (Reith 1943) book whose writing and that of others has recently had a mixed press (Lentz and Chaires 2007). 'British' might be a slight misnomer on the part of this piece but it does consider Ireland and Scotland and their impact on Colquhoun, Peel and the first Commissioners of Police to the Metropolis. Part of the task here is to restore Reith's reputation to a wider audience. However the argument explores further back, further than the last 70 years, to 200 years ago. The participants here in this early account are seven. Later many more thinkers appear, before even the critical policing criminologists of in the mid twentieth Century. There are a complex network of tracks here to be mapped to understand the critiques and demands for reform of the twenty-first Century policing leadership, management and governance. This is not academic history, it is a practitioner's account of his predecessors but attempts to fulfil some of the requirements of the historian (for example MacMillan 2010, p. 5, 43) of orientation, considering context, asking questions, making connections and collecting and assessing evidence evidence. It is work in progress.

The chapter examines the roles of the policing philosophers John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham, the magistrate Patrick Colquhoun, the politician Robert Peel, the administrator and legislator Edwin Chadwick, and the police practitioners, administrators, managers and leaders Charles Rowan and Richard Mayne, in charting a way. (It could have gone earlier to the Fielding brothers but does not consider their highly important developments for lack of space.) The paper considers whether their thinking and research a century before him, informed Reith's arguments for British Policing Principles (Reith 1943, p. 4), and if it has any relevance to today.

J. G. D. Grieve (✉)
Portsmouth University, Portsmouth, UK
e-mail: jgdg@xob.demon.co.uk

For example the reach of Bentham into the twenty-first Century has been, arguably, illustrated recently by the whistleblower on American and UK intelligence systems, Edward Snowden by his adoption of Bentham's coining of a 'Panopticon' as a way of describing the increased power of the state (see below and for example Harding (2014) which shows the philosophers continuing influence.

Recent changes in policing governance are significant, for example the 2012 arrival of the single person party political in many cases, elected Police and Crime Commissioners to replace the part elected 16 members, multi party bodies that were the Police Authorities (Brown 2014). These dated back to 1964 in current legislation but with a much earlier genesis. The Police and Crime Commissioners can be traced in part to American models (see Cohen below). Three American models are considered here and their relationship to the British model is considered.

Developing the theme of seeking the paths by which a British policing philosophy can be explored the chapter is particularly concerned with the twin imperatives from these early days; those of prevention and investigation and whether these conflict? This hypothesised tension might be taken to be further evidence of a crisis in democracy, in Reith's terms the democratic ideal, as well as the political debates of a crisis in policing leadership and management.¹

The Early Thinkers and Practitioners of Policing

This piece does not claim that there is no role for politicians in determining policing strategy. On the contrary it is the task of policing to uphold the laws passed by politicians in Parliament. How that policing should be conducted is a matter in part for police practitioners and their leaders but they need to take account of the imperative for public support and the related issues of accountability and transparency. In a democracy the tactics and operations of the police need to be independent of the politicians, not least because sometimes the politicians may be the subject of police operations, just as the judiciary are required to be independent of the executive—the politicians in government in power and independent of everyone else. The police are accountable to the judiciary as they both uphold the law. Accountable in this sense means also giving an account of the exercise of their powers after the event to both the judiciary and politicians. Also they are accountable to the communities

¹ This paper distinguishes between the use of the words 'leadership' and 'management' in a way that many writers have pursued and about which there is still considerable debate. In short, because the issues can be discussed in volumes, leadership is about taking people somewhere they may not otherwise have gone and management is about the resources required, which includes the training and recruitment of those people. The related concept of 'command' of military origin but of considerable relevance to policing is a subset of leadership. (See the section on Elliot Cohen (2002) below). I am grateful to my colleagues both police and academic, with whom I have had many discussions on these topics. In particular I am very grateful Dr Andrew Fisher who falls into both categories and who continues to contribute to the material considered here not least about the relationship of Peel to Reith.

they were drawn from and so from earliest times needed to take into account the approval of many layers of the public; this was at the least through the jury system, in the criminal and civil courts and at Coroners Inquests dating back hundreds of years before Peel. That leads to thinking by policing leaders about the balance of independence and accountability in order to achieve public support (see for example Alderson (1979, 1984, 1998) for the detailed accounts of these imperatives, principles and developments over the years, written by a practitioner, academic and police philosopher).

Balancing difficult concepts is a task for philosophy. Critchley (1967) Stead (1977a) Ascoli (1979) Alderson (1998) all claim the influence of the Utilitarians on Peel and Chadwick and the early years of policing. Reith (1943) however does not cover their philosophy at all; he does however include both Bentham and Colquhoun in his 1952 book.

Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) is arguable the thinker behind the emergence in the last 250 years of the police democratic ideal; the ‘new’ policing, what Alderson (1998) calls the ‘good’ or ‘high’ police balancing the issues raised by the need for public approval. He introduced thinking about this public approval (more generally called public or community confidence in the police today) and independence by articulating the greatest happiness (and least pain) principle, in part about the public good, founding the basis of a pleasure and pain calculus and it’s relationship with miscarriages of justice. Indeed the words ‘maximise’ and ‘minimise’ were coined by him. The concept of a ‘Panopticon’ prison where the prisoners were visible at all times to ensure their good behaviour (and avoidance of pain inflicted by punishment for misbehaviour).² Bentham was a great influence on Colquhoun (Critchley 1967; Stead 1977a).

The philosopher who developed (indeed wrestled with) these ideas through the early years of policing was John Stuart Mill (1806–1873); his father was a friend of Bentham. He identified the issues at the heart of many debates about the public good, pleasure and pain and *On Liberty* the title of his most influential work. It was not for nothing that Peel wrote that liberty should not confused with being accosted by drunken women (sic), this is still relevant today as a recent bus journey on a Friday night in London showed. It is also evidence of the long shadows of philosophy that one of the most active pressure groups for police changes and reforms should be called *Liberty* at the time of writing (Critchley 1967; Stead 1977a, Alderson 1998).

Patrick Colquhoun (1745–1820) was a Magistrate at Thames Magistrates Court dealing with cases bought amongst others by the Thames Police patrolling the river through London. He was a close associate of Bentham, Stead writes that he admired

² This concept of constant visibility is what must have attracted Edward Snowden to the word Panopticon, in his case relating it to the constant visibility to the surveillance of the state through digital data. Continuing that thought of visibility another early example of intelligence is Bentham’s close associate Colquhoun’s (see below) knowledge of individual rioters behaviour and their identities. He made known to them his “forbearance” and admonished them to make good use of his forbearance an early example of preventive intelligence led policing (see Stead 1977b, p. 59) and even an early form of cautioning!

Colquhoun (Stead 1977b, p. 51). His *Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis* (1795) is a seminal work on policing and criminology not least on the criminology of policing. Colquhoun set about understanding the problem that police in its original sense, still to be found in the Police Instruction Books and web pages throughout the ages to this day, is some variation on “the arrangements made in civilised states to ensure the inhabitants keep the peace and obey the laws” (Alderson 1979, pp. 158–159). It is significant that the first Commissioners were Magistrates—that is Justices of the Peace.

Colquhoun made a detailed record, gathered data, defined his terms, analysed the data, explored motivation, came to conclusions and made recommendations. Not surprisingly, given what he did, he described policing as a new science. His definition of police is interesting but slightly more complex than that given above. It is “all those regulations in a country which apply to the comfort, convenience and safety of the inhabitants” (Stead 1977b, p. 51; Reith 1952, pp. 136–149). It is suggested that regulations means more than just those set up under legislation. Which definition aptly describes the police tasks today. Colquhoun is the architect of the preventive paradigm in policing, the prevention of crime as the primary object of the wider definition of police, including prevention by detection and punishment.

Peel offered his thoughts generally on how the ‘new’ Police should act in a debate in Parliament on 28th February 1828; he outlined what he had seen in Paris and Scotland³. He thought they should epitomise—(that the Police Officer as a) “Public Officer for that purpose, who apart from malice and private considerations, is bound to execute his duty with impartiality and firmness.” (Parliamentary Debate 28.2.1828 paragraph 795 MEPO 7/1 PRO). Impartiality and fairness is the foundation of the independence of chief officers and all who hold the Office of Constable under the Crown in the British model.

Robert Peel certainly did not write out or articulate any list of policing principles that resembles Reith (1943, p. 3) in their entirety. Or if he did we have not found them. It is disappointing to trawl through the Public Records Office Peel papers and the early Metropolitan Police letter books (MEPO). The records are of politics and drunkenness. That is Peel’s politics and police and public drunkenness. There are accounts of recruitment and pay and the general character and backgrounds of police recruits. There is an illuminating letter (cited in Hurd 2007, p. 106) on the artisan nature of the tasks that Peel was proposing. There is no outline of principles of how policing was to be done nor an overall strategy; that has to be inferred from the later correspondence and first police instruction books. The issue here is not that Peel wrote the Principles but what is the evidence that he believed in some or all of the values they espoused? The two first Commissioners Rowan and Mayne turned Peels legislation into practical instructions for the ‘new’ police in the spring and summer of 1829 (see Times Newspaper 25.9.1829 pages 2 and 3). By autumn of

³ Not it should be noted Ireland as he is often described as getting his thinking from his experiences there. He goes on to cite his learning about the nature and behaviour of policing in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, (and eventually) Dublin and Edinburgh (“Parliamentary” Debate 28.2.1828 paragraph 788).

that year they were ready. The combination of the disciplines of military, law, philosophy and politics has cast long shadows on the path policing governance, management and leadership has followed (Reith 1952; Critchley 1967; Stead 1977a; Alderson 1979, 1984, 1998).

Charles Rowan was an army officer, trained by Robert Craufurd in the Napoleonic Peninsular campaigns. He was a staff officer who wrote well and was probably involved in the writing of a forgotten early nineteenth Century treatise on the policing of military camps (Fletcher 1991). The military paradigm is at the heart of many debates about policing and police leadership down the ages to this day. Rowan drafted the initial Instruction Book that outlined the demeanour, tasks and duties of the Office of Constable under the Crown that pulled together all the good in what had gone before. Making sure that the duties were conducted in the style that Peel desired was a leadership and management task from the outset that Rowan described to his Superintendents—their badge a Crown being the Warrant Officer's not the Major's, further proof of the artisan nature of policing that Peel had desired (Times Newspaper 25.9.1829 pages 2 and 3; Reith 1952; Critchley 1967; Stead 1977a; Alderson (1979), (1984) and (1998)). The nature of policing, its demeanour and tasks remain a management and leadership task to this day.

In a famous letter (cited in Hurd 2007, p. 106) Peel had written that he did not want 'gentlemen' (and presumably would not want ladies today)⁴ in his 'new' police. His reasons are arguably mixed; control of the working classes and non working classes he anticipated would be better achieved by artisans and their leaders from the same class albeit with an officer and a gentleman as the first Commissioners. This patronising and class based issue remains the basis for some attitudes to the police and from some of the police themselves to this day.⁵

Richard Mayne, Rowan's co commissioner initially and then sole incumbent epitomises the legal paradigm in policing, Mayne had been a Magistrate in Ireland. Whilst Rowan was outlining the tasks and demeanour of the new police Mayne drafted the legal basis on which the police officers' powers rested. (Reith 1952; Critchley 1967; Stead 1977a.). Another abiding leadership and management task to this day.

It is worth remembering that Rowan and Mayne were both appointed as Justices of the Peace, a quasi judicial role retained until late in the twentieth Century by Metropolitan Police Commissioners.

⁴ See footnote 1.

⁵ A senior officer said to the author of this paper in 1986 that "policing was a working man's job that had been hijacked by intellectuals" he might have added, based on the authors assessment of his mindset "and women". But he did not. This is not an attitude the author approves, nor holds as either helpful or correct.

Charles Reith and the ‘Not Peelian’ Principles

Charles Reith does not claim that Peel wrote the 9 Principles that he recorded at the start of his account of policing and democracy (Reith 1943, pp. 3–4). Peel’s name does not appear at all in Reith’s first chapter and when it does appear 11 pages in, it is in the context of “party tactics and political manoeuvring” (Reith 1943, p. 11). Reith (1952, p. 139) considers that “Although his contribution... was an essential one, it was very small in comparison with what was contributed by each of the others. The share of fame that was allotted to him by historians was unfair.” What Reith is arguing for is longer tradition and public support for order and peace (most of the time) and for its role in national unity, if not for public support for the actual establishment of a public or new uniformed police.

So the nine principles of police as articulated by Reith are separate from Peel:

1. To prevent crime and disorder, as an alternative to their repression by military force and severity of legal punishment.
2. To recognise always that the power of the police to fulfil their functions and duties is dependent on public approval of their existence, actions and behaviour, and on their ability to secure and maintain public respect.
3. To recognise always that to secure and maintain the respect and approval of the public means also the securing of the willing co-operation of the public in the task of securing observance of laws.
4. To recognise always that the extent to which the co-operation 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 to preserve public favour, 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 the substance 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 friendly good humour; and by ready offering of individual sacrifice in protecting and preserving life.
6. To use physical force only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient to obtain public co-operation to an extent necessary to secure observance of law or to restore order; and to use only the minimum degree of physical force which is necessary on any particular occasion for obtaining 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 interests of community welfare and existence.
8. To recognise always the need for strict adherence to police-executive functions, and to refrain from even seeming to usurp the powers of the judiciary of avenging individuals or the State, and of authoritatively judging guilt and punishing the guilty.
9. To recognise 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.

(Reith 1943, pp. 3–4)

What follows is an attempt to anchor these principles in the past and apply them to today.

Clive Emsley said in a presentation recently that the so called Peelian Principles may not have been articulated by Robert Peel but they seemed like good ideas and

most policing thinkers today would probably sign up to them⁶. There is evidence of that from both sides of the Atlantic and across the Irish Sea. Peel may not have listed them but there is much in the public record that supports the contention that he may have supported the thinking behind versions of Reith's 9 Principles (Reith 1943, p. 34).

Some Later Usage of the 'Not Peelian' Principles

The Americans and their thinking about police reform and the democratic ideal produced the police practitioner academics August Vollmer and (MacNamara 1977) his protégée O.W. Wilson. (Vollmer 1936; Carte and Carte (1977)). Their work and its influence illustrates from the US experiences in 1930s what Steve Savage (2007) called the trade winds of policing thinking that crossed both the Irish Sea and the Atlantic. These trade winds might also be seen as sea ways, another form of path to be followed. They may help in preparing a map of ideas and values in policing. Wilson wrote about the British Police model and a review of Reith's studies so he was well aware of the non Peelian Principles (Wilson 1950a, b, c).

Tom Critchley a distinguished UK civil servant was the secretary to the 1964 Royal Commission and subsequently wrote a history of policing (Critchley 1967, 1977). Paying tribute to the scholarship of Radzinowicz (1956) he discusses at length the related roles of Bentham and Colquhoun in establishing the primary task of police as prevention.

The work of Philip John Stead on the pioneers and reformers of policing (Stead 1977b) had a profound impact on the thinking explored here whilst he was at the Police Staff College Bramshill in the 1970s and later in the USA at John Jay University New York in the 1980s; the Staff College is a casualty of the contemporary politicisation of police. The Metropolitan Police library that Reith had used was another casualty. Stead covered each of the founding fathers. Tom Critchley was his contributor on Colquhoun (Critchley 1977).

David Ascoli writing to celebrate 150 years of the Metropolitan Police in 1979 also considers the related roles of the founding fathers (Ascoli 1979) dedicating his book to Rowan and Mayne and their contribution to the subsequent history of policing.

In the follow up to Lord Scarman's third Inquiry, the one into the Brixton Disorders (Scarman 1981) ⁷another American model that of Lubans and Edgar (1979) appeared. This was a variation on the theories of management by objectives applied as a complete structure of policing. Policing by objectives appeared in UK police

⁶ Emsley (2014) this was at a workshop organised by Professor Jennifer Brown of the academic thinking behind The Lord Stevens Inquiry into Policing for a Better Britain (Stevens (2014) Brown Ed (2014)).

⁷ Lord Scarman conducted three public inquiries. Red Lion Square. Northern Ireland. The Brixton Disorders. All of these could be argued to have a relevance to this discussion.

managers bookshelves in the early 1980s as part of advice on UK reforms from the US Police Foundation and in particular research and recommendations from John Eck on volume crimes. Stephen Savage's study of the history of the twentieth and early twenty-first Century reforms helps explore the issues, particularly the role of the police themselves on reform from within, and sets the context and interpretation (Savage 2007). Robert Reiner's (2000) hugely influential 'The Politics of Police' was a major contribution to understanding the context and environment of policing governance. He describes the Principles as Reithian and "a significant reference point for British police thinking" (Reiner 2000, p. 24).

About this time Robert Fleming aided by Hugh Miller made a fly on the wall extensive TV documentary series which was to be the forerunner of many to come, they accompanied it with a near 400 page book (Fleming and Miller 1994) which intriguingly both denies and confirms the thesis presented here. They interviewed dozens of senior Metropolitan Police Service officers from the Commissioner downwards. On the one hand there is no mention of Peel or any of the founding fathers by name; on the other hand their ideas are everywhere. The principles, 50 years after Reith, seem to have been ingested. There are fortunately a number of women interviewed. For example "the police are the public and the public are the police" principle as epitomised by *Crimestoppers* (Fleming and Miller 1994, p. 261), the importance of prevention in this instance by investigation, detection and intervention before the crime is committed—in this case armed robbery—arrested by Flying Squad officers in a perfect illustration of Colquhoun's preventive police (Fleming and Miller 1994, p. 101).

Robert Adlam and Peter Villiers both former academic tutors at the UK Police Staff College produced a useful volume of contributions on rethinking police leadership for the arrival of the twenty-first Century (Adlam and Villiers 2003). They derive some principles which form an interesting commentary on those prepared by Reith.

Sir Patrick Sheehy was asked by Kenneth Clark then conservative Home Secretary to look at police management structures and conditions of service (Sheehy 1993; Brain 2010; Savage 2007).

Down the years many attempts were made by different governments to reintroduce military values into police leadership.⁸ for example the scheme by Lord Trenchard to introduce an officer class in the 1930s. A different American military model was explored by a later conservative government. Policy Exchange a conservative think tank, asked Eliot Cohen an American academic to adapt some of the thinking in his book about the military leadership and politicians, Supreme Command, (Cohen 2002) to the relationship between politicians and police leaders. The book used the examples of Lincoln, Clemenceau, Churchill and Ben Gurion to

⁸ A recent Commissioner to the Metropolis once told the author of the comment made by a very senior soldier to him "the trouble with the police is that they have no honour." Perhaps he meant they are neither gentlemen nor ladies. The artisan model of policing was alive and well in some officers' messes. Another recent commentator on an exclusive officers military club claimed "they did not want Plod in here" they were referring to counter terrorist specialists.

illustrate the different ways politicians might interact with at the least and control at the maximum their military leadership:

- President Abraham Lincoln writing a letter to his military commander Ulysses S. Grant during the American Civil War:
- The French Premier Clemenceau visiting his front line troops and their commanders in the First World War following the mutinies of 1917 regularly one day a week
- Wartime Prime Minister Winston Churchill's methods of asking difficult questions of his military leaders
- Israeli Prime Minister Ben Gurion's thinking and workshops called 'seminars' because of the intellectual rigour he demanded. His raw materials were the Hagannah and other guerrilla forces that he forged together for the creation of the Israeli Defence Forces. He created a disciplined body from the disparate guerrilla armies that had fought the British during the League of Nations/UN Mandate in Palestine.

What these each have in common are that they are about supreme political command at times of grave national danger in wartime. Political intervention was not just a possibility but an imperative, a necessity. How can that be compared with the situation of police reforms? Can it be argued that a situation in policing is analogous outside of where the politician's judge there is a grave national danger? One possible exceptional answer might be the example of some periods in Northern Ireland which led for example to the second Lord Scarman Inquiry, where the situation especially the alleged exhaustion of the RUC was judged so grave that the Army was deployed, as Military Aid to the Civil Powers (MACP) (Brain 2010, p. 14).

“The Last Great Unreformed Public Body”?

Finally this section seeks to understand the influence, if any, of the history of non Peelian Principles in changes in police governance and management in the twenty-first century.

Four sets of recent papers, the first by former Chief Constable Peter Neyroud, the next by Sir Denis O'Connor then Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary and two linked ones by lawyer and former rail regulator now Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary Tom Winsor, the last by former Commissioner Lord John Stevens and Professor Jennifer M. Brown explore the issues of policing in an age of austerity and increased political and media intervention. The content and commentaries on these might illustrate the relevance and significance of the early thinkers to today's issues and reforms.

Some critical commentators on the reforms that are apparently required, for example Nick Hopkins and Sandra Lavelle (2014, p. 15) consider the arguments that this period of extreme reform and proposed further reform of policing as alleged by some could have been driven by party politics not least by the current Prime Min-

ister⁹ and also as alleged could be political revenge for the alleged ill judged police investigation and inquiries in the Palace of Westminster into Damien Green MP¹⁰ (albeit the investigation had been started at the bequest of another political party, the Government at the time as is largely forgotten now) and the MP's expenses scandals (which was generated by media revelations in the Daily Telegraph).

Peter Neyroud a former Chief Constable and Tom Winsor later HMCIC, are both, intentionally or otherwise driving Government sponsored radical reform programs that navigates the landscape of a political agenda in an age of austerity; they seem uninterested in the past and in tradition. Neyroud (2011) is concerned with the paths and preparation for leadership, indeed for supreme command though not on the Cohen model. The limited references Neyroud cites are American though.

Sir Denis O'Connor was explicit in the role he identified for the founding fathers in the British Policing Model that he recommended be the foundation of policing. In two hard hitting HMCIC Reports (Her Majesty's Chief Inspectorate of Constabulary) he reminded the service of its origins and the contemporary relevance and significance of the non Peelian Principles (HMCIC 2009a, b).

Winsor (2012) considered the recruitment and conditions of service of police. In particular he reintroduced the officers and gentlemen debate by proposing and then driving direct entry at Superintendent level, most commentators then assumed this was to mean officers at the conclusion of their military careers.

Former Metropolitan Police Commissioner Lord John Stevens and Professor Jennifer Brown from LSE in 2012 and 2013 drove a number of projects academic and pragmatic that supported a Government Opposition party political alternative to the twenty-first Century Government driven reforms. They commissioned a wide ranging review of policing (Stevens 2014; Brown (2014)). The Commission examined the relevance of the 'non Peelian Principles', in considerable detail and seems to offer radical reforms but in the sense of seeking new ways to support traditional values in policing like those expressed by Reith in the non Peelian Principles. Their book of academic papers to support the commission's report contains a number of contributions which offer insight for the contemporary relevance (Brown 2014).

Conclusion

This chapter has suggested that in the twenty-first Century there is more to be ingested still from the 'non Peelian' Principles. There is much debate about the nature of states and their structures and powers and that if that might be a crisis in the democratic ideal then that crisis underpins any account of a crisis in policing, and also underpins any crisis in policing governance, leadership and management.

⁹ David Cameron Prime Minister at the time of writing was part of Kenneth Clarke's association to Patrick Sheehy's Review of Policing.

¹⁰ Damien Green MP was alleged to have been involved in the leakage of documents from a minister's office whilst his party was in opposition. At the time of writing he had just finished a period as Minister for Policing in the Home Office.

Reith's versions of the 9 Principles owe much to the founding fathers but also to the much earlier attempts to keep the peace and obey the law. What Reith describes as the tradition of the British Police and the Democratic Ideal stretches back to before Bentham and Colquhoun let alone Peel. This is not to deny Bentham's, Colquhoun's or Peel's influence on Rowan and Mayne and their articulation of the first philosophy, strategy, policy, practices and processes of the public or new police.

Peel deserves much of the credit for the practical, political but essential role in the development of the emerging framework, even if not the precise labelling of them as Peel's Principles that he has sometimes been given. But he should be given the credit as an artificer¹¹ building on what had been begun earlier rather than as a completely original thinker as Douglas Hurd's work advises us (Hurd 2007). He made the democratic ideal of British Police begin to happen. Reith's articulation remains helpful as an ideal. The Principles, ancient though they are in origin, have relevance and resonance today. They are like stones on old footpaths that were trodden by many before us. They are still markers on a path to be followed. The path is abandoned by leadership, management or command, whether supreme or operational, at the peril of contemporary democracy.

References

- Adlam, R., & Villiers, P. (2003). *Police leadership in the 21st century*. Winchester: Waterside Press.
- Alderson, J. (1979). *Policing freedom*. Plymouth: Macdonald and Evans.
- Alderson, J. (1984). *Law and disorder*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Alderson, J. (1998). *Principled policing*. Winchester: Waterside Press.
- Ascoli, D. (1979). *The queen's peace*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Brain, T. (2010). *A history of policing in England and Wales from 1974: A turbulent journey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, J. (Ed.). (2014). *The future of policing*. London: Routledge.
- Carte, G. E., & Carte, E. (1977). O.W. Wilson: Police theory in action. In P. J. Stead (Ed.), *Pioneers in policing*. Montclair: Patterson Smith.
- Cohen, E. (2002). *Supreme command*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Colquhoun, P. (1795). *A treatise on the police of the metropolis*. London.
- Critchley, T. A. (1967). *A history of the police in England and Wales*. London: Constable and Company.
- Critchley, T. A. (1977). Peel, rowan and mayne: The British model of police. In P. J. Stead (Ed.), *Pioneers in policing*. Montclair: Patterson Smith.
- Emsley, C. (2009). *The great British bobby*. London: Quercus.
- Emsley, C. (2014). Peel's principles, police principles. In J. Brown (Ed.), *The future of policing* (pp. 11–22). London: Routledge.
- Fleming, R., & Miller, H. (1994). *Scotland yard*. London: Michael Joseph.
- Fletcher, I. (1991). *Craufurd's light brigade*. London: Spellmount.

¹¹ A contemporary analogy for the work of Bentham, Colquhoun, Peel, Rowan and Mayne, Chadwick and Mill in London and beyond might be the innovators who gathered at Stanford University and migrated to Silicon Valley in the 1980s. It is perhaps also relevant that Vollmer and Wilson in a later age came from California.

- Harding, L. (2014). *The Snowden files*. London: Guardian Books.
- HMCIC. (2009a). *Adapting to protest—nurturing the British model of policing*. 25.11.2009. Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Policing. Home Office, London.
- HMCIC. (2009b). *Adapting to protest—facilitating peaceful protest*. 25.11.2009. Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Policing. Home Office, London.
- Hopkins, N., & Laville, S. (15 February 2014). 'We haven't changed in 100 years': Disarray in the ranks leaves union hierarchy in crisis. *Guardian Newspaper*, 15. London.
- Hurd, D. (2007). *Robert Peel*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Lentz, S. A., & Chaires, R. H. (2007). The invention of Peel's principles: A study of policing 'text-book' history. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 69–79.
- Lubans, V. A., & Edgar, J. M. (1979). *Policing by objectives: A handbook for improving police management*. Connecticut: Hartford Social Development Corporation.
- MacMillan, M. (2010). *The uses and abuses of history*. London: Profile Books.
- MacNamara, D. E. J. (1977). August Vollmer: The vision of police professionalism. In P. J. Stead (Ed.), *Pioneers in policing*. Montclair: Patterson Smith.
- Neyroud, P. (2011). *Review of police leadership and training*. London: Home Office.
- Radzinowicz, L. (1956). *A history of the English criminal law and its administration from 1750*. London.
- Reiner, R. (2000). *The politics of the police* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reith, C. (1943). *British policing and the democratic ideal*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Reith, C. (1952). *The blind eye of history*. London: Faber.
- Savage, S. (2007). *Police reform. Forces for change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scarman, L. (1981). *The Brixton disorders: Report of an inquiry*. London: HMSO.
- Sheehy, P. (1993). *Inquiry into police responsibilities and rewards*. London: HMSO.
- Stead, P. J. (1977a). *Pioneers in policing*. Montclair: Patterson Smith.
- Stead, P. J. (1977b). Patrick Colquhoun-Preventive police. In P. J. Stead (Ed.), *Pioneers in policing*. Montclair: Patterson Smith.
- Stevens, J. (2014). *Policing for a better Britain*. Independent Commission into the Future of Policing. Essex: Lord Stevens and the Anton Group.
- Vollmer, A. (1936 reprinted 1969). *The police and modern society*. California: University of California.
- Wilson, O. W. (1950a). *Police administration*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Wilson, O. W. (1950b). Review of Charles Reith: Short history of the British police. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 40(5), 675–677.
- Wilson, O. W. (1950c). The British police. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 40(5), 637–650.
- Winsor, T. P. (2012). *Independent review of police officer and staff remuneration and conditions*. London: TSO. Command 8325.

Prof. John G. D. Grieve CBE, QPM, BA (Hons), M.Phil. joined the Metropolitan Police in 1966 at Clapham and served as a police officer and detective throughout London, in every role from undercover officer to policy chair for over 37 years before retiring in 2002. His duties involved the Drugs, Flying, Robbery and Murder Squads senior investigator. He was also the borough commander at Bethnal Green and head of training at Hendon Police College and was the first Director of Intelligence for the Metropolitan Police. He was appointed as one of four Commissioners of the International Independent Monitoring Commission for some aspects of the peace process in Northern Ireland in 2003 by the UK Government until 2011. He is a Senior Research Fellow at University of Portsmouth and Professor Emeritus at London Metropolitan University. He currently chairs the MoJ/HO Independent Advisory Group on Hate Crime and advises a number of policing bodies including on cultural matters. He has written extensively on policing matters including leadership and creativity.

Police Services

Leadership and Management Perspectives

Wankhade, P.; Weir, D. (Eds.)

2015, XI, 181 p. 6 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-16567-7