AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE CULTURE(S) OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE BETWEEN THE 1930s AND THE 1960s

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Thomas William Cockcroft

Department of Law, Brunel University

August 2001

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the following people for their help, support, advice and encouragement over the last few years;

Keith Cockcroft, Graham Cockcroft, Jane Hopkins, Arthur Hopkins, Ged Denton, Ulanda Taylor, Kieran Heneghan, Keith Barton, Jane Woolfenden, Mark Bartholomew, Graeme Clarke, Rachel Leigh Carter, Betsy Stanko, Sharon Cowan

I would also like to thank Dr Robert Perks of the National Sound Archive for his help.

The research would not have been possible without the co-operation of the 26 retired officers who agreed to take part in this research. Many thanks to all of you.

The following people also deserve medals;

Phil Rawlings, Jenny Deiches, Fiona Brookman

ABSTRACT

The majority of published work in the area of police occupational culture follows the methodological template of Skolnick (1994) which utilises both participant observation and the interview. The way in which this approach has been used has proved problematic for a number of reasons. First, it has promoted a view that police occupational culture is static and unchanging. Second, it has failed to acknowledge that officers have a choice whether or not to engage in certain behaviours. Third, it has promoted a view that police officers display essentially negative behaviours.

The aim of the present research was to investigate, by means of techniques drawn from oral history, the culture or cultures of police officers within the Metropolitan Police Force in London between the 1930s and the 1960s. Firstly, there was a desire to find out to what extent accepted correlates of police occupational culture applied to police work in the period prior to the 1960s when it was first investigated. Secondly, if there did appear to be differences between the findings of the present research and those of authors charting post-1960s police culture, ideas would be forwarded in an attempt to explain such variations. Examples of factors which could account for such variations might include changes in the relationship between the police and the public, changes in police practice or changes in legislation.

Through 26 interviews with retired officers, it was found that the intensity of Skolnick's key factors for the emergence of police occupational culture (danger, authority and the need to appear efficient) appeared to be greatly influenced by wider societal factors manifested in the state of police/public relations. Similarly, the present research found great variations within the officers' apparent adherence to key parts of the police 'working personality' as proposed by Skolnick. In short, the great variation in police behaviours exhibited in the present research could be attributed to the fact that wider social factors served to affect the intensity of Skolnick's three key factors.

Contents   Page

Chapter 1

Introduction

This piece of research was undertaken in an attempt to find out more about the nature of police occupational culture. Since the 1960s when the subject was first addressed, there appears to have been very little theoretical progress made except for the work of Chan (see Chan 1997).

Skolnick's research introduced a methodological template characterised by intense and relatively short-term pieces of research based upon participant observation and interviews. This approach has been utilised by later authors such as Cain (1973), Smith and Gray (1983) and Manning (1977) and research undertaken in such a way has tended to unearth similar data and draw similar conclusions. These findings, generally, appear to suggest that the police indulge in corrupt, immoral, or at best, questionable practice most of the time with little or no mention of those situations where officers display good police practice. Such negative behaviours are viewed as being the result of cultural influences acting upon the will of individual officers with scant regard for any personal or individual motivations which they might hold. In many ways, it appears that the *modus operandi* employed by many researchers during such research is to carry out an observation of police behaviours but only to analyse improper behaviour. This may give the impression that police work is, by its very nature, tainted by corruption or impropriety. A more in-depth exploration of such issues will occur in the Analysis chapter.

The premise of the present research is not to dismiss the existing research in the area of police culture but to add to it or enhance it. In many ways, it may be possible to view such existing pieces of research as limited in that they generally involve a researcher observing police action and then ascribing their interpretation of its meaning to it. This is not to say that the opinions of sociologists are to be discounted. We should acknowledge, however, that the subject area might benefit from an analysis of the meanings which the social actors themselves ascribe to their working lives and the behaviours therein.

Oral history techniques have been used previously in the study of the police, specifically by Brogden (1991) and Weinberger whose collection of transcribed interviews with police officers is held at the National Sound Archive (Collection C684). However, the approach utilised by the present research differs from the work of Brogden and Weinberger in that it uses aspects of the methodology to investigate the occupational culture of the police rather than particular aspects of the social history of policing.

Because police culture is viewed, in many ways, as an umbrella term for all that is seen as wrong in the police it is vital that those who served in the profession have their views heard. To utilise the views of such individuals would undoubtedly provide us with a deeper understanding of the culture or cultures of the police because we would not merely be observing police behaviours and ascribing a meaning or meanings to them but because we would be letting the ex-officers describe their own perceptions. It may be possible to question the objectivity of such an approach and argue that the information from the interviews has been selected and categorised and, therefore, represents the biases or agendas of the researcher. Similarly, an unscrupulous researcher, it could be argued, may decontextualise the views of the interviewees to make any particular point that he or she desires.

This first of the above views could be countered with the argument that any information that has been filtered out of the text has been done so because it is superfluous to the concept of police occupational culture as defined by authors who write on the subject. With regards to the latter point, the wealth of information which was amassed throughout the interviews rendered such falsification needless.

The use of such a methodological technique (i.e. one which concentrates upon the views of officers) was seen as a means of giving an element of depth to the area of police occupational culture. Any new analysis of police occupational culture would have to acknowledge that the existing conceptualisation is apparently too simplistic to adequately account for the sheer diversity of police

officers' behaviours and actions. In all societies, Skolnick (1994) argues, the police face danger, are imbued with authority and have to appear efficient and this has encouraged the notion that the culture of the police is homogeneous. The rationale behind this study is not to disprove the fact that there may be elements of universality or persistent themes within police occupational culture but to show that police officers can exhibit a rich diversity of behaviours and attitudes. The present research, therefore, attempts to highlight the diversity of police work by exploring the variation of police culture(s) over a period of approximately thirty years within a number of markedly different environments. In short, therefore, this piece of research will attempt to show the importance of investigating wider social factors and their effect upon police culture.

At the outset of the research, it became apparent that there was a real scarcity of both contemporary texts on police culture and in-depth documentary materials relevant to both the era and the geographical location under investigation. The fact that autobiographical works by retired officers tend to pertain to policing outside of the Metropolitan area or outside the period of the 1930s to the 1960s meant that the only real way to get the required information was to interview retired officers.

The sample was assembled through advertising in publications for ex-Metropolitan Police officers who had served between the 1930s and the 1960s and who were willing to be interviewed for a piece of research. Interviews were limited to those officers who served within the Metropolitan area for two main reasons. Firstly, it was assumed that constraints upon time and money would be eased by interviewing ex-officers who, for the main, still resided within the area. Secondly, it was assumed that the Metropolitan area itself covered such a wide variety of environments and communities that a wide selection of police experiences would be uncovered.

The great majority of the sample came forward after reading about the research in various London free papers. Twenty-six retired police officers were interviewed over the course of a year and throughout the country. The ex-

officers were picked by fulfilling no criteria other than having served in the Metropolitan force between the 1930s and the 1960s. This time period was picked for two main reasons. Firstly, it was assumed that it would be extremely difficult to come across any surviving ex-officers who had served before the 1930s. Secondly, research into police culture began in the 1960s and there was a reluctance to cover a period where there was already a ready supply of information. No non-white ex-officers and only three female ex-officers came forward to be interviewed. This was not seen as problematic and, in reality, probably reflected the fact that very few members of either of these groups were recruited by the Metropolitan Police for much of the period under investigation. Stratification of the sample through rank and gender was not undertaken and the sampling procedure was unashamedly opportunistic.

Those officers who made up the sample had experienced greatly varying careers within the Metropolitan Police Force. Some of the officers never rose above the rank of Constable while several rose to Sergeant and, in one case, Detective Inspector. Some were only posted to one or two different stations whilst others had experience of many more environments - most notably, one officer had served at 11 stations. One officer was based at Paddington and spent 17 years in the Flying Squad whilst another spent 20 years in the Met as a PC first at Kenley and then at Croydon. It is of little wonder that a catch-all theory which tries to encapsulate the wealth of all these individuals' professional experiences and which tries to predict their behaviour will encounter some difficulty. This is why it was viewed as important to investigate the effect of wider societal factors upon police work.

Extremely useful background information was supplied by the National Sound Archive who kindly granted me access to a collection of interview transcripts undertaken by Dr Barbara Weinberger (Collection C684). These were vital in providing an idea of the day-to-day realities of police work between the 1930s and the 1960s. Without such materials, areas such as the police relationship with both barrow boys and street bookmakers would not have been addressed.

The interviews themselves were designed to investigate two main areas. Primarily, the interviews addressed issues relating to key parts of police occupational culture (that is, those negative aspects of police work which are addressed by existing research) such as racism and corruption. At another level, the interviews addressed historical aspects of policing which, whilst not being viewed as accepted correlates of police culture, nevertheless provided valuable examples of police culture issues. For example, by investigating police views on street bookmakers we address areas such as police attitudes to legislation, police attitudes to law-breakers and the police relationship with the community which they police.

The un-structured nature of the interviews meant that whilst key points were covered, the interviewees also had the opportunity to discuss at length any other issues or areas which they felt were of interest. This tangential information that emerged was often vital in alerting the researcher to important areas which had not previously been covered and also in adding a dynamic dimension to the research. This issue will be covered in a more in-depth manner in the Methodology chapter.

The interviews were then transcribed and analysed in accordance with a number of correlates of police occupational culture, many of which had been identified within the Literature Review, by Weinberger's work or by the present research itself. Quotes were then listed under the relevant heading with a commentary linking them together. The commentary allows certain issues to be highlighted and explained and also helps to add a certain fluidity to the information.

In the Analysis chapter, an overview is made of Skolnick's conceptualisation of the 'police working personality'. This is followed by a discussion of some of the problematic issues which arise from his work. Then the findings of the present research are compared to those of existing research with regards to key correlates of police occupational culture such as racism, sexism and corruption. Finally, the importance of wider societal factors in determining the intensity of police culture will be addressed.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

"We, the police, are in fact the most accurate reflection of British society, its tolerance, its strengths and its weaknesses" (Mark, 1978, p.33)

1. What is Police Occupational Culture?

The term 'cop culture' refers to sets of attitudes, perspectives, norms and values which are believed to be prevalent amongst police officers and which are seen as shaping their understanding of the social world and their behaviour within it. In many ways, cop culture can be conceptualised as a universal phenomenon by virtue of the fact that police officers throughout the world have a large amount of occupational discretion at their disposal to be utilised on a common set of problematical situations. Thus, it could be argued that police officers working in such diverse cultures as the UK, the US, Asia and Africa all face similar issues regarding public order, crime detection and crime management and that this facilitates the emergence of what could be viewed as a comparatively cohesive culture within the occupation. Cop culture is seen as being important due to its, "...character and persistence, in the amount of research enquiry to which it has been subject, in the role it is alleged to play in supporting or preventing change in police organizations" (Heidensohn, 1992, p.75).

Cop culture is directly linked to the concept of the 'working personality' (Skolnick, 1994) which should be viewed, not as a psychological phenomenon, but as a socially constructed set of responses. It must also be noted that the linked concepts of cop culture and 'working personality' are problematic in that it is extremely difficult to gauge to what extent they determine an officer's particular practices.

It is important to emphasise at the outset of such a discussion the importance of discretion as an issue of police occupational culture. Steer (1970) wrote, "...The police in England and Wales have wide discretion in prosecuting, and by no

means every offender who comes to the notice of the police is ultimately taken to court" (p.5). The Royal Commission on the Police Final Report states that the Association of Chief Police Officers claimed, in 1961, that,

"...The exercise of this discretion by Chief Officers has at times been the subject of unfavourable public comment...but it is thought that the public generally are well satisfied with the impartial and often sympathetic way in which decisions in matters of this kind are made by the police" (p.855).

However, the same report stated that there should be some concern about the use of discretion by the police. It claimed that, "...there are some ways in which the police can exercise their discretion more wisely and more uniformly than they do at present" (p.116).

Discretion, therefore, can be viewed as an important factor for at least two reasons. Firstly, it allows officers to apply the law differentially between similar situations and, secondly, it makes them open to accusations of bias when such variations are made known to the public.

Skolnick (1994) identified two types of discretion exercised by the police - delegated discretion and unauthorized discretion. Delegated discretion referred to that discretion which was conceived as an inevitable part of the police officer's job (and therefore viewed as authorized) whereas unauthorized discretion referred to that discretion which was influenced by the individual officer's personal views. Unauthorized discretion refers to the fact that, "...policemen are rarely supervised, that supervisory (Sergeant to patrolmen) ratios are very high, and that training in most cases is minimal, "internal" control over police conduct is weak" (Manning, 1977, p.364).

2. Danger Authority Efficiency

Skolnick (1994) claims that the police are suspicious of the public for three main reasons. The first is that of danger. Many occupations are viewed as dangerous yet policing is different in that it is impossible to know what 'lies around the next

corner'. Manning (1977) wrote, "...The police possess what might be called a "threat-danger-hero" notion of their everyday lives" (p.302). Similarly, Skolnick places a lot of emphasis upon the paramilitary analogy (i.e. that the occupation of policing is very much like that of soldiering). As Reiner (1992) points out, the dangers which face the police come not from calculable risks but from the unpredictability of human nature.

The second factor which Skolnick viewed as crucial to the emergence of suspicion within the police officer's personality is that of authority. Engels (1969) wrote,

> "Because the English bourgeois finds himself reproduced in his law, as he does in his God, the policeman's truncheon which, in a certain measure, is his own club has for him a wonderfully soothing power. But for the working man quite otherwise" (p. 253).

This still seems relevant today for although we tend to hold the view that police authority should be applied in a fair and unbiased nature it does, however, often appear to be directed towards the young, the male and the marginalised.

The fact that the police bear such authority, tend to be suspicious and are granted a wide degree of discretion all lend themselves to an occupational framework where the application of the law is seen as anything but predictable. The exercise of authority is negotiable and is dependent on factors such as the location of the offence, the visibility of the offence and the class and status of the social actors involved. Within such a framework police authority can be viewed as a form of negotiable and authorised state coercion. Manning (1977) wrote that the ideology of the police, "...contains three interrelated axioms: it posits the existence of an absolutistic morality, links it with the state and makes them equivalent, and it attaches to policing the obligation to defend these two entities" (p.5) and that, "...Their actions underscore and implement the intentions of the state - they are Leviathan enacted" (p.4). The fact that the police are viewed as

the defenders of such an absolute morality may be seen as inhibiting the legitimacy of any complaints made against them as an organisation.

The third factor is that of the police officer's need for efficiency. Efficiency is a difficult concept to define precisely when applied to the concept of policing. Is an efficient police force one with which the public express satisfaction, or one which succeeds in securing an increase in the clear-up rate of crimes, or one which succeeds in causing a decrease in the crime rate? Questioning what exactly is meant by an efficient police force lands us in the debate concerning the actual role of the police. Morgan and Newburn (1997) chart the way in which the Conservative Government of recent times, following its drive towards increased 'law and order', took decreases in the crime rate as the primary measure of police efficiency. They were disappointed to find that an increased police presence led to an increased rather than a decreased crime rate. The very fact that police efficiency is such a difficult concept to define, let alone measure, implies that it might be the case that there is no single role by which the police are judged. It may be sufficient for this discussion to note that police efficiency can be taken as meaning securing a certain amount of public satisfaction and support and being seen as having a positive effect upon the detection and reduction of crime.

Skolnick viewed these three factors of danger, authority and efficiency as converging to create conditions from which the police officer's 'working personality' emerges. A primary part of this personality is 'suspiciousness' which is viewed as an integral part of the culture. It must be noted that the 'siege mentality' which appears to be so prevalent amongst police officers today is a direct result of this suspicion.

3. Suspiciousness Pragmatism Excitement

Much of the existing literature in the area of cop culture (e.g. Skolnick, 1994, Reiner, 1978, Smith & Gray 1983) has pointed to the fact that police officers tend to be suspicious of any behaviour that does not fit into a certain, idealised form which corresponds with the police view on how things should be. This appears to

be a crucial facet of the police 'working personality' which affects the nature of the police relationship with both criminal and non-criminal groups. Indeed, Reiner (1978) gives the example of a detective who told him, "...'You drive along and you see things differently to your wife or friends...You go to the football, and you tend to be more aware, to keep your eye on the yobs'". (p. 210). Similarly, Skolnick (1994) wrote,"...it is in the nature of the policeman's situation that his conception of order emphasise regularity and predictability" (p.46).

Suspicion, it has been noted, is not just a result of policing what are often perceived by police officers as potentially dangerous social environments. Skolnick (1994) claims that, "...the police are indeed specifically *trained* to be suspicious" (p.47). He goes on to argue that police officers are instructed to look out for 'suspicious behaviour' like, for example, a) individuals appearing 'on edge' when near a police officer, and, b) individuals appearing unconcerned when near a police officer. To the casual observer, such a degree of suspicion may be viewed as bordering upon the paranoid.

Another aspect of police culture, that of pragmatism, was put forward by Reiner (1992). Generally, police officers reject theoretical concepts in favour of the easily discernible and the tried and tested. Reiner (1992) writes, "...Police officers are concerned to get from here to tomorrow (or the next hour) safely and with the least amount of paperwork" (p.128). Such a pragmatic approach is probably at its greatest amongst street cops working in more dangerous communities and where cynicism and suspiciousness are greatest.

Several pieces of research have highlighted the tendencies amongst many officers to crave excitement (e.g. Skolnick, 1994, Cain, 1973, and Reiner, 1992). Cain (1973) showed how officers often hope to work what is termed a 'good pitch' where there is a large crime rate and an increased possibility of violence with the public. The PSI study (1983) gives the example of an officer who claimed that the most enjoyable occurrence of his working life was when he was involved in a car chase which ended in a crash. Cockcroft (1995) illustrates this pursuit of excitement by citing instances where an 'interesting' sounding call (i.e.

16

one which might signal the possibility of violence) comes through to a patrol car and the officers race to arrive at the scene motivated not by any deep-rooted altruism towards potential victims but by the possibility of a violent encounter. Ignoring, for a moment, the possibility that such statements merely reflect the inherent cynicism of cop culture, it could be said that many officers tend to look for such exciting events to break up the monotony of much day to day policing.

4. Social Solidarity Social Isolation

Two inter-related factors which also contribute to the police officer's 'working personality' and, thus, to police culture are police solidarity and social isolation (Skolnick, 1994, and Reiner, 1992). The average officer, claims Skolnick, encounters great difficulty in forging (and maintaining) rewarding relationships with those who inhabit different occupations from themselves even when factors such as age, race, class and religion have been accounted for. Skolnick goes on to claim that many officers perceive themselves to be so stigmatised by the label 'police officer' that they often lie about their occupation when asked about their work by a stranger. One important point to raise concerning this issue is, to what degree is this perceived stigmatisation realised? That is, is this hostility actually present or is it merely a by-product of the officer's own ingrained suspiciousness?

Police solidarity is strongly connected to the concept of social isolation. Cain (1973) writes about, "...the need for mutual secrecy and trust" (p.190) among police officers and, similarly, Skolnick (1994) claimed that the police, "...emerge as an exceptionally socially active occupational group" (p.53).

Skolnick goes on to indicate how solidarity within the police force is greater than for other occupations by comparing it with the solidarity of those in the printing industry which is, traditionally, a very tightly knit occupation. He cited research by Lipset et al (1962) which found that 54% of printers had not been to a work-based social event in the last five years whereas, according to Skolnick's research, the same percentage of police officers had attended at least three such occasions in the last twelve months. However, police solidarity does not

just pertain to how officers spend their leisure time, it also refers to camaraderie during working hours even in instances where official protocol was being breached. The PSI study (1983) found that if there was any sign that a fellow officer was being physically attacked, every police car for two miles would race to the scene. The same study found that police solidarity manifested itself in the institutionalised practice of the protection and 'covering up' of colleagues' infringements of procedure. Evidence of this was cited within the PSI study when the authors interviewed the head of a crime squad who claimed that, in the event of one of his men getting into trouble, he would, "...'get all of us together and...script him out of it'" (p.72).

Thus, police solidarity goes further than mere companionship or friendship and, in many cases, may be seen as a motivating factor behind some corrupt police behaviour. It appears, therefore, that official police procedure, like much of the law, is regarded not as a rigid code of morality but as a flexible and negotiable tool to be compromised on occasion if the ends justify the means. Such a camaraderie would suggest that there were sanctions available to use against those officers who did not wish to commit themselves to the norms of the group. One example of this is the case of Serpico, the American officer, who made a stand against the corruption he saw in his department and who found that he became the recipient of such negative sanctions as delays in receiving back-up when he requested it.

Maguire and Norris (1994) make the point that much of the evidence of police solidarity emerges from studies of those serving in the uniformed ranks rather than CID. They did not subscribe to Skolnick's assumption that police solidarity is uniformly present both within and between ranks. Maguire and Norris cite the work of Baldwin and Maloney (1992) who found that feelings of solidarity amongst plain-clothes officers were limited to their 'teams', which often were comprised of just one other officer. It may, therefore, be the case that we can identify two types of police solidarity - that which is common to uniform officers and which is relatively far-ranging and that which is common to plain clothes officers and which is more limited.

The link between social isolation and police solidarity may be explained as follows. The very nature of policing tends to isolate the police officer from the public. MacInnes (1962) compared police officers to occupying troops in an enemy country, a comparison supported by Baldwin (1962) who wrote, "...none of the Police Commissioner's men...have any understanding of the lives led by the people they swagger about...controlling" (p. 65).

This appears to illustrate how police officers are, by the nature of their job, alienated from the rest of the population. Skolnick (1994) claims that this reaction against the police can be understood best in the light of two main factors. First, the public tends to resent the police as they wield a certain amount of power and authority which is denied to the rest of the population. Secondly, such resentment may be due, claims Skolnick (1994), to, "...the suspicion that policemen do not themselves strictly conform to the moral norms they are enforcing" (p.56) which, as the literature on police corruption illustrates, has a basis in both fact and history.

Isolation and the need to be able to rely upon one's colleagues are the main ways of accounting for the high level of police solidarity within the force. The very nature of the job (i.e. its potential for danger and the need, especially amongst beat officers, to work as a team) helps to make the bonding between police officers one of the strongest occupational ties in existence. This, coupled with the large amount of isolation, helps create the, "...them and us outlook which is characteristic of police culture" (Reiner, 1992, p.117).

Whitaker (1964) forwards the idea that police solidarity has increased with perceived decreases in police authority. When, therefore, the police feel under increased threat, through legislation, re-structuring, or increased public hostility, there may be a distinct tendency for officers to tighten the solidarity and camaraderie within the occupation. Skolnick (1994), however, views the isolation of the police from the public as an inevitability by virtue of their invested authority.

5. Variations in Police Culture

At this point it might be useful to note that this area does appear to attract some potential contradictions. For example, it is not made clear how we can reconcile Skolnick's view that, "...The element of danger in the policeman's role alienates him not only from populations with a potential for crime but also from the conventionally respectable (white) citizenry" (1994, p.53) with Reiner's notion of the 'innocent victim' (who one would suppose to be conventional, respectable and white, in the eyes of the police). To what extent can police officers truly desire to protect a type of person whom they feel themselves so isolated from? We may be able to explain such a problem by bearing in mind the fact that Skolnick's research was based in the United States whereas Reiner's was based in the United Kingdom and that societal and cultural differentiation may bring to bear differing attitudes to the police relationship with the public. If this, however, is the case it adds weight to the argument that we should differentiate between UK and US police cultures.

A similar point which adds to the argument that variations in police culture may occur between the two countries is one concerning the specifics of the social isolation correlate. Skolnick (1994) asserts that the isolation of officers within the United States is created by external factors such as the hostile attitudes of many members of the public towards the police, whereas, in the United Kingdom, the police themselves are seen as actively encouraging such a detached persona. Manning (1977) wrote that, "a sacred canopy is drawn over police work...ideological mechanisms suffuse policing with a moral integrity and by doing so conceal as well as reveal the realities of police work" (p. 5) and it appears that these attempts to conceal the nature of police work are determined by either internal or external mechanisms depending upon the country in which it is occurring. In the United Kingdom it appears that the police themselves draw the 'sacred canopy' whereas in the United States, according to Skolnick (1994), it is the public. Harris (1973), however, took the view that other factors had an influence and credited the isolation process as being due to the job and the department a particular individual worked in as well as the obvious factor of attitudes of the public.

Reiner (1992) follows the tradition of writers such as Broderick (1973), Walsh (1977), and Shearing (1981) by addressing the differentiation, between officers, in their approaches to the job. Reiner, himself, argued that there were four main types of police officer; the 'bobby', the 'uniform-carrier', the 'new centurion' and the 'professional'. The 'bobby' is viewed as utilising his discretion in a practical way and attempts to maintain the peace by emphasising the need to foster good relations with the public. The 'uniform-carrier' embodies the general disillusionment found in much of the police force and can be viewed as doing the bare minimum of work. The 'new centurion' views crime fighting as the central role of the police and the street cop as the most important role within the organisation. Reiner's final category, that of the 'professional', refers to those officers who view police work not so much as a way of life but as a career to be approached like any other. Such officers are viewed as being motivated more by the opportunities for career advancement offered by the police than the opportunity to fight crime.

Such variations in individual officers' attitudes towards policing, according to Reiner (1992), tend to emphasise, "...an alienated cynic, a managerial professional, a peace-keeper and a law enforcer" (p. 132). It would be of interest to look at what informs the nature of such classifications. It might be that such classifications represent character traits or attitudes which the individual holds and which they have brought to the job. Another explanation might be that such attitudes may represent the ways in which individual officers internalise, to a greater or lesser degree, the often contradictory components of what Skolnick terms the 'working personality'. Thus, the 'alienated cynic' refers to an over-internalisation of the suspiciousness vital to the 'working personality', whereas the 'managerial professional' may occur as a result of an increase in what Morgan and Newburn (1997) termed, "...private sector management strategies" (p.9) within the police force.

Similarly, the roles of 'peace keeper' and 'law enforcer' may reflect the dichotomy between serving the public and catching criminals. It may be the case, therefore,

that such distinctions are not necessarily mutually exclusive and may just reflect variations in the internalisation of core police attributes.

The existence of a 'sense of mission' amongst many officers (Reiner, 1992, and Cain, 1973) is exemplified in the behaviour of those officers who correspond to Wambaugh's (1970) typology of the 'new centurion'. These officers were characterised by a tendency to view themselves as modern enforcers of law and order in an increasingly chaotic and dysfunctional society. They tend to place special emphasis upon protecting the weak and the innocent from the more un-savoury elements of our towns and cities.

Whilst the 'sense of mission' leads to officers adopting uncompromising attitudes towards crime and law-breakers, it may also lead to displays of antipathy towards those aspects of their work which do not involve crime fighting. Punch (1979) shows how many police officers view 90% of their work as 'shit' work (i.e. non-crime related work) which they find, "...morally degrading to them as upholders of public safety" (in Holdaway, 1979, p.110). Manning (1977) claims that such, "...nonadversary, morally binding interactions are avoided or treated with disdain" (p.313).

Cain (1973) shows how this 'sense of mission' is more widely embraced by city police officers as they tend to have a much narrower perception of what they believe the police role should include. Paradoxically, it should also be noted that it is the more community or service based aspects of the police role that help to nurture good relations between the police and the public.

The police officer's 'sense of mission' occurs, according to Reiner (1992), because policing is viewed as, "...not just a job but a way of life with a worthwhile purpose, at least in principle" (p. 111). The police officer's perspective is one that revolves around the fact that they are there to protect the law-abiding citizens from those who break the law and, also, to maintain the status quo. Thus, the typology of the 'innocent victim' is viewed, by Reiner, as the focal point which demands protection and this may on occasion be used as a motivating factor to

those officers who do not abide by the letter of the law. Additionally, this perspective is informed by the need to sustain the authority of the police in the face of attacks upon their authority from various groups.

6. Police Cynicism Police Pessimism

Several academics have found cynicism (or 'police pessimism') to be an integral part of cop culture (e.g., Reiner, 1992, Foster, 1989,). Manning (1977) writes that, "...people in general are viewed as stupid, fallible, greedy, lustful, immoral and hypocritical...Man is seen as a translucent Machiavelli, easily uncovered by insightful probing or public action" (p.26).

Westley (1970) shows how the police view the 'public as enemy'. Another example of the cynicism within the police force is shown by Punch (1979) who quotes *The Sunday Times* of 18/4/76 wherein the Deputy Chief Constable of Yorkshire claimed that it had become a 'work of art' to get delinquents into court because of the growing influence of 'liberal' specialists . Thus, the cynicism of the police seems not just to be directed at members of the public who, as Manning (1977) indicates, appear to be looked down upon because of their human failings (of which, presumably, the police have none). It is also directed at a criminal justice system which, in the police officer's eyes, appears to favour the criminal and not the police.

Cynicism (or 'police pessimism'), like suspicion, may, in part, come from the day-to-day aspects of policing. It is quite probable that working in the worst areas of a community, dealing perpetually with the less appealing parts of life and being a constant target of public hostility makes one's view of life become cynical. Cockcroft (1995) recounts a situation when, before going out on patrol, the officer bluntly said to the researcher, "C'mon Tom..Time to police 'the shit'" (p.37). Such a remark adequately conveys both the cynicism with which the police view the public they have to deal with and the police's view of themselves as superior to those who bear the brunt of their authority.

Reiner (1992) suggests that police cynicism may have an underlying use as a tool to protect the individual officer, emotionally, from the less enjoyable aspects of their occupation. The growth of police cynicism in older officers may also be due to the realisation of one of the inherent contradictions of police work namely that danger and authority, "...unavoidably combine to frustrate procedural regularity" (Skolnick, 1994, p.65). Reiner (1978), in a similar vein, notes how many officers entered the police force with unrealistically high expectations of the job and that this lead to cynicism over the years.

7. Categorisation of the Public

Some research points towards the existence of widespread categorisation of the public by the police (e.g. Reiner, 1992, PSI study, 1983,) and, as Reiner (1992) points out, such categories are specific only to the police and rely on criteria other than class. The basis of such categorisations is the police perceptions of an individual's propensity towards breaking the law or causing trouble. Once such distinctions have been made, other more delicate distinctions may be applied. Reiner (1992) illustrates this point by differentiating between 'Good Class Villains' (professional law-breakers with whom the police may enjoy a relatively amicable relationship), 'Police Property' (usually members of the under-class who are left to the police to deal with), 'Rubbish' (people who make 'nuisance' calls, e.g., those pertaining to domestic disputes), 'Challengers' (professionals from various disciplines who scrutinise the work of the police), 'Disarmers' (groups such as women, children and the elderly who are difficult to deal with because they attract sympathy), 'Do Gooders' (groups who wish to restrict police powers) and 'Politicians' (who are seen as dictating police legislation without knowing the intricacies of the job).

Cain (1973) also addressed the way in which officers' categorised members of the public into different groups when she wrote,

"...specialization enhanced the tendency of city men to perceive the population not as a total community but as divided into specific groups -

motorists, drug-pushers, informers, nice people whose homes get broken into..." (p.83).

The use by the police of such categorisations has much in common with Skolnick's notion of 'the symbolic assailant', which is a type of, "perceptual shorthand" (1994, p.44) used by officers to assess an individual's propensity to act violently towards them. Unlike Reiner's categories, Skolnick's use of the symbolic assailant is limited towards predicting physical violence and this might be a result of a greater fear of violence amongst officers in the United States than in the United Kingdom. To what extent, however, can we view such distinctions as inherent properties of cop culture when, as Cain (1973) intimates, they appear to be a product of the move within recent years to incorporate increasing degrees of specialisation within the police?

Cain (1973) shows how the distinction between the dual concepts of 'rough' and 'respectable' is more important than distinctions based on social class. Such assumptions lead to stereotyping which is the inevitable cognitive process used to predict the outcome of, for example, an encounter with a certain group. The police use such stereotypes to predict what type of danger they are placing themselves in by engaging in a certain action. One problem of stereotyping, however, is that it can lead to a sequence of events, "...which magnifies, exaggerates, and creates deviance" (Downes and Rock, 1988, p.184).

The PSI study (1983) shows how police officers attempt to justify such stereotypes by claiming that, for example, if they stop an Afro-Caribbean male they are more likely to get a result than if they were to stop a Caucasian female. Such ideas are seen to perpetuate the whole process of stereotyping. One could argue, however, that such categorical representations of the public are too deterministic and inflexible. Rather than using such all-encompassing categorical mechanisms to represent police perceptions of different societal sub-groups it may perhaps be more useful to use more linear, or scale-like, representations which allow for greater flexibility. Police officers do not treat all black people or women or social workers in the same way and there must be an element of

flexibility to this stereotyping. For example, it is quite possible that factors such as the appearance, the degree of eloquence and the occupation of an individual may all have an influence on the outcome of a given outcome between an police officer and a member of a stereotyped group. In this way, stereotypes may be seen as negotiable to a certain extent - that is, the stereotype may be modified in a given instance after the aforementioned factors have been taken into account.

Skolnick (1994) was probably the first theorist to refer to such stereotyping processes within the police officer's 'working personality' when he referred to how officers use 'perceptual shorthand' in an attempt to identify the symbolic assailant. This notion of the symbolic assailant is linked directly to Skolnick's stressing of the importance of danger to the culture of the police. Without the core issue of danger there would be no need for such a tool. To Reiner, however, the issues of authority and efficiency appear, in many ways, to be given greater importance. This is shown by his means of categorising the public into two broad types; those who question police authority and those who affect police efficiency by wasting their time. Ultimately, therefore, stereotyping may be seen as a means whereby officers can protect themselves from potential threats from members of the public and from members of other occupations who might find themselves in conflict with the police on occasion. However, The Macpherson Report (1999) into the death of Stephen Lawrence shows how such stereotyping may also lead to serious incidents such as, for example, a failure to classify an assault as being racially motivated.

8. Conservatism Authoritarianism

Another major element of cop culture is that of conservatism/authoritarianism (Reiner, 1992, Skolnick, 1994, Farrell, 1993). Reiner (1992) claims that the majority of police officers are conservative, "...both politically and morally" (p.121).

Skolnick (1994) claims that during the course of his research he came across only three police officers who would describe themselves as 'liberal'. Farrell (1993) examined the Police Federation and its role and came to the conclusion

26

that, despite its union-like appearance, it is actually a tremendously conservative organisation. Farell supports this assertion by showing how the Police Federation, "...allowed its members to be completely excluded from all the employment protection legislation of the 1970s" (p.86). The Police Federation, according to Farrell, also initially resisted moves to make racial discrimination by police officers a dismissable offence. It appears, therefore, that the generally conservative disposition of many officers may be reinforced by the actions of their professional body.

Several writers have asserted that cop culture is authoritarian, that is, it attracts what Adorno, et al, (1950) referred to as the 'authoritarian' personality. The claim is that those who are authoritarian are prone, amongst other things, to conventionalism, submission to moral authority, rejection of the unconventional, stereotyping, displays of power and toughness, cynicism and exaggerated concern regarding sexual mores. Obviously, to many people this would appear to summarise many of our own stereotypes regarding the police 'mentality'. However, Loevinger and Ossorio (1959) state that such traits should be viewed, not as authoritarian, but as conventional in as much as they refer to the psychological traits displayed by the great mass of the population. Thus, it appears that a major element of cop culture is not any far-right authoritarianism but a basic deference to the dominant mores of society, in short, conservatism.

Police conservatism may be influenced by several other factors. Reiner (1992) notes that public order policing has often revolved around left-wing action, such as demonstrations and union activities, and that this may serve to reinforce right-wing views within the police force. Although twentieth-century history is littered with instances of the policing of left-wing demonstrations, it would not be prudent to assume that this automatically implies a police bias against the left wing. There were several disturbances caused between 1934 and 1940 when the British Union of Fascists (BUF) clashed with left-wing groups and the police became involved. Skidelsky (1975) claims that the police were impartial and that they were neither pro-fascist nor pro-socialist but merely 'pro-police'. Similarly, Temple (1995) cites a number of instances where officers expressed outrage at

such acts as the BUF marching through Jewish communities in East London. This is not to say, however, that an individual who expresses outrage at an extreme right-wing group cannot have sympathy with the Conservative Party.

There is also some disagreement over the assertion by Reiner (1992) that a conservative mentality fits well into a very disciplined organisation like the police. Maguire and Norris (1994), however, say that this is a somewhat limited view as the police force, often "...allows a great deal of autonomy and discretion" (p. 20) especially within the CID. Skolnick (1994), however, believes that to hold anti-Establishment views whilst serving the Establishment would lead to what Festinger (1957) termed 'cognitive dissonance'. In short, an officer has to believe in the norms which he or she enforces which, in turn, leads to a conservative mentality within the force. It may well be the case that an individual can hold radical views and 'hide' behind a uniform and this may or may not be a factor contributing to 'wastage' levels. Skolnick (1994), however, cites the case of a young black American who joined the police for what might be termed radical reasons and did not last for very long because his ideals went against the grain of police culture. This prompts the question, to what extent can the police culture accommodate an individual whose expressed views do not lie within such a culture's seemingly strict parameters?

9. Machismo
Young (1991) wrote that,

> "...The police organization I have described can be defined as forming a primarily masculine domain where metaphors of hunting and warfare pre-dominate. Categories of prestige, power and status are allocated to tough manful acts of crime fighting and thief taking" (p. 191) which create, "...a rigidified and defensively aggressive world" (p. 191).

Although Heidensohn (1992) raises doubts as to whether, "...the hard men on mean streets image...is either authentic or universal" (p. 77) an overemphasis on stereotypically male attitudes and behaviours (characterised by sexism, heavy-

drinking and a propensity for violence) has for a long time been regarded as an integral element of cop culture (Skolnick, 1994, Reiner, 1992, and Maguire and Norris, 1994). The PSI study (1983) found that, for CID, drinking, "...is an integral part of their working lives" (p.81), whereas for the uniformed officers it is an integral part of their social lives. Reiner (1992) claimed that, "...Police alcoholism has been a perennial problem from the early days of the force" (p.124).

The PSI study (1983) contains explicit examples of police officers being attracted to violence. The authors recount an episode where one police Constable, involved in public order policing at an incident in Southall, claimed that, "...It was a great day out, fighting the Pakis. It ought to be an annual fixture, I thoroughly enjoyed myself" (p.88).

Cockcroft (1995) cites an incident back at a police station after a violent man had been eventually arrested but only after the use of some extreme force. The arresting officer proudly recounted his use of his truncheon in securing the arrest of the man and said, "...Did you see that move? You wouldn't find that in any fucking Home Office training manual" (p. 41). The fact that some police officers appear to be attracted to violence may be connected, in some instances, to the fact that some officers appear to crave excitement.

The third component of what the PSI study (1983) referred to as the 'Cult of Masculinity' (p.90) is sexism. Sexism within cop culture has, according to Smith and Gray (1983), a far-reaching set of effects as it influences both attitudes and behaviour towards women, sexual offenders and victims of sexual offences. Sexism manifests itself in the force through lewd remarks aimed at both female colleagues and female members of the public who, claims Foster (1989), are often referred to as 'slags' or 'whores'. At a more structural level, sexism serves to restrict the entrance of females into the force and also to restrict their movement up the hierarchy. Heidensohn (1992) claims that, on average, females make up just over 10% of the British police force and these are usually restricted to the lower ranks. Additionally, she shows how many female officers viewed their role within the police as markedly different from that of male officers

and that many disliked such 'matron duty' (Heidensohn, 1992, p.120). Heidensohn (1992) quotes two female officers as saying, " '...from the training school, the atmosphere had been that you were second-class police because you were really just going to sit-around fiddling with children and young people' " (p.120) and " '...we dealt mainly with the aliens, missing persons, truants, child abuse, neglect...' " (p.120).

Smith and Gray (1983) quote an older officer who claimed that when a new female recruit arrived at a police station she would be stamped on the bare backside with that particular station's rubber stamp. This, the authors claim, has three main symbolic meanings - the treatment of females as objects, the humiliation of females and symbolic sexual assault.

The dominant values of the police force reflect predominantly male attitudes making it (culturally, at least) a bastion of masculinity. Surrounded by such an all-pervading male culture female officers have to struggle to become accepted as an officer. According to Young (1991), "Women who do breach the boundary to penetrate the masculine world can only ever be partially successful and will often have to subsume "male characteristics" to achieve even a limited social acceptability" (p. 193).

The male-oriented culture of police work influences not only male officers' views of female colleagues but also their views of female members of the public. Smith and Gray (1983) claim that some male officers view particular cases of rape and imply that the individual 'asked for it' or even 'enjoyed it'. It is interesting to contrast this reaction with that of police attitudes towards paedophile offences which 'disgust' or 'sicken' them. Whereas children are viewed as innocent, women are regarded as sly, underhand and sexually promiscuous, a view that harks back to the work of Pollak (1950). Male officers are seen as adopting a series of attitudes and responses which the culture of the police appears to reinforce. The female officers whom Smith and Gray (1983) interviewed claimed that male officers were prejudiced against them mainly on the grounds of physical strength and their doubts that females were sufficiently physically

equipped to undertake police work efficiently. Sexist attitudes are seen, by women, as being at their most heightened in training school and this may account, in part, for the seemingly entrenched nature of such stereotypical attitudes.

Female officers have claimed that it is very difficult to gain entrance to CID as, it is claimed, the 'Cult of Masculinity' is at its most prevalent there. Hunt (1984) accounts for this engrained resistance to female police officers, at all levels of the force, as being due to the fact that male officers feel threatened by female colleagues. Male officers oppose female officers because they threaten to expose the informal and male-based working rules of the occupation and thus signify a threat to the existing 'police myth'.

It must be noted, however, that it is not impossible for female officers to rise to the upper echelons of the policing profession as was shown when Pauline Clare was appointed Chief Constable of Lancashire (the first female ever to reach this position). In an interview with *The Observer* newspaper (30/7/95) Clare claimed that policing incorporated a predominantly male culture but that it was possible to overcome such resistance. For example, she claimed that once she was brought off patrol to cook breakfast for the male officers but that later she, "...went to see the Superintendent and he said if I didn't want to do it then don't" (p.8).

Some research points to the fact that such gender discrimination manifests itself in more sympathetic treatment of females in custody. Holdaway (1983) claimed that women are, generally, treated with more courtesy and are less prone to be physically assaulted than their male counterparts. Holdaway recalls two occasions which serve to illustrate this point. The first concerns an incident where a woman was being arrested and was being abusive to the arresting officer who remained very calm and whose only response was to try and placate her. The second incident Holdaway reported was where a drunken woman was resisting having her potentially dangerous rings removed. One officer turned to another and said, "...if it wasn't a girl we could just thump her" (p.122).

Such a response is interesting in that it does not appear to show any great respect for the suspect but merely an unwillingness, despite provocation, to treat a woman in the same way they might treat a potentially dangerous man. There may be three reasons for this. First, our societal norms dictate that it is wrong for a male to engage in physical contact with a member of the opposite sex whom he does not know and who has not agreed to such an action. Secondly, research has shown (e.g. Skolnick, 1994) that policing has no room for ambiguities and that officers like to view the social world they operate in as clear and unambiguous. Arresting women, or using force on women, is, in effect, a grey area as the police do not, generally, view women as what Skolnick (1994) termed 'symbolic assailants' (as being likely to represent a physical threat to a police officer). Finally, officers usually view females as what Holdaway (1983) termed 'disarmers' (as being vulnerable in the eyes of the public). Thus, the 'working personality' of the police officer encounters a form of 'cognitive dissonance' when an individual is identified as straddling the two separate and conflicting typologies.

Several factors go towards explaining the presence of machismo within the police force. The great majority of police officers are male, and those officers who are female very rarely reach the upper ranks of the profession. This tends to give the force a very male-oriented working culture. Another factor contributing to this machismo is the fact that, during police work, officers are most likely to come across women in situations where the female is the victim, or is in need of sympathy and sensitivity. The PSI study (1983) claims that this causes, "...a devaluing of qualities associated with women" (p. 91).

It appears, therefore, that a fundamental stereotypical classification within the police officer's 'working personality' is that of the 'woman as the victim' and this serves to reinforce outdated perceptions of women. Reiner (1992) claims that such attitudes are perpetuated at an informal (or cultural) rather than formal (or occupational) level.

The PSI study also examined the cultural phenomenon, within police forces, of heavy drinking which the authors view as being part of the 'Cult of Masculinity'. Two possible factors may to explain this. First, many officers appear to believe that you can only really get to know and trust another police officer after going out drinking with them. Second, many officers also see heavy drinking as a form of release from the stresses and isolation which are caused by the job. Another possible contributory factor is that, traditionally, CID officers have spent much of their time in pubs and clubs attempting to gain information. These factors may all contribute to the image of the hard-drinking police officer. Brogden (1982), however, points out that, in fact, drinking has long been an accepted leisure activity of the working class and claims that police alcoholism is therefore probably as much a result of working class culture as police culture.

10.Racism

Another important aspect of police culture is that of racial prejudice and Foster (1989) identifies two types of police racism. The first is merely to hold racist views whereas the second is to hold such views and to act in accordance with them in one's working life. In the same way that police officers often have to address internal conflicts when dealing with female law-breakers, similar tensions often arise when an officer is dealing with a member of an ethnic minority. The fact that an officer is meant to apply the law equally to all citizens regardless of their creed, colour, gender, or class may prove problematical in that all officers have their own beliefs, biases and attitudes. This coupled with the fact that they have to enforce the law in a working situation characterised by great discretion creates an environment where the potential for both cognitive dissonance and racial tension run high.

Racial tension between the police and members of the public and police malpractice against ethnic groups have, of course, been well documented although this does not have to be viewed as the norm. Indeed, Foster (1989) claims that an officer who privately holds racist views will, "...often deal with incidents involving young blacks without being aggressive and over assertive" (p.148).

Thus, in many cases, it appears that the personal views held by police officers will be over-ridden in order to treat suspects, who belong to ethnic minorities, fairly and by the book. This particular incarnation of racism is not really seen as being worthy of cause for concern as it does not affect the way in which officers carry out their duties. The second type of racism which Foster identified (i.e. letting one's occupational behaviour become affected by one's personal views) may be seen as an issue of great concern. The brand of racism inherent to cop culture has, according to research (Skolnick, 1994, Smith and Gray, 1983), been mostly directed against people of Afro-Caribbean descent. Two issues we must seek to address when attempting to gauge police racism are: 'do the police actively target certain ethnic groups in order to secure a result' or as Hall (1979) chose to refer to it, 'nigger hunting'? and 'do members of ethnic minorities receive the same quality of police service as, for example, the white sections of society?'

On the first count there is much evidence to support the view that police officers stop a disproportionate amount of young, male, Afro-Caribbeans. Smith and Gray (1983) encountered one Constable who, when asked what criteria he used to make a stop, replied, "...How does an experienced policeman decide who to stop? Well, the one that you stop is often wearing a wooly (sic) hat,...is dark in complexion,...has thick lips he usually has dark, fuzzy, hair" (p.129). Another police Constable is quoted as saying, "...If I saw a black man walking through Wimbledon High Street I would definitely stop him" (Smith and Gray, 1983, p. 130).

Thus, in the above examples, there appear to be a distinct assumption held by some police officers that if they stop someone of Afro-Caribbean descent they will get a 'result'. It has also been asserted that racism leads to differences in quality of police service to those of different racial groups. An example of this is highlighted by Cain (1973) who recalls an occurrence when police officers spent over an hour trying to find the address of a party which an American Air Force officer wished to attend. The same evening an elderly coloured gentleman was

34

turned away from the station three times without being advised on where he could find accommodation.

Racial bias, however, occurs in other more subtle ways within the police force. For example, Smith and Gray (1983) found a reluctance on the part of the officers to investigate offences involving Asians. A similar reluctance was also encountered when having to assign police resources to cases such as racially motivated attacks. One of the most glaring examples of the racism that cop culture can spawn is that racism within the police force which is often directed against Afro-Caribbean or Asian colleagues. In October 1997, *The Guardian* newspaper quoted the results of a police survey into racism against ethnic officers which found,

" 'There was continuing...evidence of inappropriate language and behaviour by police officers, but even more worrying was the lack of intervention by Sergeants and Inspectors...Many ethnic minority officers felt unsupported by management and were left to rely on support from colleagues of a similar background' " (*The Guardian*, 29/10/97, p.6).

The same article referred to a coming industrial tribunal case where the complainant, a Metropolitan police Sergeant from East London, claimed that he was transferred to a worse job for complaining about the racist and sexist attitudes of one of his senior officers. The 1999 Macpherson Report into the death of Stephen Lawrence also investigated such issues and found that police racism is not always directed solely at members of the public.

Thus, it may be the case that racism is generally accepted by the culture and that any moves to oppose it may be met with unofficial sanctions which, unfortunately, are imposed by the higher ranks of the hierarchy. Reiner (1992) and Farrell (1993) both point to the existence of racism within the police force with Reiner viewing it in terms of the racism inherent in wider culture and Farrell viewing it as institutionalised within police culture. Stereotyping has helped to perpetuate racism (as it has sexism), as has the fact that ethnic minorities are

not fully represented throughout the ranks of the police force. It used to be thought that racism amongst police officers was exacerbated by the fact that officers only used to come into contact with members of ethnic minority groups when they were arresting them. It was, therefore, thought that an increase in the numbers of officers from ethnic minority backgrounds within the police force would lead to increased tolerance. However, the PSI study (1983) shows how police officers make racist comments without any regard as to whether there is, for example, someone of West Indian descent in the vicinity. This suggests that police racism is not merely a reaction borne of interaction with members of ethnic minorities but that it has become entrenched in the culture of the police.

The inquiry into the Stephen Lawrence murder has also led to accusations of another type of racism to be levelled against the Metropolitan police, namely, that of a reluctance to acknowledge some attacks as being racially motivated. A 1999 report by Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary viewed such reluctance as being due, not to racism amongst officers, but as being due to an ignorance amongst officers of the real impact of such crimes upon their victims. It stated that,

"The difficulties surrounding the police management and investigation of racial assaults and abuse would be resolved if the Service came to recognise the particular vulnerability of the ethnic minority population. To be victimised because of ethnicity adds emotional gravity to any physical hurt or financial loss and leaves individuals with fears equivalent to those of the lost or abused child or the despair of the elderly victim. The acceptance, throughout the service, of this special and specific vulnerability is the key to real success..." (HMIC, 1999, p.25).

The 1999 Macpherson Report claimed that the police as an institution was racist and put forward 70 proposals to safeguard against racist attitudes and behaviours including greater public control of the police, a renewed commitment to the rights of victims and an extension of the number of offences classified as racist.

Much has been written about police racism and its possible link to police culture. However, conclusions are hard to draw because of the fact that police racism takes many forms. It can be used to describe racist attitudes which are or are not acted upon, the way in which a certain crime is recorded, the ethnicity of people who are stopped, and even police attitudes to officers from ethnic backgrounds. Such diversity might mean that simple and succinct explanations are unlikely to adequately explain police racism.

11. Changes in Police Culture

So far in this chapter I have outlined the main areas of the phenomenon known as cop culture. I shall now address those variables which perpetuate and sustain such an occupational culture. Academics have proposed differing reasons as being important in determining the different parts of cop culture. Consequently, no single factor sustains such an apparently firmly rooted collection of attitudes, responses and norms single-handedly - attitudes towards women are motivated by essentially different factors from those pertaining to race. The most important thing to note is that such attitudes join to form a semi-cohesive whole which is not to say that every policeman walking the streets is conservative, racist, sexist, socially isolated, authoritarian and has a propensity for violence. It merely means that being in a policing role and being surrounded by other police officers for large chunks of time makes the individual more susceptible to accepting such views (or, at least, claiming to accept such views). As Skolnick (1994) wrote,

"...Such an analysis does not suggest that all police are alike in 'working personality', but that there are distinctive cognitive tendencies in police as an occupational grouping" (p. 42).

So far I have identified the main manifestations of cop culture and have put forward explanations as to why they occur. I will now attempt to identify any changes which may have occurred within cop culture and, if possible, explain them. It must be noted, however, that during the last decade there has been little research undertaken in the area of cop culture, thus making it extremely difficult

to identify any concrete changes in the phenomenon. I will, therefore, attempt to analyse general trends in policing (and in society) and to draw conclusions as to how these may have affected cop culture. We must also take into account the existence of differences in opinion regarding changes in cop culture. For example, it is possible to advocate the view that so long as policing involves the combination of danger, authority and the need to appear efficient, there will always remain a culture which is specific to policing. This combination of danger, authority and efficiency is seen as crucial by Skolnick (1994) in accounting for the existence of cop culture. This implies that unless there is a radical change of role for the police, cop culture will persist in, more or less, its present form. Conversely, due to changes in police procedure, for example, with the implementation of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (1984), it may be that cop culture is decreasing in effect as police authority and discretion are reduced.

It must be noted, however, that research has pointed to variations in both cop culture and police organisational culture. Reiner (1992) shows that there are four general styles of policing open to an individual officer and that these do display a degree of universality. He also cited research (Rossi, et al, 1974) which accounted for variations in organisational culture between police stations and police departments in terms of their adherence to different sets of norms. Some departments were motivated by the need for public relations and community involvement, whereas others placed more emphasis upon law and order or civil rights. A harsh stance on law and order was viewed as being largely influenced by the views of the Mayor and the Chief of Police on blacks. Such factors were seen as having a major impact upon the style of policing that occurred in a given area.

It is possible to identify certain changes in cop culture which have been caused by changes in police procedure. Foster (1989) examined attitudes held by staff at two London police stations and found some evidence to combat the widespread view that, "...any attempt by management to implement change is resisted and doomed to failure" (p. 149).

The first station that Foster investigated adhered to the 'old school' set of ideals whereby the public was seen as the enemy, ethnic minorities were targeted for hard policing and official procedure was often ignored resulting in an arbitrary form of policing. The second station that was investigated was characterised by an extremely different culture, probably due to the fact that it was situated in a more racially mixed area of the city. The race factor precipitated the implementation of strategies designed to make police/public reactions less tense. One such measure was that of zonal policing. This succeeded in creating a more community-oriented atmosphere which tended to reduce what Downes and Ward (1986) saw as the mutual paranoia that tended to characterise police/ethnic minority relations.

Much of the cop culture of the CID in the East End of London was, claimed Hobbs (1989), caused by the 'symbiotic' relationship between the public and the police force in the area. The entrepreneurial basis for the East End culture was seen as pervading the occupational personalities of both the police officers and the 'villains'. Accordingly, both were seen as players in a game based upon, "...the trading of moral identities" (Hobbs, 1989, p.179) which served to confuse the distinction between 'cop' and 'criminal'. It is quite possible that changes to organisational procedure have changed this situation. Maguire and Norris (1994) assert that measures such as changes to CID practice and improvements in training may all have had a beneficial effect but that it is difficult to assess their long-term impact. For example, nowadays, members of the CID have to return to uniform after a period of three years and this may have resulted in changes to the culture of the CID and a decrease in the clique-ish nature of such squads. A similar measure is that of 'staggering' police shifts so that officers find themselves working with different officers on different shifts therefore resulting in a corresponding decrease in what Skolnick (1994) termed 'clannishness'. Such changes do appear to indicate that the police have made real attempts to address police malpractice in recent years, although it is hard to tell how the effectiveness of such measures will be gauged.

Increases in specialisation within the police force may have been effective in changing the occupational culture as, nowadays, it is very rare for a police officer to be involved in a particular case from 'cradle to grave'. Such a 'division of labour' is most noticeable in cases involving such emotive matters as child abuse. By allowing particular officers to be involved in only certain aspects of an investigation (and the subsequent use of special 'family' units) we may be able to expect a reduction in the idea of policing as a 'way of life' rather than a 'normal' profession.

The reduction in pro-active (or 'offender-based' policing) may also have had an effect upon cop culture. Maguire and Norris (1994) state that at the time of their report there were only two serious crime squads in existence. Thus, a reduction of crime squads, which were previously characterised by large amounts of discretion and flexibility, may have reduced the 'law unto themselves' tradition of detective culture. Indeed, Maguire and Norris (1994) claim to have identified a new set of occupational characteristics emerging amongst detectives in recent years. The 'new' detectives appear to be committed to working within the concept of 'crime management' rather than 'thief taking' and are more likely to spend their leisure time working out in a gym rather than drinking in a bar.

Research in this area has pointed to the fact that racism and sexism still appear to be widespread within the police force and this will probably not change until such groups are allowed to progress to the higher ranks. Reiner (1992) presents evidence to support the idea that the 'sense of mission', once so prevalent throughout the force, has been eroded by the growing cynicism of police officers. It is quite possible that such idealism cannot last for long in a profession where authority and power are perceived by its practitioners as being eroded. Indeed, it may well be the case that reports such as that of Sheehy *et al* (1993) have served to place under scrutiny the very definition of policing and has laid the foundations for its re-definition. It may, therefore, be useful to consider the extent to which the introduction of such concepts as 'Policing By Objectives' into the general discourse of policing have made the police themselves begin to re-evaluate the core role(s) of policing.

It must be stated that there are two ways in which to analyse the concept of cop culture. It is possible, for example, to view it in holistic terms as an all-pervading phenomenon. It should also be possible, however, to view cop culture as an association of different factors which may, or may not, be wholly embraced by an individual officer. For example, it may be that a police officer can be conservative, politically, yet not necessarily racist. The very fact that variations in cop culture do occur points to the fact that there are differing degrees to which an officer may internalise the different elements of cop culture.

One of the main problems associated with the work of writers such as Skolnick (1994) is that of sheer determinism. Although writers like Skolnick and Reiner state that cop culture is neither monolithic nor unchanging there appears to have been reluctance by writers in the area to address possible variations in police culture in any real depth.

12. A New Conceptual Framework?

Chan (1997) proposed a new conceptual framework within which to analyse cop culture. Her research was prompted by her view that current research was severely limited because the concept was being analysed within an outdated contextual framework. She goes on to cite four main criticisms before proposing a new theoretical approach.

Her first criticism is that most research presents cop culture as too deterministic and inflexible a concept. This is shown by the failure of most theories to account for the internal differentiation between groups of officers. Heidensohn (1992) appeared to acknowledge this criticism when she asked if cop culture was as, "....purely reactive" (p. 76) as earlier writers, such as Skolnick, claimed. Similarly, cop culture is often seen as just referring to 'street' cop culture, thus ignoring 'management' cop culture (for a further discussion, see Reuss-Ianni and Ianni, 1983). Manning (1993) has suggested that there are three types of cop culture - 'command', 'middle management' and 'lower participants'. Chan (1992) detected differences in working personalities between officers with different functions, thus

implying that cop culture is a more 'fluid' concept than was previously recognised. The deterministic approach to the study of police culture may, in part, be due to the great influence of Skolnick's work. The methodology utilised by Skolnick for his original study incorporated participant observation and interviews with street cops where negative, rather than positive, behaviour was being investigated. This approach has been replicated by several authors, most notably in the UK, perhaps, by Smith and Gray (1983) during the PSI research which found very similar results to Skolnick's work with regards to key cultural correlates. A similar methodology was also utilised by Holdaway (1983) and again focused on the more negative aspects of police practice.

The second criticism made by Chan refers to the process whereby police officers become socialised into cop culture. Many accounts appear to espouse the view that cop culture is a one-way process and that the individual officer is a passive bystander within the process. Such an approach, claims Chan, is too deterministic and does not account for the fact that, ultimately, the officer has a choice as to whether he or she adopts the behaviours and attitudes suggested by cop culture. As Fielding (1988) wrote, "...one cannot read the recruit as a cipher for the occupational culture" (p. 135) and Chan places great emphasis on the importance of viewing this interaction between the occupational culture and the individuals' existing attitudes.

Chan's third point is that cop culture should be viewed within wider societal, political, legal and organisational contexts. Thus, the culture within a particular station can be particularly affected by an external inquiry, a change in organisation or by a new piece of legislation. For example, Lord Scarman's Report showed concern about how the police, "...run the risk of becoming, by reason of their professionalism, a 'corps d'elite' set apart from the rest of the community" (1983, p. 121).

Thus, Scarman wished to see a shift from policy being dictated wholly by technological advances and to more traditional methods such as beat policing, a

move which would very probably have far-reaching effects upon occupational culture.

Chan's fourth and final criticism encapsulates her previous points and is that, to a large extent, the dialectic between social environment and policing has been ignored thus making it impossible to account for changes or variations in cop culture. Only when such a relationship is recognised will we be able to examine the phenomenon with any sense of objectivity.

Chan proposes a re-conceptualisation of police culture within three converging perspectives. The first is that of recognising the active role played by individual members of the police force. Secondly, she claims that there is a need to be aware of the fact that multiple cultures may exist within a single organisation. Thirdly, she claims that there is a need to situate culture within the ever-changing social and cultural contexts of police work.

Chan's work is of great importance in that it is the first real effort to articulate the views of those who have researched cop culture yet have found its parameters frustrating. Very few pieces of research appear to address those differences in cultural correlates that occur between police stations and even between shifts. Chan's approach has allowed us to turn existing theories on their head. It is now acceptable to look at what divides police officers as well as what binds them.

This new conceptual framework, as proposed by Chan, is also useful in that it allows us to investigate changes in police culture throughout historical periods. Established texts tend to give the impression that police culture (or cultures) did not exist until the phenomenon was first addressed in the 1960s. This interest arose as a result of the growing interest, at the time, in the causes of scandals in the police and the consequent decrease in public support for the institution. However, when looking at the period before the 1960s, it could be argued that the pre-requisites of danger, authority and efficiency were present. As this thesis will attempt to show, many of the correlates of police culture were present in that period yet the variety of behaviours and attitudes expressed by the officers

interviewed point to the influence of wider social factors in shaping police culture. This indicates that an appreciation off such factors may be useful in any analysis of present day police cultures as it will allow us to assess the relevance of police/public relations as they impact upon the culture of the police.

13. Conclusion

To summarise, cop culture refers to the general attitudes and behaviours which make up (and inform) the unofficial working rules of the 'job'. The work of Skolnick (1994) shows how the police need to use a 'perceptual shorthand' in order to make sense of the chaotic and divided communities which they police. The 'job' itself is unique. The police are armed with the statute books of criminal law which would, under ideal conditions, lead to an equality of enforcement. However, the law is a theoretical construct and has to be 'negotiated' to be of any use to a police force serving in a modern society. Less than adequate staffing levels and increases in regulation of the police have served to give the police a 'siege mentality'. Those who offend are viewed as the 'enemy' rather than merely being the recipients of non-partially imposed state sanctions and those who do not offend are viewed with suspicion for failing to recognise the issues that make police work such an onerous profession.

Policing is, in many respects, an 'impossible' job. The police officer has to impose his or her invested authority upon those who neither respect it nor consent to it. Similarly, there is the potential for danger with every 'tour of duty' yet, unlike the soldier, the officer is not armed to deal with such violence. The police are viewed as the controllers of crime, yet greater levels of crime are reported when more officers are on the beat (see Morgan and Newburn, 1997). The large amounts of discretion accorded to the officer and the pressure for results serve to make crime a negotiable process where the targeting of certain groups and certain crimes occurs so as to secure the best result for the least time expended. By doing so, police culture and its attendant biases are replicated. Ethnic groups are targeted and their marginalised status ensures that many of those targeted will have broken the law, not by virtue of their own ethnicity, but merely because they, like many of the white underclass, are

criminalized by their own marginalization. Due to excessive targeting the assumption of ethnic criminality becomes a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy which further justifies the police officers' stereotypical assumptions. Such a targeting of young males also further enforces the ambiguity accorded to the females they encounter in the criminal justice system.

When addressing the concept of cop culture we are, as Chan points out, faced with the problem of using what might be outmoded frames of analysis. This point was well summed up by Walker (1985) when he wrote, "...Police research...has neglected the effect of increased minority or female employment on the police subculture. The literature on the police subculture is still shaped by the paradigm developed in the 1960s" (p. 565). What needs to be assessed is the possible impact on police sexism and police racism by having increasingly greater numbers of women and ethnic minorities in the police force.

Another issue which needs to be considered is that of the 'universality' of cop culture. There may well be significant differences in police occupational culture between countries meaning that, for example, the findings of US research are not applicable to UK policing and vice versa. It may be the case that differences in cop culture between the United States and the United Kingdom are due to the fact that police/public relations in the former are characterised by a much greater amount of violence.

Holdaway (1983) raises the point that it might not even be appropriate to consider the effects of the police 'working personality' as culture and that it might be more helpful to view such behaviours in the context of oral history and folk tales. Such an approach would lead us to talk less of culture and more within the realms of a "social construction of policing" (p. 154). To what extent, however, can we draw a line between what is social construction and what is culture?

The potential contribution to our knowledge of police culture offered by oral history as a methodology does appear to have been overlooked. There is a real lack of critical and revisionist accounts of police work in the Metropolitan Police

Force between the 1930s and the 1960s and oral history methods allow us to address perhaps more concealed forms of police behaviour than existing accounts do. Additionally, oral history is unique in that it allows the subjects themselves to assign meaning to a particular occurrence. The fact that the 'meaning' attributed to an occurrence by an individual might not have much relevance to what actually happened is not a problem. In such an eventuality, it is the individual's subjective opinion that is important. Thus, we learn about the individual's own motivation to engage in a certain action rather than an observer's interpretation of the action and it is this motivation which is crucial in explaining the culture of the police and what it means to individual officers.

Additionally, it is quite easy to get the impression when reading an account like Skolnick's or the PSI study that any 'good' behaviour engaged in by the police officers being observed will not be reported. However, when interviewing retired officers, the majority of the time appeared to be taken up with their reminiscences of the public service role of police work rather than more negative behaviours and this might serve to give the present research slightly more balance.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The first part of this chapter will provide an analysis of the methodology of oral history. After defining what is meant by the term oral history, this chapter will distinguish between traces and secondary data and also investigate how oral history as a form of secondary data came to prominence. Finally, a critique of the methodology will be presented.

The second part of the chapter will provide a step by step account of how the present research was carried out so that the research could be replicated. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of some of the practical methodological issues which arose during the course of the research.

1. Oral History

Seldon and Pappworth (1983) claim that, for a long time, general opinion has tended to concur with the Library of Congress's definition of oral history as, "...A record of information gathered in oral form, usually on tape, as the result of a planned interview" (National Union Catalogue of Manuscript Collections, 1971). Seldon and Pappworth, however, believe that the definition put forward by Louis Starr (1977) that, "...Oral history is primary source material obtained by recording the spoken words - generally by means of planned tape-recorded interviews - of persons deemed to harbour hitherto unavailable information worth preserving" (p.440) is perhaps of more value even though they disagree with the part of the definition that assumes a tape recorder is essential.

Bloch (1954) investigated the dichotomy between unearthed 'traces' (i.e. discovered artefacts) and secondary data (e.g. an entry in a diary) a distinction first made by anthropologists and later investigated by social historians. Trace histories have for a long time been held in higher esteem due to the prevailing influence of the ruling paradigm of scientific modernism, a point made by Tonkin (1992) when she wrote, "...In an academic culture of objectivity, this is their moral charm. They are purely impersonal" (p.84). Thus, the predominant assumption that traces may be seen as objective and oral histories as subjective has become ingrained in academic culture. Vansina (1985) overcame this dichotomy between oral and trace histories only by questioning the validity of the terms 'subjectivity' and 'objectivity'.

Tonkin (1992) claims that the failure by many to recognise oral history as a valid methodological tool has served to blind us to the advantages of the use of oral histories. For example, the depth of information which the method can deliver allows it to be used as a stand alone tool or in conjunction with trace methods to create a more comprehensive social picture of a historical era. Vansina (1985) was the first academic to attempt to evaluate the varying methodologies which had become grouped under the umbrella term of 'oral history' and made the distinction between oral reminiscence and oral tradition, the latter being the transmission of oral communication which is at least one generation old.

Bloch (1954) develops the idea of the philosophy of historical theory by claiming that history (including oral history) is the interaction between the intellectual mode (our realm of understanding) and the subject matter (people in history). Crucial to this theory is the idea that one starts one's analysis not from a position of contemporary world knowledge but from one of critical questioning. Thus, it is believed that after obeying such criteria one can unearth a history which succeeds in maintaining its objectivity. Indeed, Tonkin (1992) quotes Leach (1957) as claiming that there could be no greater form of empiricism than when culture is comprised of only that which the researcher observes. Without criticising the validity of the social encounter many, however, would agree that such a methodology can never be value-free. In other words, oral histories, despite issues surrounding objectivity and bias, are a valuable means of gaining information and are, therefore, an invaluable methodological tool.

Tonkin goes on to point out the socio-economic dynamics of the methodology and their direct relevance to Marxist perspectives. Orthodox literary history may be viewed as the product of a bourgeois establishment - an entity which is utilised to produce false consciousness amongst members of the proletariat. Thus, Marxists advocate the use of oral histories which tend to emphasise the collective, i.e. they appear to show common experiences amongst similar groups of people. However, the rejection of trace histories in favour of collective oral tradition may prove to be a double-edged sword in some respects. It may be problematic to assume that oral testimonies are wholly un-tainted by external influences such as the media or that an ex-officers perceptions will not be influenced by the recollections of their former colleagues.

2. Criticisms of Oral History Techniques

Oral history is not without its problems. The methodology is both time consuming and expensive when compared to more quantitative approaches. The researcher is required to have more in-depth training for the oral history method than if he or she was merely presenting an interviewee with a questionnaire.

When the time comes to analyse the results much more care and attention is needed than in many other techniques as the researcher will be faced with a great mass of information much of it devoid of relative social meaning - that is, sometimes such information is extremely difficult to contextualise outside the interview situation. Similarly, the researcher will be faced with information which has been delivered with varying degrees of articulateness, sometimes prompting him or her to have to catalogue prose which has been swamped in cliche purely because some people have less developed verbal skills than others. Another problem which should be at least noted was raised by Tonkin (1992) who asked whether we can assume that information which has been passed down through several generations has the same inherent validity as verbal information from someone who actually witnessed the social phenomena which we are researching. Such a problem would be near impossible to solve yet should at least be borne in mind when attempting to compare oral tradition and oral reminiscence. Can we indeed trust any researcher to interpret spoken material in the way it was meant to be interpreted given the fact that, often, vast cultural gaps exist between those who ask the questions and those who answer them? Sometimes the researcher will not grasp the importance of what he or she is being told.

Some have claimed that interview transcripts miss the entire essence of the interview. For example, Kvale (1996) addresses some of the issues that become apparent when transcribing the oral to the written:

> "To *trans*cribe means to *trans*form, to change from one form to another...Transcripts are decontextualized conversations. If one accepts as a main premise of interpretation that meaning depends on context, then transcripts in isolation make an impoverished basis for interpretation" (p.166-167).

In transcribing the interviews undertaken for this research, each transcript was prefaced by a covering page that described my immediate impressions of both interviewer and interviewee. Upon this page notes would be made regarding the

physical appearance of the interviewee and information on the researcher's general feelings regarding the interview. Due to the relatively small numbers of officers being interviewed it was possible to retain a distinct impression of each interview. A decision was made to keep all tape recordings until the analysis was complete so that they could be returned to in the event of the researcher requiring more of a 'feel' for a particular interview. Although the interviews were recorded verbatim the transcriptions included details of non-verbal actions which may help to colour the transcripts. For example, if an interviewee laughed or, as did happen in one case, cried or became particularly animated such information was recorded. If such information was deemed to enhance the meaning of the statement it was decided that it should be left in.

Also, there occurs the problem of knowing what to ask. Ultimately, the interview technique is based on the biased sample of those people who actually agreed to be interviewed. We have to recognise that those people who did not come forward to be interviewed could have had totally different experiences of police work in the Metropolitan area. It is also important for us not to underestimate the extent to which interviews may be influenced by a large number of factors which include the perceived interviewer/interviewee relationship, the age of the interviewer and the location of the interview, to name but three.

Seldon and Pappworth (1983) have attempted to collect and collate the main criticisms which have been made of oral history over the years, although, as they point out, many of the criticisms may also be applied to forms of documentary evidence. The first batch of criticisms may be seen as possible faults of the interviewee and not the method or the interviewer.

The first such criticism is that of the *unreliability of memory'* (p.17) whereby memory is viewed as an active producer of perceived knowledge which is informed by social interaction, the environment and other factors. In this present piece of research, it may also be the case that the police officers suffered from unreliable memories caused by the effects of age. Seldon and Pappworth, however, make the valid point that special events as well as routine happenings

have a positive impact upon the memory of the interviewee - the former due to the inherent uniqueness of the event and the latter because of the day-to-day predictability ingraining itself on the memory. Within the present research, it was generally found that the interviewees appeared to be able to speak confidently and without hesitation of events that took place, in some cases, over fifty years ago. However, this, in itself, is not conclusive proof of the interviewees having perfectly reliable memories and it may be possible that they, on occasion, filled in gaps in their memories with guesses at what might have happened.

The second main criticism of oral history is that of *'unfairness through vindictiveness'* (p.19). Seldon and Pappworth claimed not to uncover any evidence for interviewees using the interview situation to attack individuals (e.g. former rivals or adversaries). To a large extent, though, this may depend on factors such as the passage of time or the occupation of the individual being interviewed. For example, the retired police officers appeared, generally, not to use the interview situation to attack former colleagues or adversaries. This may have been due to several reasons. First, the passing of time may have rendered inconsequential, in the eyes of those involved, any former feuds. Second, it may be the case that the camaraderie of the police may restrict an officer from denigrating another officer, especially in front of a stranger. However, it must be taken into consideration that political dynamics occur in any large organisation, the police included, and that in such situations the researcher must do his or her utmost to attempt to understand and detect such tensions and distinguish such tarnished opinions from more 'reasonable' recollections. For example, in the period prior to the interview schedule taking place I analysed the transcripts of Weinberger's interviews with police officers throughout the 20th century which are held at the National Sound Archive in London. Such documents impressed upon me some of the issues facing police officers between the 1930s and the 1960s such as the relationship between CID and uniform officers and the relationship of beat officers with barrow-boys and street bookmakers. With regards to the relationship between CID and uniformed officers, I was able to enter the interview situation 'armed' with an idea of what kind of answer to expect from either an ex-CID officer or an ex-uniform officer without actually

being able to predict it. In short, Weinberger's work gave me an idea of the particular nuances of police work which I would come across when interviewing officers from the Metropolitan area who served between the 1930s and the 1960s.

The use, by interviewees, of *'excessive discretion'* (p.20) is also seen as problematic in that it may result in information that does not really inform the researcher of anything that he or she does not already know. The problem, of course, is more likely to occur if a researcher is interviewing members of more secretive occupations such as the armed forces or the police. With regard to the present research it may be hoped that the interviewees felt sufficiently comfortable to be able to impart knowledge to the researcher which, years ago, they might have felt reluctant to do because of its sensitive nature. This will also be helped if trust is developed between the two parties and a confident interviewing manner is adopted.

Seldon and Pappworth's next category of criticism comes under the heading of *'superficiality and gossip'* (p.22) which refers to times when it is difficult to get the interviewee to divulge the information the researcher seeks. The interviewee may have forgotten what happened or be too busy or too disinterested to give the researcher an in-depth account. In research, for example, regarding the wartime activities and role of the police force an ex-officer may come out with the official line - and not with what really happened. Again, Seldon and Pappworth maintain that the way to override these problems is for the researcher to maintain a knowledgeable and confident air and to impress on the interviewee the seriousness of the project at hand. Similarly, the researcher should make sure that enough time is put aside during the interview for in-depth discussion to take place. During the present research an episode occurred when an interviewee, in response to the question regarding pressure for arrests or summonses, replied, "No...there wasn't really...no" (Officer P).

After I explained some examples of pressure for arrests and summonses which other interviewees had disclosed, the interviewee said,

"...The only thing was that there were certain...PC's on the beat and there were section Sergeants...and there were some Sergeants who liked to chase up motorists...make sure they didn't stop, not even for a minute, on the yellow line. I suppose he was justified but he kept us on our toes to make sure that we chased these people up...Individuals had certain methods of policing...some were heavy handed, really, we felt...but that was their temperament...There were one or two that I can recall...they just came unstuck because people wouldn't stand for victimisation" (Officer P).

As is shown in the above case, therefore, gentle persistence can bring forth extremely valuable information.

'Over simplification' (p.21) may also be a problem. Oral historians must, claim Seldon and Pappworth, guard against receiving simple opinions regarding complex matters as these do nothing to aid our understanding. For example, a researcher investigating the area of police occupational culture during World War II who was told by an interviewee that he thought police/public relations were 'OK' would not really have learned anything of real note. It is probably wise to heed the words of Seldon and Pappworth when they wrote, "...As a general rule, oral evidence that offers cut-and-dried answers should be treated with particular caution" (p.22).

'Distortion of interviewee's role' (p.22) is another possible disadvantage of oral history and is characterised by an exaggeration of the interviewee's involvement in the scene being recounted. Although some interviewees may deliberately mislead, it is thought to be the case that most people who do over-estimate their role in a given situation do so by mistakenly believing it to be true. Seldon and Pappworth actually believe that the biggest problem regarding distortion of the interviewee's role is not that of exaggerating individual roles but of people playing down their individual involvement. It is also possible, they claim, that the importance of the organisation for which they worked is overstated. Thus, when examining decreases in the crime rate during the early stages of World War II, it

may be the case that ex-officers will explain it in terms of increased police performance rather than other factors such as the redeployment of many offenders to the armed services where crimes are less likely to be committed or where if they are committed and discovered they will be dealt with through other channels.

Seldon and Pappworth claim that one of the major problems with oral history is that of a *lack of perspective'* (p.22) in that, "...Interview evidence is prone to overplay the role of individuals en masse, in part because people and their deeds are more easily recalled than the more complex factors underlying events" (p.22-23). Thus, it is argued, results gained from oral history techniques will tend to underplay the role of politics and socio-economic factors whilst concentrating upon the role and memories of a few opportunistically selected individuals. In order to combat this it may be claimed that there is a need to back up oral evidence with a thorough grounding in the less subjective literature concerning the period that is being researched. The argument here is that it may be the case that oral history techniques are most effective when utilised as part of an eclectic approach. However, very few trace histories of relevance to the present research are available. Those that are available tend to deal with subjects such as police work during World War II and can all be classed as belonging to the category of what Reiner termed 'orthodox' police histories which function, "...within a framework of palpably conservative assumptions...The police were seen as an inevitable and unequivocally beneficent institution" (1992, p.12).

One book which can be counted as a World War II trace history is 'The Metropolitan Police at War' (HMSO, 1947) which was written by the former Secretary to the Metropolitan Force, H.M. Howgrave-Graham. Unsurprisingly, the book is a detailed orthodox account of police work during World War II and the author's use of language makes it clear that there would be not a hint of revisionist text within it. For example, the author wrote,

"The task of presenting a coherent picture of the many acts of gallantry performed during air raids by police officers is not an easy one. Even if it were possible to describe every incident which earned a decoration or a commendation, half the story would still remain untold. It is common knowledge in the Force that many courageous acts inevitably escaped notice...Much of the work was done unobtrusively, often under cover of darkness, and those who did it were not likely to proclaim their achievements. Even the incidents which did in fact come to light would in many cases not have been heard of had not some eye-witness come forward spontaneously to tell the story" (p.22).

Similarly, the author, writing about how the passage of time had helped people to forget the War, claimed,

"Memories are short. What were ugly open wounds only a few years ago are now comparatively tidy scars, beautified in summer time by copious growths of willow-herb and made almost romantic by the visits of rare birds" (p.34).

It is possible to locate two potential problems which restrict the usefulness of such trace histories when trying to utilise them as background material for the present research. First, literature written in the era prior to the 1960s appears to adhere strictly to the orthodox style where the authors present an informative account of police successes and no criticism of police shortcomings. Second, no meaning is ascribed to reported actions by those who actually took part. Such material is of little use to the present research save for as a chronological gauge of events, as the text reports, for example, no police malpractice nor does it address the meanings ascribed to events by particular officers.

Oral history has attracted some criticism regarding *'distortion due to personal feelings'* (p.24). Seldon and Pappworth interviewed a retired Cabinet official who remained unconvinced of the advantages of oral history techniques because he had noticed how, after Cabinet meetings, ministers would return to their

departments with totally different interpretations of events. It must be noted, therefore, that our personal feelings, attitudes and perceptions tend to colour our recollections of particular events, locations, or individuals. With regards to the present research, this might not be viewed as an issue because when investigating police culture we are investigating attitudes, perceptions and feelings rather than 'facts'.

'Self consciousness' (p.25) is another factor which needs to be taken into account. It is claimed that often an interviewee will realise that he or she is being given the opportunity for future generations to hear their side of a particular story and will therefore yield very little information of worth due to self-consciousness. Seldon and Pappworth claim, however, that because the interviewee has been able to prepare for the interview he or she will be given the chance to organise his or her thoughts and therefore deliver them with more clarity than, for example, a casually written remark in a diary. It may be hoped, with reference to the study of police occupational culture, that police officers are not, generally, of a self-conscious disposition and that the occupational practices of taking notes, recording incidents and speaking in courts have served to make them articulate and less self conscious interviewees.

Another factor to remain alert for when undertaking an oral history project is that of the 'influence of hindsight' (p.25). It is possible that, during an interview, an interviewee recalling an event will do so in the light of evidence which has emerged since the time of the event being witnessed. This would serve to confound the research because oral history is mainly concerned with how people felt about, for example, certain happenings at the time they occurred and not how they were interpreted in light of later perspectives of knowledge. When analysing such transcripts, therefore, it is necessary to be able to distinguish between the interviewees feelings as they were at the time of the event and those which occur in the light of later or more contemporary developments.

The final, interviewee-based, criticism of oral history put forward by Seldon and Pappworth was 'repetition of published evidence' (p.26) which, in a way, follows

on from the last criticism. It specifically refers to the possibility that interviewees may experience difficulty in distinguishing between what was experienced by themselves and what they have since learnt from other sources. Thus, a pollution of memory traces may occur. The fact that all the interviewees in the present research appeared to be very lucid and aware of their role reassured the researcher that repetition of published evidence was not happening. However, it must be noted that there was no real way of accounting for such a factor.

Now I shall address the criticisms which can be eased by in-depth interviewer training.

'Unrepresentative sampling' (p.27) is viewed by many as a basic problem concerning oral history. The very fact that researchers are often seeking people who may be of an advanced age necessitates the adoption of a sample from an opportunistic population. Similar criticisms can also be aimed at other methodological approaches which draw upon the qualitative paradigm and should only become a real problem when those who analyse the evidence assume that their findings on, for example, police culture can be applied to every other set of ex-police officers who served during the same period. During such analyses the researcher should investigate all the possible factors which may have influenced the results which were gained. For example, results gleaned from officers who served in the Metropolitan Force may be vastly different from the results of a study conducted in wholly rural forces.

The second factor seen as acting as a limitation on the interviewer by Seldon and Pappworth is *'biased questioning'* (p.27). This refers to situations whereby the researcher's personal bias may be reflected within the structure of the questions thereby influencing the interviewee's responses. Such biases may therefore create responses which support the personal bias or viewpoint of the researcher and thus invalidate the project. Experience has shown that a researcher who wishes to prove a certain point rarely comes away without some information that fits his or her hypotheses. To counter the possibility of biased

questioning, every effort was made to ask questions that required interviewees to speak in some depth about a topic rather than just give a 'yes' or 'no' answer.

According to Seldon and Pappworth, research based upon oral history can become problematic due to *'deference and bias towards interviewees'* (p.28). This problem occurs when the researcher (especially a novice) becomes somewhat overawed by being in the position of talking to some influential person and loses their sense of objectivity. The deferential researcher will ask the interviewee questions which will not add to our knowledge but which he or she knows they will be able to answer. Similarly, the deferential researcher will ask the interviewee about his or her finest hour rather than his or her personal nadir and will always accept the version which is proffered as being the truth. To combat this the researcher should, at all times, remind themselves of the research project at hand and what information is required by it and not what questions they might, personally, wish to ask the interviewee.

The final criticism proffered by Seldon and Pappworth of interviewer limitations is that of *'interviews as a replacement for reading documents'* (p.29). This criticism is aimed at researchers who use oral history evidence without first acquainting themselves with background contexts for a given situation and then present ambiguous quotes which have been taken out of context as a version of the 'truth'. This is a criticism which is perhaps more directed at those undertaking oral history in a historical context whereas the present research is utilising oral history methodology in a non-historical way – namely, to advance our knowledge in the area of cop culture.

3. Advantages of Oral History Techniques

Seldon and Pappworth have divided the advantages of oral history techniques into four main categories; 'facts not recorded in documents', 'interpretation of personalities and events', 'interpretation of documents' and 'potential benefits of interviewing'. Under the first category there are three main advantages - *'events'*, *'personalities'* and *'personal and organisational relationships'*.

'Events' (p.37) refers to the fact that documentary evidence often contains gaps or errors. These gaps in documentary evidence may be filled by gathering data from interviews and using it to bring light to areas where previously there had been confusion regarding, for example, the sequence of a particular chain of events.

'Personalities' (p.38) is viewed by Seldon and Pappworth as one of the key areas where oral history techniques may be of benefit in furthering our knowledge. Facts about individuals' private (and working) lives may be difficult to gain using conventional historical texts. Interviews may be used to boost our knowledge regarding the ways in which a certain individual may have conducted his or her working or private life. For example, oral history techniques may be used to gain information regarding an individual's state of health. This is a subject which much documentary evidence may fail to take into account and which may, ultimately, prove to be the deciding factor concerning why a certain piece of behaviour may have been exhibited. This factor is not of direct relevance to the present research as it is more concerned with, for example, biographical research into the life of a major decision-maker rather than the working lives of police officers.

'Personal and organized relationships' (p.39) concerns the fact that oral history techniques allow us to explore the nature of an individual's relationships not only with other people but also in relation to the complex hierarchical structures of organisations. Thus, oral history techniques could be used, with regard to the present research, to determine the nature of the relationship between, for example, CID officers and beat officers during a particular era.

Seldon and Pappworth's category of 'interpretation of personalities and events' mainly concerns the area of 'relationships and personal roles' (p.40) which refers to the way in which oral history techniques allow us to interview people who can provide us with personal opinions regarding a particular individual - their relationships with others, their status and so forth. This also allows us to use an interviewee's opinions to create comparisons between certain people. For

example, an ex-police officer's subjective comparison of two Chief Constables may be of great use in helping to clarify certain gaps in existing documentary evidence.

Seldon and Pappworth's category of 'interpretation of documents' looks at the ways in which oral information may be used to help the researcher in the use of documentary evidence. *'Overall grasp of the documents'* (p.43) refers to the fact that the use of information gathered from an interview may help the researcher in deciding which of the overwhelming amount of documentary evidence is of use and which is not. This advantage can be particularly beneficial if the researcher is new to an area of academic research and wishes to form a succinct outline of the arguments, debates and controversies contained therein.

'Clarification of factual confusions' (p.44) is advantageous when investigating areas of historical knowledge which demand elucidation due to conflicting documentary reports. It may be the case with regard to the present research that, for example, documentary evidence concerning violent incidents between police officers and members of the BUF are unclear about the actual time and location of a certain event. By interviewing officers who witnessed such events it may be the case that we can greatly increase our knowledge of them. One example that came to light during the present research was that of the Rubber Heel Squad. Prior to analysing Dr Weinberger's interviews, I had never come across the term 'Rubber Heel Squad'. Although it was referred to several times throughout the course of my interviews, I had never seen it mentioned in any official document and I was unsure as to whether the Squad was a myth or not. Officer B, however, was able to substantiate the Squad's existence when he said, "Well, that was a branch within COC1...Commissioner's Office" (Officer B).

'Underlying assumptions and motives' (p.45) refers to the way in which oral history techniques may be used not just to find out *what* happened but, also, *why* it happened. Documentary evidence may tend to record merely what happened without informing us of the underlying agendas, philosophies, or policies, or, if

explanations are provided, they may not refer to the real motives due to, for example, notions of national security or the maintenance of public morale.

'Gaps in documentation' (p.45) deals with, naturally, the fact that documentary evidence may be incomplete. Official documents may have been repressed by a Government agency and private papers may have been 'edited' to protect, for example, an individual's reputation. Similarly, the enormous increase in the use of the telephone as a means of communication has signalled a corresponding decline in the use of letter and document writing and therefore it may be the case that interviews may be the only way of gathering information regarding the more sensitive subject areas of our history.

The final set of advantages of oral history come under Seldon and Pappworth's category of 'potential benefits of interviewing'. 'Additional personal documents' (p.46) refers to the fact that, as is hoped, the researcher will become trusted by the interviewee and this may create an atmosphere whereby the interviewee is prepared to grant access to previously unused historical sources or documents. There are numerous accounts of researchers going to interview a friend or relative of a historical figure only to be presented with, after the interview, a box of unpublished manuscripts or memoirs. During the present research, two of the interviews concluded with interviewees lending me journals which they had kept during their policing days for me to photocopy and return. Such journal evidence was of great use and extracts are quoted within the Findings chapter of this research. Another interviewee gave me a copy of a deleted HMSO publication entitled "The Metropolitan Police At War".

'Further information after interviews' (p.46) is an advantageous and, providing the initial interview created an atmosphere of trust, not uncommon experience. The researcher's notes from the interview may be transcribed and then returned to the interviewee who may then correct any mistakes which may have occurred in the period of transcription.

'Atmosphere and colour' (p.47) are two of those sometimes intangible essences which may often be noticed only by their absence from 'dry' documentary evidence. Much documentary evidence is produced to recount merely what happened in a certain situation with no attempt to colour it with any emotional content. To gain a fuller picture of the real human impact of a certain situation or relationship we often need to hear the story from the first person complete with their accounts of how the individual felt about it at the time of their experience.

'Discovery of entirely new information' (p.48) may be viewed as one of oral history's most important assets. The very fact that the researcher may guide the individual through his or her recollections means that in many cases he or she is discovering 'new' history. A researcher working on documentary evidence may only analyse that information through one or other of a variety of political, economical, historical, or philosophical perspectives. Although some may claim that we should guard ourselves against taking all information gathered from oral techniques as being infallible, apart from the discovery of new trace materials, it still remains the only real way of creating an entirely new angle on a particular historical occurrence.

'Insight into a subject's personality and thought processes' (p.49) is one advantage that may be viewed as coming into play when conducting interviews with what have become termed 'elite' witnesses. It may be the case that a particular Chief Constable has been described in some documentary evidence as having a certain set of traits or attitudes. The only way to verify such information is to meet the individual in question and conduct an interview with them from which you might be able to establish some characteristics of their mental make-up. Thus, oral history techniques may be viewed as beneficial in that they allow us to verify (or dispute) documentary evidence which ascribes certain mental traits or attitudes to an individual.

'Evidence from non-elite witnesses' (p.49) is advantageous in that most orthodox, documentary-based, historical works deal only with the rich and famous, the infamous, or the powerful at the expense of evidence from those

contemporaries with lower profiles. It is often the case that people in certain positions have to protect themselves thus causing them to not always provide interviewers with the entire truth. Thus, oral history gives us the chance to challenge accounts which may have become aired in, for example, a Chief Constable's biography with those accounts given by his chauffeur or maid.

'Information about eminences grises' (p.50) is advantageous in that, for the most part, oral history allows us to gain information from those individuals who lurk in the shadow of a more famous or powerful spouse or friend yet whose influence on the others rise can be tremendous. It is often the case that such individuals are privy to large amounts of information regarding the lifestyles and behaviour of the person being studied.

'Enrichment of experience and understanding' (p.51) is a less specific perceived advantage of the oral history technique than many of the others listed in this piece but nevertheless remains important. It points to the fact that merely by interviewing a variety of people the researcher benefits from the experience to conduct better interviews in future.

The final advantage of oral history techniques put forward by Seldon and Pappworth is entitled 'an extra dimension; sound' (p.52). The very fact that most oral history is conducted via means of audio tape allows us to present it in many and varied ways. The information we gather may be disseminated through television, radio, pre-recorded audio and video tape and the internet.

4. Analysis

It appears impossible to successfully resolve the criticisms aimed at the use of oral history techniques. This is due to the fact that, ultimately, the argument comes down to one of objectivity versus subjectivity. Those criticisms aimed at the method come, generally, from those who subscribe to a paradigm which stresses the importance of 'validity' whereas those who proclaim the various advantages of oral history techniques look towards practical rather than theoretical considerations. Thus, most of the criticisms aimed at the methodology point to potential problems regarding scientific or empirical objectivity and therefore ask questions like *'How do we know that the interviewee is telling the truth?'* or *'Is the interviewer competent enough?'* whilst those who propose the use of such methodologies use them, not to create an empirically sound science project, but to gather information which may shed new light upon a particular subject.

Samuel and Thompson (1990) have examined this apparent dichotomy. They argue that it comes down to the differences between history and anthropology - documentary evidence tending to be the methodology of choice for historians and oral history techniques being favoured by anthropologists. Anthropology, as a discipline, treads a similar path to sociology. It looks at the fluidity of concepts such as culture and discourse rather than seeking universal truths or facts, whereas traditional history concerns itself to a great extent with the empirical paradigm. Samuel and Thompson (1990) wrote on the subject of the leading paradigm in historical research,

> "...Our whole training predisposes us to give a privileged place to the factual, or...'exact knowledge'. We look for the reality content in our documents rather than what they may tell us about the symbolic categories through which reality is perceived. We build our arguments on empirically verifiable truths" (p.1).

Writers in the field of oral history have invested a lot of time in investigating the concept of 'myth', an idea which at first glance may have little to do with

perceptions of police work. It may be the case, however, that Manning's (1977) concept of the 'Police Myth' has a direct effect upon the outcome of an oral history project investigating police culture. Manning (1977) looked at the way in which police work is perceived, in many ways, in mythical terms and how such a mythical status, "...removes the matter from everyday discourse and places it in the realm of the nebulous and the mystical, that which stands to serve *all* in a removed and fair, almost dispassionate fashion" (p.325).

A traditional historical discourse may attempt to deconstruct the myth without ever looking at the effect it has on the perceptions of both the public and the police alike. Tonkin (1990), on the subject of the validity of such myths, wrote,

> "Many historians live by the myth of realism. This may seem a silly-sounding claim: and anyway, is it not a contradiction in terms? I want to argue that to believe in the natural veracity of any narrative form is a false faith; and also that since realism is a predominant mode of historical writing, it is too easily accepted as the opposite of myth. Myth is a representation of the past which historians recognize, but generally as an alternative to proper history. I think we should dissolve this dichotomy" (p.25).

Thus, there appears to be a growing move away from the notion that there is a universal truth with regards to history. Tonkin (1990) investigates the multi-faceted nature of history and claims,

> "Histories are arguments created by people in particular conditions. These conditions include the very social worlds in which they live, and which, by their telling, they model and sometimes seek to alter" (p.29).

The views of such writers might add support for the possibility that the culture of police work provides police officers with a ready made framework in which to formulate their thoughts and ideas on the subject. At the same time, such a framework might *inform* police opinions although this should not be seen as an invalidating or falsifying factor.

66

We must take care, however, not to become staunchly uncritical of oral history methods solely because they themselves do not subscribe to the empirical sphere of understanding. Tonkin (1992) claimed, whilst expounding the superiority of the method, that many cultures favour the use of oral history over documentary evidence. This may be true, but it should be taken into consideration that Tonkin worked mainly within what many would describe as Third World cultures where low rates of literacy have, no doubt, stifled any increases in the use of documentary evidence. It may be the case that oral history techniques will experience a reduction in popularity in the eventuality of such cultures undergoing widespread educational development.

Oral history techniques have been criticised for advocating a 'solitary universal' and for representing the views of solitary individuals, but Tonkin has responded that human beings are part of a wider social world and, therefore, ingest and disperse social knowledge as part of a living whole. This may be true, yet it does highlight the dichotomy between 'historical fact' (i.e. what documentary texts purport to be) and 'oral history' (which has strong social roots). If we can regress further, the argument comes down to whether one believes that knowledge is a monolithic slab of 'fact' (whatever that may be) or a social construct borne of everyday social interaction within a particular culture. If one believes that the latter is the case then it might be possible to argue the case that 'fact' is ever-changing and ever-evolving.

It could be said that such a methodological approach is ultimately based on Weber's (1949) 'verstehende' sociology. Weber's perspective, according to Spradley (1980) stresses the need to adopt, "...an approach which avoids the pre-definition of what is to be considered relevant" (p.24). Despite the fact that the present research had specific aims regarding subject areas to be broached during the interviews, there was wide scope for the interviewee to impress upon the interviewer the relevance of a certain situation or occurrence. Ultimately, this open approach resulted in the researcher being made aware of the importance of specific aspects of the police/public relationship and it's importance to police occupational culture.

Weber's perspective saw the importance of making all scientific judgements value free, thus advocating that the social sciences should be concerned with factual knowledge (the way things are, i.e., fact) rather than normative knowledge (the way things should be, i.e., values). Thus, when observing social action or interpreting someone's account of social action the perspective decrees that we should assess it in relation not to our own values but in relation to its own 'cultural significance'. Central to this perspective of sociology is the importance of addressing the meanings which individuals attach to their actions. Gerth & Wright Mills (1991) explained this as follows, "Man can 'understand' or attempt to 'understand' his own intentions through introspection, and he may interpret the motives of other men's conduct in terms of their professed or ascribed intentions" (p.57). They continued by countering possible accusations of naivety in Weber's adoption of a subjective methodology,

"Weber rejects the assumption of any 'objective meaning.' He wished to restrict the understanding and interpretation of meaning to the subjective intentions of the actor. Yet...he is no less aware than is Marx of the paradoxical fact that the results of interactions are by no means always identical with what the actor intended to do" (1991, p.58)

Weber further guarded against such criticisms by two procedures: first, he always studied the individual in relation to the group rather than the individual in isolation; and secondly, by invoking 'ideal types' (1949). According to Gerth & Wright Mills (1991), "As general concepts, ideal types are tools with which Weber prepares the descriptive materials of world history for comparative analysis" (p.60).

Weber's work is important to the present research in that his methodological perspective justifies the use of comparative analysis upon subjective data, thus validating the use of a comparative oral history approach on individual police histories. His emphasis upon studying the individual in relation to the group sets the precedent for us to view objectively the symbiotic relationship between the

individual police officer and the occupational culture within which they operate. In other words, Weber's work encourages the study of individuals in relation to wider cultural influences.

Within the present research, the use of un-structured interviews served to place a great importance on the views of the interviewees. In some instances this lead to information on subjects which the researcher had not heard of before such as the existence of the 'Hotka'. On other occasions the interviews served to provide us with more in-depth information on greatly neglected areas such as the 'Rubber Heel Squad'.

5. How the Research was Carried Out

The present research required, it was envisaged, about 25 respondents who were to be subjected to in-depth un-structured interviews. The individuals were to have served in the Metropolitan Police Force at some time between the 1930s and the 1960s. The geographical parameters were chosen to lessen the amount of travelling undertaken by the interviewer. At the same time, however, it was thought to be of use in that a great many different types of community are covered within the wide-ranging area of the Metropolitan boroughs. The research was limited to the above time scale for two main reasons. Firstly, research into the culture of the police began in and around the 1960s and one of the aims of the research was to investigate pre-1960s policing. Secondly, it was thought that there would be very little chance of finding surviving officers who joined the Metropolitan police force before the 1930s.

The primary problem encountered was that of contacting members of the population from which I wished to create my research sample. The first move was to identify those publications which, it was believed, might contain suitable individuals amongst its readership or whose readership would be able to put the researcher in touch with suitable individuals. Therefore, notices were placed in publications such as 'The Job', 'The Journal of the Police History Society' and the 'London Police Pensioner Magazine'. The notices stated;

> "Researcher wishes to get in touch with ex-Metropolitan Police Force officers who served between the 1930s and the 1960s. Please contact Tom Cockcroft c/o The Law Dept, Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH. Tel. (01895) 274000"

The feedback from this first wave of advertising was disappointing with only about eight individuals making contact. At this point, it was realised that a problematic situation was emerging - i.e. how to get in touch with possible interviewees without having to invest in costly advertisements in various publications. Notices placed in police-interest publications had been free of charge but had not proved entirely effective in gaining the survey a large enough

sample. In fact, only four contacts were made through such an advert in the Journal of the Police History Society. After much thought, it was decided to send the same advert to a number of small scale publishers of London borough newspapers.

These were,

Advertiser North London Series, Barnet Press Series, Chronicle Series (London), Croydon Advertiser Series, East End Life, Enfield Independent Series, Epping Forest Independent Series, Express & Post Series (Barking), The Gazette & Leader Series, Gazette & Advertiser Series, Guardian Series (Sutton), Guardian Series (Hounslow, Staines & Richmond), Guardian Series (South London), Hackney Gazette & North London Advertiser Series, Harrow Observer, Leader & Independent Series, Ham & High Series, Harrow Times Series, Heathrow Villager, Hendon Times Series, Highbury & Islington Express, The Hounslow & Chiswick Informer, Ilford Recorder Series, Informer Series (Kingston), Islington Gazette & Journal Series, Kingston, Surbiton & New Malden Times, Newham Recorder Series, News Shopper Series, North West London Newspaper Series, Romford & Hornchurch Recorder Series, South London Mercury Series, Uxbridge Gazette Series, Waltham Forest Guardian Series Wandsworth Borough News Series, Wimbledon, Morden & Mitcham Independent, Lea Valley Star, Bromley News, Kentish Times & Express Series.

Such publications, it was thought, would be a lot more amenable to printing such a request due to their emphasis on the interests and lives of members of their community rather than more national issues. Such an assumption appeared to be successful as the response rate satisfied the survey requirement for a sample of 25.

Twenty four interviews took place. Twenty five would have taken place but one respondent died before the interview could be undertaken. Twenty two of these were 'one on one' interviews where the interviewer interviewed one interviewee and two were 'one on two' interviews where the interviewer interviewed two

interviewees. One of these 'one on two' interviewees, in particular, was beneficial in that it meant that the interviewer did not have to make two separate trips to a town on the South Coast.

The purpose of the research was relayed to the potential interviewees verbally when the researcher talked to them in the first instance (usually to arrange the time, date and location of the interview) and, again, before starting the interview. The purpose of the research was held to be "To gather information regarding certain aspects of the day to day reality of policing between the 1930s and the 1960s".

At the beginning of the interview, the interviewee was briefed about the nature of the interview and also told that total anonymity would be assured in the writing-up of the study. Similarly, the interviewee was assured that all names (not just their own) would be changed. It was also deemed essential to ask the interviewee if he or she had any objections to the use of a tape recorder with which the interviewer recorded the interview.

Within the present research no interviewees refused the use of a tape recorder. Similarly, no ethical issues arose during the research although two of the respondents clearly did not want to broach the subject area of police corruption. The researcher respected their views by not forcing the issue. This was because it would have been disrespectful to make respondents feel uncomfortable after they had been kind enough to agree to be interviewed.

The interviews were, ideally, meant to follow guidelines laid down by the list of interview questions (see Appendix 1) and key subjects were broached with an amount of sensitivity. When attempting to capture an interviewee's views on a subject they would be asked in a manner that did not assume that the subject was present during their time in the police. For example, they might be asked "Could you tell me if you experienced any evidence of corruption during your time in the Force?" rather than by assuming that corruption was

present by asking "What was the corruption like in the Force when you were serving?"

General questions regarding the less controversial aspects of police work were asked first in an attempt to create an amiable relationship between the interviewee and the interviewer. The interviews started with 'Could you tell me when and where you were born?' and were followed by 'Could you tell me why you wanted to join the police force?' Such 'neutral' preliminary questions were used in an attempt to make the interviewees feel comfortable with the interview at the outset.

More sensitive questions, such as those regarding possible corruption in the force, were not broached until the interviewer felt that he had gained the interviewee's trust. It was necessary to build a certain amount of flexibility into the interview format. For example, it was, of course, of no use to ask an ex-officer about the effect of the Second World War on the role of the police if he or she joined the force after 1945. Similarly, if the interviewee became visibly uncomfortable with a certain line of questioning, as a few did with questions regarding police corruption, the subject was not pursued. This was done mainly because it was believed that rather than try and force an issue it was better to leave an individual topic unexplored so as not to jeopardise the possibility of gaining information upon another topic. At the same time it was believed that any individual who had been gracious to allow the interviewer into his or her home should be treated with respect and not 'forced' into a position where they might feel uncomfortable. At the end of the interview it was, of course, only natural to thank the interviewee(s) for taking the time to be interviewed and for assisting the research. Similarly, they were asked not to hesitate in contacting the interviewer if they had any questions regarding the research in the period after the interview. Out of the 26 officers who were interviewed, two did get in touch to enquire upon the progress of the research. On two occasions, the interviewer was lent journals or manuscripts recalling periods of the individual's life and these were photocopied in the period after the interview and returned by post

promptly with a covering letter expressing thanks at their continued assistance. After transcription of the interviews, the tapes were archived.

The process whereby the information held within the transcripts of the 26 interviews was transformed into the format of the Findings chapter was as follows.

Following the transcription of the interviews, the researcher drafted the headings under which the analysis would take place.

These were Pressure for Arrests or Summonses, Discretion, Common Sense, General Discipline, Attitude of Older Officers, Camaraderie, Social Solidarity, Social Isolation, Attitudes to Policewomen/The Role of the Policewoman, Attitudes to Women in General, Attitudes to Ethnic Minority Groups/ Relations with Ethnic Minority Groups, Complaints against the Police, Corruption, Relationship with Barrow Boys and Street Bookmakers, Relationship with Prostitutes, The Rubber Heel Squad, The Relationship between CID and Uniform, Relationship with Magistrates, The Relationship with the Public, Differences in the Police/Public Relationship between Areas, Perceived Changes in the Police/Public Relationship over Time, Differences in Cultural Dynamics between Geographical Areas/Police Stations, Relationship with Left and Right Wing Organisations, Relationship with Law-Breakers, Role of the Police. Thief-Taking or Public Service?, Cynicism/Hardened, 'Once a Copper, Always a Copper?'.

The purpose of the analysis was to ascertain the relevance of the information gathered from the interviews with regards to the above 27 headings.

These headings were mainly gathered from the existing literature in the area of police culture although not exclusively so. Attitudes of Older Officers, Relationship with Barrow Boys and Street Bookmakers, Relationship with Prostitutes, The Rubber Heel Squad, and Relationship with Magistrates were

areas of interest which arose from Weinberger's work. 'Once a Copper, Always a Copper?' and Role of the Police. Thief-Taking or Public Service? arose from the data of the present research.

After the decision was made to use the above headings, the physical task of the analysis began. Each of the 26 interviews were scrutinised by the researcher for quotes which pertained to any of the 27 headings. When a relevant part of the information was identified it was copied and pasted from the computer file of the interview transcript to a separate file which contained each of the 27 headings and placed underneath the relevant heading. By the time that every interview had been treated in this way the file contained an extremely large amount of information which would have to be arranged into a more comprehensible format.

This was done by analysing the information under each heading in a systematic way. Firstly, general quotes regarding a subject were placed towards the beginning of a section whereas more in-depth quotes were placed towards the end. This was done so that the information under each heading would begin with a more general overview of the subject before looking more deeply at any subtleties which may have emerged. For example, the analysis of police solidarity begins with a quote which supports the view that there was widespread solidarity within the Metropolitan Police Force and ends with an interviewee talking of the, "…intellectual ghetto state of the police" (Officer V). Thus, from a general overview under each heading separate themes were allowed to come to the fore.

When each quote had been placed in the order in which the researcher believed it should be addressed editing had to be undertaken as the file was extremely long and would need to be shortened so that a commentary could be provided to link the quotes. The editing process was systematic in that quotes were only edited out of the text if the point being made was covered by another quote. That is, if five quotes made an identical point, three of

these might be deleted. Similarly, if the majority of interviewees appeared to have similar views on an issue the point was made as such.

Where interviewees expressed denial towards a subject this too was placed in the analysis. If many expressed such denial, this too would be noted. For example, the one officer who appeared to disagree with the phrase 'Once a Copper, Always a Copper?' had his opinion quoted in full. By taking such a representative approach to the analysis it was hoped that a balanced account would emerge. If no consensus was seen as emerging from the interviews, no consensus was reported.

The issue of interviewees having a lack of knowledge on a subject did occur. For example, Officer W, when asked if she had witnessed any evidence of complaints against the police replied, "There may well have been...but I didn't hear about any". When this occurred, interviewees were not pressed for more information as it was seen as naïve to assume that all interviewees would have experienced all correlates of police culture. In these instances, such 'passes' were accounted for when referring to the number of officers who did espouse a particular view. For example, if less than half the sample 'passed' on the issue of social isolation and the rest of the sample agreed that social isolation occurred then the text would refer to the majority of officers as having experienced social isolation.

In a lot of instances, however, there was such a large amount of information, much of it duplicated, that only quotes which conveyed salient or contradictory points, as decided by the researcher, were kept in. Similarly, the unstructured nature of the interviews meant that many of the views of the interviewees did not appear fit into the 27 categories chosen for the analysis. Ultimately, the validity of such an approach to analysis depends upon the integrity of the researcher and it is imperative that he or she takes care to ensure that the views of the officers are represented fairly and within context at all times.

After the order of the quotes under each heading had been decided upon, a narrative was created to put the quotes within a wider context and to make the chapter more readable.

Despite the fact that the ex-officers who were interviewed served over quite a large time-span very little effort was made to stratify the experiences of the officers with regards to the years they served. This homogeneous treatment was used for a number of reasons. Firstly, the sample was not stratified. Ideally, an equal number officers who served within each of the decades would have been used as the basis of the sample. Unfortunately, this was not possible because of the initial difficulties experienced in creating a sample. Secondly, officers serve for differing amounts of time and this, again, leads to difficulties with regards to comparability over time. Thirdly, the present research's purpose was to investigate the culture of the police between the 1930s and the 1960s, not, for example, to compare that of the 1940s with that of the 1960s. This is not to say that the research did not address opinions of change between the 1930s and the 1960s but it was left for the interviewees to make the comparison, not the researcher, as is shown under the heading of Perceived Changes in the Police/Public Relationship over Time.

The questions which were posed to the interviewees were not located in time. In other words, if the subject of, say, police racism was raised it was not tied to a particular period between the 1930s and the 1960s. Unless the interviewees responded with reference to a specifically defined era the answer also was not located in any particular time frame more specific than that between the 1930s and the 1960s.

6. Equipment Used

All interviews were recorded with a Sanyo Talk-Book microcassette recorder and transcribed on an Olympus Micro/Mini transcriber.

7. Methodological issues encountered in this study

I shall now address the practical issues which arose and assess their impact upon the present research.

One primary issue, when investigating police culture between the 1930s and the 1960s, is to formulate an interview content which does not merely attempt to transpose the concept of contemporary police culture onto a thirty year period which ended perhaps thirty years ago. The massive societal changes which have occurred in the 20th century have had a profound effect upon our cultures, societies and our police and, consequently, the culture of the police. Thus, it is unrealistic merely to look at the literature in the area of police culture and try to force it upon a past period. It is necessary to look at the history of the police force and the social history of the period being studied and, at all times, to bear in mind that the culture of the police is inexorably linked to the wider culture of the time. Fortunately, I was able to track down a collection of oral histories which spanned policing in England throughout the 20th century and these helped to provide me with some of the necessary background. The work by Weinberger (stored in collection C684 at the National Sound Archive) was instrumental in familiarising me with the discourse and rhetoric of police officers which itself may serve to reflect the cultural dynamics of the occupation (and the era). This was extremely helpful in providing me, I believe, with an acceptable historical framework within which to search for indications of occupational culture.

A number of the advantages and disadvantages raised by Seldon and Pappworth (1983) did not appear to be relevant to this particular research and have therefore been left un-examined. These included *'unfairness through vindictiveness', 'events', 'overall grasp of the documents', 'clarification of factual confusions', 'underlying assumptions and motives', 'gaps in documentation', 'insight into a subject's personality and thought processes', 'evidence from non-*

elite witnesses' and *'information about eminences grises'.* These were viewed as lacking in relevance to the present research either because they appear to be more applicable to controversies regarding particular historical incidents or matters pertaining to creating biographies of high profile individuals. Such factors may not be extremely relevant to the present research because it is not a historical piece of work but is merely utilising aspects of the oral history methodology.

'Unreliability of memory' is quite hard to detect or assess, within interviews, unless the interviewee either admits to it or implicitly shows that he or she is encountering difficulty in remembering a certain incident. It may indeed be the case that individual memories are bolstered or 'patched up' by more contemporary knowledge yet it is, of course, difficult to prove whether or not this actually occurs. Generally, it was found that the respondents appeared to have very little trouble remembering events that may have occurred as far back as 50 years ago. The fact that the sample failed to exhibit a total consensus of opinion regarding police matters neither serves to support or refute the suggestion that the reliability of memory is an issue. Because of the relevance of the term 'discretion' to police culture research, Seldon and Pappworth's use of the word 'discretion' has been replaced for the duration of this chapter by the word 'caution'. The research revealed a certain amount of caution amongst some members of the sample but it is hard to tell to what extent it was excessive or not. Caution usually arose when the matter of police corruption or scandals within the force was broached although, fortunately, the majority of the sample appeared to be very open towards discussing such issues.

Seldon and Pappworth addressed the area of 'superficiality and gossip' which can be viewed as being quite problematic. A lot of the oral information gathered was not relevant to the central research questions although the fact that the interviewer influenced the direction of the interview made sure that the main points were covered. In many cases, as well, after answering a question an interviewee would go off on a verbal tangent which proved difficult to curb. Perhaps the most common example of this problem was at the beginning of

interviews when, on several occasions, the interviewees did not wait to be asked questions and just started talking. One method of combating such a problem was to tell the interviewee, at the offset, that there were a number of questions which the research aimed to answer. By attempting to control and reduce any information which does not conform to our exact needs does, however, appear to be going against the very idea of oral history. Thompson (1978) claimed that, "Oral history gives history back to the people" (p.226) yet if we seek to control such histories with our questions and biases can we really consider ourselves to have undertaken a democratic history? It could be argued, however, that such aspirations to a democratic history are, ultimately, flawed because they ignore the fact that the interpretation of the subject's views are undertaken by the historian in view of his or her knowledge, experience or theoretical perspective.

Seldon and Pappworth looked at the issue of 'over simplification' which they claimed was a common problem in oral history. It may be the case that this problem is more applicable to oral histories where the interviewer takes a passive role and does not attempt to extract the desired information from the interviewee. In the present research it was the case that if the interviewer asked a question and was met with a simple 'yes' or 'no' answer the interviewee would be asked to explain why they had given that particular answer. In other words, it is often necessary to gently coax the information out of the interviewee.

The possibility of an interviewee exaggerating their role in a certain incident has been viewed as an issue but, in the present study, it did not appear to be too much of a problem. Although certain ex-CID officers who were interviewed were quick to inform the interviewer of their achievements, at the same time, one ex-officer viewed himself as a 'plodder' and a 'coward'. I believe when a retired detective claims he was a 'good thief taker' we should, generally, believe it as we should when an officer claims that he was a 'pen pusher' or 'office boy'. Seldon and Pappworth's notion of 'distortion of interviewee's role' is problematic in that it is a hard concept to measure and may be unhelpful in that it encourages us to doubt the validity of what we are being told. The fact that the interviewer had both a knowledge of the area being studied and an active control over the

interviews may have restrained individuals from overplaying their role in a given situation.

Seldon and Pappworth go on to claim that 'lack of perspective' is a problem facing the oral history methodology yet within the present research I have found this not to be the case. Firstly, I believe that such a view assumes the sample are both unintelligent and unable to view events in anything but a narrow and local context. Secondly, the present research was undertaken to investigate some of the dynamics of institutions and individuals within the criminal justice system and the relationship of these with the public. Because the research question was focused in such a way, lack of perspective was not viewed as an issue. The individuals who were being interviewed were not passive bystanders of every situation that they recounted and actually formed part of the history that they spoke of. The problem arises, however, of how do we strike a balance between accepting what the interviewees tell us as the truth and retaining the questioning air of the social scientist or historian?

The aforementioned authors also looked at the possibility that the personal feelings of the interviewee may colour or distort his or her account of what happened. Such an occurrence is, I believe, inevitable and should not be regarded as a problem. Rather than reflecting an actual problem, it refers mainly to the inadequacy of the empirical paradigm in being able to explain the histories which make up our pasts and therefore neglects the fact that, "...the term 'truth' is many-faceted, and different criteria will be used in different situations" (Tonkin, 1990, p.29). Again, this appears to imply that any particular 'truth' touted by an individual is to be viewed as valid despite the fact that the role of the researcher is to test the validity of results and to interpret them accordingly.

The issue of 'self-consciousness' did not prove to be a problem with regards to the present research. As had been anticipated the ex-police officers did not prove to be self-conscious in the interview situation. Matters were probably helped by the fact that the interviewer started with a number of questions which were 'neutral', such as those regarding the individual's background, their

motivation to join the police and their period of training. Thus, it was hoped that by the time more sensitive questions were asked (e.g. those pertaining to scandals and corruption within the force) a rapport would have already been established. A related point is that concerning the development of trust between the two parties. A number of interviewees were, at first, slightly wary of the fact that I might wish to portray the police in a bad light. Gans (1982) claimed that to develop an air of rapport and trust a researcher needs only, "...an honest face, a visible earnestness...and a quiet demeanour" (p.57).

Fontana and Frey (1994), however, saw personal presentation as extremely important when they wrote, "The decision of how to present oneself is very important, because after ones presentational self is 'cast' it leaves a profound impression on the success (or failure) of the study" (p.367). To a certain extent this appeared to be true in that the interviewer, by projecting himself in a manner that was agreeable to the interviewee, enabled the two parties to develop a good relationship.

The 'influence of hindsight' is, as Seldon and Pappworth rightly note, potentially problematic but only when an interviewee makes a statement which is informed by such an influence and does not acknowledge it. Generally, in this research, it was found that individuals looked back at certain incidents in the light of later knowledge but did so in a way that acknowledged this use of hindsight. For example, one interviewee, when asked about corruption in the CID, replied,

"I think anyone who's a decent person and has worked in the CID, especially at that time, can't look back without regretting a lot of the stuff they've done...a lot of it was wrong but we were young and we thought what we were doing was right" (Officer E).

It appears that this statement was made with the influence of hindsight by virtue of the fact that now the interviewee believes that some of the things he did were wrong. However, the influence of hindsight has not obscured the fact that at the time incidents happened he did not believe that he was acting unfairly or

82

unjustly. On the other hand, it might possible to argue that he knew at the time the actions he was undertaking were wrong but did not want to admit it.

A similar criticism made by Seldon and Pappworth was that of the 'repetition of published evidence' which refers to the way in which an individual's recollection of a certain event might be coloured by published evidence which he or she has read in the period after the original incident. This factor did not, I believe, really provide much of a problem for the present research because the nature of the incidents which were recalled, anecdotally, by members of the sample were not the type of incidents which would have been subsequently written about. The incidents which were recalled were usually concerned with the day-to-day basics of police work, although a few officers referred to incidents and individuals which have subsequently been written about like, for example, the infamous Sergeant Challenor who was convicted of planting evidence. In any event, it is impossible to tell to what extent an individual's opinion of an event is tarnished by subsequent publications unless he or she directly admits to it.

'Unrepresentative sampling' is viewed, by Seldon and Pappworth, as a problem with the oral history technique and the sample used for the present study was by no means structured. The ex-officers who were interviewed were chosen mainly because they had responded to the adverts in various publications and no attempt was made to structure the sample. Any replication of this research might well benefit from, for example, interviewing five officers who served in the 1930s, five officers who served in the 1940s, five officers who served in the 1950s and five officers who served in the 1960s. Part of the problem revolved around the fact that there are only very few surviving ex-officers from the 1930s, an issue addressed by Thompson (1978) when he wrote, "The far limit of the past recoverable through oral evidence recedes remorselessly through death, day by day" (p.225).

To a large extent, therefore, the present research was guided by an open-minded attitude whereby anybody from that wide spectrum of police officers who served in the Metropolitan police between the 1930s and the 1960s was

interviewed. This move was, in part, prompted by the initial difficulties which were experienced in securing an adequate sample.

The idea that 'biased questioning' may affect the validity of a particular study applies to all interviews and questionnaires. It could be said that merely by asking a question one is introducing an element of bias into a situation by drawing another individual's conscious thought to a specific area determined by the interviewer. Generally, though, this point refers to the idea that interviewers may formulate questions which go towards ensuring the very answers which the interviewer desires. Kahn and Cannell (1957) wrote,

"The respondent's age, race, sex, and socioeconomic status may relate to attitudes or stereotypes which the interviewer holds. Accordingly, the interviewer expects the respondent to behave in certain ways and give certain answers. It is only a short step for him to lead the respondent in the expected direction or to interpret his responses in ways which fit his own preconceptions" (p.185).

Occasionally during the present interviews, however, the researcher had to ask more direct questions than he actually wanted. Without exception, this was caused when an interviewee did not appear to understand a more subtle means of broaching a subject. One example of this was when the subject of police cynicism was broached with Officer A. He asked the researcher to explain what the word cynicism meant before responding and this gave his response the feeling of being an answer to a direct question.

Similarly, on occasion it was necessary to encourage interviewees to go into more depth on a subject as often they would stop part way through an anecdote because they did not want to bore the researcher. On such occasions, the researcher would ask the interviewee if they could tell him more about a particular subject. This type of simple probe seemed successful in impressing upon the interviewee the fact that the researcher was happy to listen to their reminiscences. Similarly, interviewees were

never interrupted and were allowed to finish their answer to a question before being asked another.

When Seldon and Pappworth wrote about 'deference and bias towards interviewees' it was probably more directed towards those interviewees who interview famous or high profile individuals. As the present research was investigating the reality of police work over a period of about 30 years, the interviewees were generally lower ranking police officers and none of them were in any way famous or 'high profile'. It may be possible, however, that some deference to the interviewees occurred in respect to their age.

Seldon and Pappworth stressed the idea that interviews should not be used as a replacement for reading documents. With regards to the present research there was, I believe, very little existing literature in the area of police culture between the 1930s and the 1960s. Despite this, it was felt important to read more general accounts of policing over that period (such as Emsley (1996)) to provide the various reference points which are necessary when embarking upon such a piece of research.

I shall now address the advantages of oral history forwarded by Seldon and Pappworth and assess their relevance to the present research. One area where the oral history technique was advantageous was that of 'personalities'. During the research I was able to assess not just what happened in a particular situation but also *why* it happened because individuals had the chance to express their own particular motivations. When ex-officers do talk about their personalities and attitudes it is possible to explode the 'myth' of policing and, for the first time, to see officers not just as officers of the law but to see them as human beings.

The oral history technique also proved beneficial in the area of what Seldon and Pappworth termed 'personal and organized relationships'. By interviewing ex-police officers I succeeded in gaining a picture of how such personalities interact within the hierarchical police institution and also in addressing the power

dynamics which occur in the relationship between, for example, uniform officers and CID officers.

Another advantage of the oral history technique was that pertaining to 'relationships and personal roles' which allows us to compare an individual's attitude towards another individual. An example in the present research regards police officers' attitudes towards Oswald Moseley, the leader of the British Union of Fascists. By analysing their attitudes towards him it may be possible to assess the validity of the claim made by writers like Skolnick (1994) that police officers tend to have right-wing political views.

Seldon and Pappworth noted the advantage of 'additional personal documents' and whilst undertaking this research two ex-officers lent me personal journals which contained reminiscences of their time in the police force. These were useful in two main ways. First, the journals often articulated a given situation which had been recounted to me in the interview yet did so with more precision thus allowing me to rectify any possible ambiguities. Secondly, they often provided me with relevant information and anecdotes which were not recounted within the interview. This advantage is directly related to Seldon and Pappworth's next advantage of 'further information after interviews'. One officer, about a week after the interview, wrote me a letter detailing some more points regarding his time in the police and another rang me about five hours after the interview to recount another anecdote to me.

Seldon and Pappworth noted that oral history was useful in that it gave accounts of various events a sense of 'atmosphere and colour' and this did prove to be the case within the present research. Oral histories, once transcribed, tend to give a much more 'realistic' and readable account of a certain happening when compared to a 'dry' piece of documentary evidence. Empirical neutrality is discarded and the human side of policing becomes much more apparent. Such histories, by providing us with a human element, allow us a deeper understanding especially when, for example, investigating the relationship between the public and the police.

One of the most important advantages of oral history, claimed Seldon and Pappworth, was that concerning the 'discovery of entirely new information'. On many occasions the interviewer was told of an incident which would be of great interest to anyone researching the culture of the police and many of these stories would not have been told by the interviewee to anyone from outside his work or family.

The final advantage of the oral history technique to be addressed by Seldon and Pappworth was that of 'enrichment of experience and understanding'. This refers to the way in which the process of interviewing individuals and of spending hours with them listening to anecdotes, stories and recollections allows the subject matter to become more 'real'. Personally, I found that with every interview my knowledge grew and that, consequently, I took more knowledge to later interviews than those at the beginning and was therefore able to extract more information of real worth. It could be argued that this is 'bad practice' and that such changes throughout the interviewing schedule may invalidate the research. However, the process is both natural and inevitable as it is impossible to ingest information and not allow it to influence your future actions.

At all times, however, we must remain aware to the fact that the subjective nature of the information gained from the interviews must be treated with caution. Despite the views of academics who champion the use of oral history techniques we need to realise that any methodology that utilises the in-depth views of individuals is open to real problems with regards to generalisation. That is, real care needs to be taken to ensure that we do not attempt to transpose the views of those officers who were interviewed onto all those officers who served within the Metropolitan Police Force between the 1930s and the 1960s.

Chapter 4

Findings

Introduction

In this chapter, relevant quotes from the 26 interviews will be listed under one of 27 headings each of which corresponds to a correlate of police culture. These quotes are linked with some narrative. These headings were mainly gathered from the existing literature in the area of police culture although not exclusively so. Attitudes of Older Officers, Relationship with Barrow Boys and Street Bookmakers, Relationship with Prostitutes, The Rubber Heel Squad, and Relationship with Magistrates were areas of interest which arose from Weinberger's work. 'Once a Copper, Always a Copper?' and Role of the Police. Thief-Taking or Public Service? arose from the data of the present research.

It should be noted, however, that some quotes have relevance to a number of different aspects of police occupational culture. For example, whilst some racist acts indulged in by police officers might be viewed as a result of 'Discretion', the same actions could be construed, hypothetically, as a result of 'Racism'. Thus, various aspects of police culture might be viewed as having a symbiotic relationship with other aspects.

To aid identification of the ex-officer who made each statement, a code denoted by a letter (see Appendix 2) is used at the end of each quote.

For a more comprehensive description of the process whereby the information from 26 interview transcripts was used in this chapter please see the Methodology chapter.

1. Pressure for Arrests or Summonses

General literature in the area of police culture has tended to view pressure for results and summonses as an inevitable part of the occupation. For example, Reiner (1992) claimed that, "Undoubtedly police officers experience external political pressure for 'results'..." (p.111) and this may lead to improper police behaviour through the violation of suspects' legal rights. Skolnick (1994) also addresses this issue of the balance between procedural regularity and the necessity to appear efficient when he wrote that, "...there are systemic pressures on police to break certain kinds of rules in the interest of conforming to other standards" (p. 106).

The ex-officers interviewed, for the present research, reported greater variations in pressure than existing work in the area of cop culture might lead one to expect. However, it may be that pressure on officers is more a contemporary aspect of police culture than a historical one. Indeed, Morgan and Newburn (1997) stated that,

> "Recently, however, we have suffered something of a crisis of confidence in our police and our policing arrangements. Crime rates have risen, continually and often sharply. Fear of crime and a deep sense of insecurity blight many lives...Public confidence in the police, as measured in repeated opinion polls, has declined" (p.1).

It may be the case that the increasing marginalisation of many sectors of the population, coupled with greater public scrutiny of the police, have led to increased pressure upon the police officers of today. This is not to say that a minority of the interviewees did not experience pressure for arrests. One interviewee claimed,

> "...Yes, there was. My opinion was that you had to get the quota and in those days they had a book called a 'Hotka'. A 'Hotka' is a short list of summonses and...for the first two years, as you know, you're on

probation and their idea was that you worked through the book...right the way through this book..." (C).

Such pressure to achieve results was not just restricted to the two-year probationary period. One ex-officer claimed, when asked if there was any pressure for results, that superior officers at a station with a grudge against a certain officer could use their arrest rates or summons rates as a lever to get rid of the officer. Thus, it appears that the issue of pressure for results could be used as a vehicle for hidden agendas or internal political wrangling on occasion. Similarly, it appears that even getting involved in a domestic dispute could be used against an officer if so desired,

"...Yes...I can vouch for that with impunity...and they sometimes twisted that to their advantage...that was the excuse given...that you hadn't got enough stops, you hadn't got enough verbal warnings, you hadn't done enough summonses, you hadn't done enough...and if you'd done something that they didn't like...shall we say even if you'd done a domestic...they would bring this other thing up...Domestics were iffy as far as the police image was concerned...they might have been looking for an excuse to move you on or something like that...there was that now and again..." (H).

Various measures were employed as an incentive for officers to make a 'respectable' number of arrests and this might result in the 'creation' of crime.

"...On W Division, at Tooting, they had the old charts on the wall with each officer and his number of arrests and it tried to make competition and blokes would perhaps swing it to get the top mark...and some will risk and swing it...It's making crime...it's not catching criminals" (N).

This does raise an interesting issue regarding pressure for results, namely, to what extent can we view pressure for results as a motivating factor in cases of police corruption like, for example, perjury? Undoubtedly, the ex-officer in the

above quote believes that such pressure did have an unfortunate effect on the ethicacy of some officers' behaviour. Such 'creation' of crime could easily become legitimised in the minds of officers, even if it is not officially sanctioned, if enough officers feel sufficient pressure for results. However, such pressure did not appear to be universal.

We can contrast the above views with the following views which endorse the fact that majority of officers in the sample experienced very little pressure for results during their working lives. Indeed, some officers became notorious for their dislike of arresting people. One ex-officer said that,

"...I was once in on the 'Big Sitdown' with a friend of mine Paddy MacDowell...well known for not arresting anybody...Paddy said, "I don't like to arrest them"...anyhow, "Paddy", said the Superintendent, "That's the first arrest you've had in 6 months"...Paddy replied, "Superintendent. With all due respect, Sir, it's my first for a year"..." (V).

The same ex-officer spoke of another officer who was reluctant to arrest,

"...Donald Wilson...Nothing annoyed him more than when an arrest came on...Donald was totally embarrassed...he didn't like making arrests...he actually thought it was a rather vulgar business..." (V).

The majority of officers in the present research therefore appeared to experience no real pressure for arrests. Aides to CID (young officers who retained their uniform status but worked as CID apprentices) appeared to experience a much greater pressure to secure arrests and summonses than uniformed officers. In many ways, this is understandable and parallels can be drawn between being an aide to CID and the probationary period of the uniformed Constable but with the former being characterised by even more pressure. One ex-aide to CID claimed that,

"...I was aide to CID...but then you did have quotas. You had to get four crime arrests a month...minimum...And DS Cross, then, allowed you to carry two over to the following month...If you didn't keep your quota up for those two months you were out...that is a fact" (C).

Another ex-CID officer spoke of this pressure when he claimed,

"...CID and aide to CID...They were expected to get results...they had to get arrests or they weren't considered good enough. Sometimes you had to spend 2 or 3 years as aide to CID before they were made CID" (O).

Similarly, the pressure for results appeared to continue when an officer was promoted from aide to CID to CID officer. Such exertion of pressure on CID officers to get 'results' can cause bad police practice to occur. The following quote shows how 'gilding the lily' was sometimes undertaken by officers in an attempt to secure a conviction. One ex-CID officer said that,

"...With CID you'd have to get results...we'd be there...plain clothes...hanging around waiting for people up to no good...you know...people nicking from cars...well, we knew who they were...it was just getting them in the act...so we'd wait there...see one of them walking up and down the road peering through the car windows. Well, we'd always say, "Yeah...He was trying all the car handles"...but only to make it stand up...We knew they was on the make...We'd never, ever...and I can't stress this enough...we'd never do anyone who was innocent. We'd just stretch it enough to get a result..." (X).

Out of the eight interviewees who had experience of CID work, only one appeared not to have experienced pressure to gain 'results', although the attitude of a colleague appears to imply that significant numbers of arrests were the norm rather than the exception. He said that,

"...As far as CID was concerned...I've never known any pressure. At Nine Elms I went through a complete month without one arrest being made at that station by me, the uniform or the PC's...And the Detective Sergeant said, "Well Bob...What's the matter?" I said, "I'm not being bolshy or anything. It's just the fact that nothing's happened where we could arrest somebody..." (F).

It therefore appears that while less than half of the officers in the sample, both CID and uniform, appeared to be under some pressure to get 'results', there were others who were not. This prompts us to question which factors may possibly account for such variations in the pressure to secure 'results' in the Metropolitan Police. It may be the case that those areas which suffered from high crime rates were characterised by a greater amount of pressure on police officers. Another possible cause of pressure could have been middle-ranking officers who were chasing promotion and wanted the men beneath them to secure a large arrest rate.

Assuming that Reiner's assertion that there is pressure on all officers to gain 'results' is correct, we must therefore accept that the nature of such pressure on officers has changed in recent history. The present research indicates that the pressure was not universal in the period between the 1930s and the 1960s. Several factors could account for this differentiation. Officers were likely to experience different levels of pressure depending on their personal attributes, the stations at which they worked and the stage of their career. One explanation for the difference between Reiner's findings and those of the present research may originate in changes to the police since the 1960s as documented by Morgan and Newburn (1997) - namely that societal change has led directly to increased pressure upon officers.

2. Discretion

The present research found that the vast majority of officers who were interviewed acknowledged that there was a large amount of discretion amongst officers. Chan (1997) claimed that such police work, "...is characterised by wide

discretionary powers, low visibility and minimal supervision" (p.12). Similarly, Van Maanen (1983) wrote that, "...police agencies resemble symbolic or mock bureaucracies where only the appearance of control, not the reality, is of managerial concern" (p.277) thus signifying that the higher ranks of the police force may not wish the true extent of police discretion to be become commonly known. The job, by its very nature, allows a certain degree of flexibility. One ex-officer said that,

"...In the police job you can't lay down hard and fast rules. You can, of course, but I mean you can't abide by them because no two jobs are the same...you get different jobs, you get different people...they react differently. Generally speaking, it doesn't matter what regulations they've made...the individual PC would usually do what he thinks...I don't say it's right but they will usually place their interpretation upon it and do that...I hope that the time will never come when everyone works absolutely to law because I think that would be the ruin of the police..." (R).

The above quote appears to highlight a number of issues regarding police discretion. Police discretion is viewed as essential to police work because of the fact that, "no two jobs are the same" and you cannot predict how people will react in given situations. This implies that, to a certain extent, it is very hard for superior officers to control the actions of an officer on the street and that, ultimately, an officer in a situation will make up his or her own mind before acting and behave in accordance with their own reasoning. This attitude was justified by approximately half of the sample who said that policing can only work in such a way and that it is foolish to believe otherwise. In other words, discretion was viewed as facilitating the policing process.

The recollection of one ex-officer shows how it was possible to exercise discretion in a positive or benevolent way. The female ex-officer said,

"...I can remember taking a child home to stay the night in my house. This little child had run away from Wales and...she had to stay overnight

somewhere. Her father was going to meet her off the train from Paddington the next day and the only place of safety as they called them in those days was a remand home...And the remand home was full of these kids that were real tearaways and this was a naive little kid...and I didn't want to send her there...So I said to the Sergeant, 'I'm going to take her home'...The Sergeant said, 'You can't do that'...And I said, 'Well, she's got to go to a place of safety and I consider that if I take her home she'll be safer than in a remand home'...They frowned about that but I felt I was justified in doing that...well, it was just my concern that if we were meant to be looking after these kids...it wasn't sufficient just to take them off the streets and put them in a place that was going to be even worse for them. And that's where I felt we could use our discretion..." (L).

In the above situation, it appears that the officer weighed up the pros and cons of the situation and made a choice dictated by what she thought would benefit the child most. The fact that her decision was frowned upon by a senior officer and involved some inconvenience to the officer herself did not sway her judgement. In short, her use of discretion was informed not by her own needs but her view of the needs of a member of the public.

The second main use of discretion is where certain procedures are ignored, not to benefit or help members of the public but to save individual officers the time and bother of following official procedure. It must be noted, however, that this form of discretion only appeared to be applied to low level situations such as those involving drunks and minor motoring infringements and was employed only to make the job easier. One of the interviewees claimed that,

"...Well, we tended to pick up on acts which were done for the purpose and malicious. You see, dangerous driving and traffic and that sort of thing...You think, 'My God! That ought to be stopped'...But if it's a minor offence that someone's committed...then you obviously ignore it" (T).

The issue arises, therefore, that such discretion is affected by pressure for 'results' but is also tempered by the perceived 'seriousness' of an offence. Again, other factors may influence the decision to use such discretion - the amount of paperwork an arrest might entail, the wish to avoid possible physical confrontation or the perceived triviality of the offence. Such pressure can be seen as influencing the decision of whether or not to arrest an individual. For example, if such pressure is present an arrest might be made, if it is not an arrest might not be made. A small number of officers spoke of exercising this type of discretion when dealing with drunks. One interviewee claimed that,

"...where you have one station on one side of the road and another station on the other side of the road...depending on what the copper was at that side and the copper on this side...what used to happen was...if the copper on the other side didn't want a 'knock off' or didn't want to be inconvenienced by having to go to court and there was a drunk sleeping in a doorway...what you used to do was...you used to pick him up, walk him across and put him in the other bloke's doorway...and this fellow...then he'd pick him up...if he wanted a 'knock'...all well and good...if he didn't he'd pick him up and put him back..." (S).

Discretion might be used to make the working conditions of the officers more bearable. One ex-officer said,

"...Well, then we had the Church Army with about 600 beds, and then we had the Salvation Army with another 800 beds...so you always had trouble from the...you know...the meths drinkers...they'd drink meths and they wouldn't let them in and out... But, generally speaking, the meths drinkers...we wouldn't take them. They'd dump 'em round the back of a hoarding somewhere and let 'em sleep it off because a meths drinker, in those days, stinks something horrible. But, of course, every now and again you'd get the bright boys...they would bring them in and the blooming places would be filled up...Saturday night...What did we have?

Six cells...they'd all be filled up with drunks by 11 o'clock and...it stinks something horrible..." (R).

In the following quote, an ex-officer describes how the issue of self-preservation might influence the use of this type of discretion. He said,

"...I mean, it depends on your point of view but if you've got half an hour to go before you book off duty then do you want to get yourself tied up with some drunken guy who's spewed all over the road and threatened to assault you or whatever?...I mean, you've still got that physical violence thing...I mean, not every drunk is a cosy, comatose person...I mean, you'd arrest them for being drunk and they'd turn around and whack you one...so you would have that in mind...'Do I need this?'...'Do I want this?'..." (I).

The third major way in which discretion manifests itself is in unethical police behaviour. While the official attitude within the Metropolitan Police is that policing, in theory, is a clear cut endeavour with no room for ambiguity or partiality, in practice, police officers believe it is impossible to 'police by the book' as it fails to account for the vagaries of human encounters. The following quote demonstrates the use of this third type of discretion. For example,

"...Another important person is the magistrate's clerk...it's not been unknown really but, "So and so...we'd like him to be kept inside and there's plenty of room for him"..."Oh yes, Sir!"...It's as easy as that you see...There's nothing illegal against it, but it would be something that would help us considerably and the chap was absolutely bang to rights...but you see perhaps there was this one little thing...if he had a decent mouthpiece he could get bail. See, we didn't want this so we could make further enquiries. It may seem to you as an improper way...but it's done and it will always be done. It's the first thing that the ordinary police have got to realise. If you stick to the Marquis of Queensbury's Rules, like in boxing, there would hardly be anyone

97

arrested. There wouldn't really...I mean the criminals would have, more or less, a free hand..." (R).

Thus, the above quote shows how this third form of discretion could lead to police exhibiting forms of behaviour which might be described as un-ethical in order to ensure a desired outcome. This institutionalised discretion of the Metropolitan Police did not just lead to officers influencing key members of the criminal justice system but also to the seemingly arbitrary arrest of some individuals. For example, one ex-officer described how arrests could be made on the basis of factors other than an individual's propensity to break the law,

"...We used to get some right laughs in the charge room. I remember there was a woman...a prostitute...she used to be a chorus girl in the 'Blackbirds' and every time she was knocked off for being a prostitute the first thing she did was strip off. She'd strip right down naked and, of course, blokes never used to stop her. She used to strip off in the charge room...the police woman used to come in the matron's room and make her put her clothes back...and, of course, the blokes used to knock her off for the simple reason that when they got to the station she was gonna strip off..." (X).

Another officer noted how the pressure for 'results' could lead to arbitrary arrests in his journal. He wrote,

"...It was an unwritten law of the Chief Insp. or Sub-divisional Insp. that during this probationary period recruits should report to drivers and make at least one arrest each week. Owing to this rule, and my incredible shyness in the presence of others I was reported as TIMID, and a P.S. BLACK, one of the few kind men, was instructed to help me with an arrest, my first! a poor inoffensive beggar who pleaded guilty after I gave him 2 shillings!?..." (from the journal of Officer Z, p.10).

Police discretion appeared to be generally used to make their working lives easier. The use of discretion in such a way tended to secure one of two possible outcomes. Firstly, it appeared that police discretion was used to save individual officers the bother of having to arrest, for example, a meths drinker who would cause some degree of inconvenience for the officer. If, however, an officer felt the need to undertake such an arrest (perhaps to satisfy a quota) he or she might make the arrest but this decision would be informed, not by the benefit to the community of making the arrest, but by the benefits it would bring the officer in terms of decreasing the pressure upon them.

Discretion also served to give officers the choice of whether or not to indulge in unethical behaviour in an effort to secure a desired outcome (for example, an arrest or a refusal for a bail application). Unethical behaviour, however, does not restrict itself purely to achieving goals within the criminal justice system, it can also be used to satisfy the baser instincts of some officers as is shown by the above example regarding the regular arrest of the chorus girl.

This issue of police discretion (especially among beat officers) is neatly summarised by the dichotomy between, on the one hand, a theoretical (and legalistic) approach and, on the other, what officers see as a practical approach. The latter stresses that the complex array of issues that confront police officers necessitate a reliance on the use of common sense. Exercising influence on the magistrate's clerk is merely one example of the latter and the problem of discretion largely revolves around this on-going struggle between two incompatible paradigms. The legalistic (and theoretical) paradigm is built upon two assumptions. The first is that the law is both infallible and capable of being uniformly applied, and the second is that human behaviour is predictable and unchanging and has been anticipated by such laws. The competing paradigm claims that justice is negotiable and it has to be so because of the variety of contexts within which infringements of the law may occur.

3. Common Sense

Reiner (1992) addressed the issue of pragmatism amongst officers and how this made many of them adopt a common sense outlook. He claimed that, traditionally, police officers are,

"...concerned to get from here to tomorrow (or the next hour) safely and with the least fuss and paperwork. This makes them reluctant to contemplate innovation, experiment or research" (1992, p.128).

When asked what qualities made a good police officer, over half of the interviewees in the present research responded by saying that common sense was essential. This pragmatic approach may, in part, be accounted for by virtue of the fact that large amounts of discretion are utilised by the average beat officer. For example,

"...I think the first thing is common sense...I think common sense practically sums it all up because there are certain things you could see are wrong but it's not harming anyone, it's not harming the public as a whole so no good purpose is served in bringing it to notice" (R).

Another officer repeated the same view,

"...I think you had to have a lot of common sense 'cos I'm a great believer in not using a rule book as a sort of firm line you can't deviate from...I'm a great believer in working according to circumstances and I think that you had to be quite firm but you had to be understanding" (L).

One spoke of the how the 'outsiders' perception of police work was, perhaps, unrealistic, "...people are cagey about telling newcomers too much about the job...revealing too much of the mystique...and then they find there's no mystique about it at all...it's all quite common-sense" (P). Apparently central to this idea of common sense being vital to the police officer is that it cannot be taught at training school and that it is picked up through policing. For example,

"Common sense is a factor that often gets mooted...and if you don't have it...you very quickly acquire it, I think, because it's one of those things that's almost indefinable, isn't it?" (I).

Common sense can, therefore, be viewed as an important correlate of police culture because officers perceive it as a vital attribute yet it is something that cannot be taught.

4. General Discipline

The general discipline of police officers is scarcely a new issue and Emsley (1996) gives examples of concern regarding 'police brutality and impartiality' (p.69) from as early as the 1880s. Discipline in the Metropolitan Force in the 1930s appeared to be considerably stricter than in the period directly after the War when, about two thirds of the sample agreed, discipline seemed less rigorous. Many of the offences for which officers could be disciplined appear to be somewhat trivial. One ex-officer said that,

"...I've known the occasion when station officers...if they knew that the Guv'nor was on his way...would whip their spectacles off and put them in their pocket because they knew damn well that he would send them for an eye test and they would get chucked out...which was a bit ridiculous...but that's the way it used to be..." (T).

The same ex-officer continued by saying that,

"...discipline was very severe...indeed...you'd be on the report or you'd be fined a couple of days pay or four days pay for doing silly things. It was even an offence to...what under the old discipline code was 'idling and gossiping'..." (T).

There does, however, appear to be some variation between police stations in the amount of rigour with which some regulations were enforced. One factor which

might help explain some such variation is put forward by the same officer. He said,

"...But if an Inspector or a Sergeant...if they were looking for promotion the first thing they got asked on the promotion board was, "How many defaulters have you had?"...And if they hadn't had any defaulters then they weren't promoted..." (T).

Not all Inspectors and Sergeants were as motivated by career advancement as the one described in the above quote and for those. Indeed, older Inspectors or Sergeants who were coming towards the end of their service might have had different ideas with regard to discipline. For example,

"...Well, it depended...If a Sergeant or an Inspector was getting towards the end of his service and he just wanted a comfortable ride and he wanted the blokes, sort of, to work with him...discipline wouldn't be enforced as it would if a chap came on promotion...you see...he'd want to make a name for himself..." (R).

Another possible explanation of variations in the enforcement of discipline merely came down to the various personalities of superior officers. Another interviewee claimed that, "...there again you could get Inspectors that were absolute so and so's and others that weren't so bad...It did vary...The only thing is...like a lot of disciplinary regulations...they're made to be broken..." (A).

The present research did not uncover a great amount of evidence regarding general discipline between the 1930s and the 1960s and most of the above quotes are from ex-officers who served in the 1930s and 1940s. This might suggest that this particular period was characterised by a more rigid form of discipline than the later years being investigated.

5. Attitude of Older Officers

After passing out from Peel House, all new recruits were sent on to division for the first time. There they would spend their two-year probationary period which would usually start with 'learning beats'. This consisted of spending a week or two with an elderly PC 'learning the ropes' and carefully (and sometimes not so carefully) being socialised into the ways of the police. Generally, it appeared that these older officers regarded such 'puppy walking' as a chore as the following officer soon discovered,

"...you're sent out with an 'alleged' experienced officer...well, of course, what would happen...they'd say, "186...Go with so and so"...and you'd hear a groan or moan go up at the back. And it'd be some old boy who was on his last legs...and he'd always have somewhere he could hide away and pass his time, you know, as conveniently as possible..." (R).

Seven of the officers in the present sample spoke of a primary objection of many of the older officers to the young recruits as being that it was regarded as an unnecessary complication to their daily routines. This especially seemed to be the case if some of those routines were of the type that would be frowned upon by superior officers. For example,

"...you were walked out by someone who didn't really want you...for the simple reason you get under his feet...if he wanted to go round Clark's Bakeries and have a cup of tea with a girl like he always did at 11 o'clock he didn't feel he ought to do it if he had you with him..." (D).

A third possible reason for disliking or distrusting new recruits, especially during the 1930s, was that older officers thought that they may be members of the 'Rubber Heel Squad' (a group which will be investigated in much greater depth later in the chapter). Such 'Rubber Heelers' were police officers who were detailed to spy upon other officers for signs of corruption or malpractice.

The apparently ingrained resentment of older officers towards young recruits appeared to increase in the more far-flung corners of the Metropolitan boroughs. One interviewee who served in Kenley explained,

"...I was much younger than any of the chaps there because, from training school, the usual thing was to post probationers to inner divisions to give them a better idea of policing...and so I was insistent on coming here or leaving the job...so I was a younger man...compared with all the others...they were older men and the older men were sent to outer divisions...where they could kind of find somewhere for their impending retirement...I was a young man of 28 and they didn't like the idea of me coming out to an old man's place...but I think it was general anywhere that the old coppers, the established coppers, weren't very keen on telling you where they got their cups of tea from, the cafe's, and so on...unless you'd proved yourself...I suppose in case you were a liability...people are cagey about telling newcomers too much about the job...revealing too much of the mystique...and then they find there's no mystique about it at all...it's all quite common sense..." (P).

This intolerance displayed towards the younger officers by the older ones, although not universal, was referred to by over half of the sample and is articulated well by the following interviewee who said,

"...given that they were, in the main, if you like, of my father's generation...some of them were very fatherly and paternal...but, in the main, most of them were miserable old sods...and they would make life as difficult for you as they could and it was deemed to be part of the initiation...you know, don't help people and ease them into the system...make it as difficult as you can..." (I).

That is not to say that the older officers did not pass on some relevant knowledge to the new recruits. The most important trade secret of police work between the 1930s and the 1960s was that there was a right way and a wrong

way of performing a given task and that the right way was not always the official or taught way. The following ex-officer recounted an important lesson he learned concerning the writing of reports,

"...But, of course, most of the Sergeants were...well I would say...not very educated...you used to take a report in and they would look at it and they'd cross things out...So you'd say, "Well...what's that for?" They'd say, "Well...you don't want that...you don't want that"...You'd say, "Well, that's what you're taught at Peel House"...Then they'd say, "Forget all you learned in Peel House. This is how you make a report..."...And, eventually, you would know the way you would want it...But there was so many little things you had to pick up...it wouldn't seem possible. You had to pick it up as you went along..." (R).

The attitude of older officers to younger officers may, in some respects, be compared to those of older members of any number of other occupations. That is, those who are experienced in a certain trade might view with mixed emotions the influx of any newcomer to their speciality. However, policing differed from this norm in several respects. Policing is an occupation which officers believe cannot be 'taught' in the conventional meaning of the word. One can ingest the unofficial codes of conduct but one cannot 'teach' a new recruit that most important possession of all officers - common sense. Paradoxically, it might appear to be the case that older officers were loathe to have to admit to the new recruits that there was no real 'mystique' about police work and that, ultimately, an inherent common sense was the main requirement of the occupation. The importance for officers to display a pragmatic nature was addressed by Chan (1997) when she wrote, "...decisions are based on experience, common sense and discretion...Decisions can only be justified situationally" (p.79).

6. Camaraderie

Skolnick (1994) stressed the importance of the linked concepts of camaraderie, social solidarity and social isolation in explaining the dynamics of the police relationship with the public. To begin with it may be of use to differentiate

between the three. For the purpose of this research, I have taken camaraderie to refer to that bonding between officers which exists exclusively during the course of work, that is, when officers are at work together. This needs to be set apart from social solidarity which refers to that bonding between officers which arises (or which is sustained) outside of the work environment, for example, during their leisure time. We must, however, at all times remain aware of the fact that these two concepts are inextricably linked and that each plays a great part in sustaining the other. Social isolation, on the other hand, refers to that isolation from members of the general public which helps provide the foundations for both camaraderie and social solidarity.

All of the ex-officers who were interviewed, apart from one, commented on the great levels of camaraderie that they claimed to have experienced within the Metropolitan police force. Several also appeared to view their own career as being during a 'Golden Age' of policing when there was significantly greater levels of camaraderie than in the present day. For example,

"...and that was one thing that I found in the police...the camaraderie when I was in the police was absolutely a hundred per cent. You depended on the blokes you was with...you had no worries about that at all...but that's gone today..." (X).

Similarly, "...the feeling within it was marvellous really and I think that's probably something that's been lost..." (A). It appears that high levels of camaraderie were maintained before World War II because of the fact that officers tended to come from outside the immediate Metropolitan area. This meant people from all over the United Kingdom were put together in austere surroundings (i.e. Peel House) and had to make the best of the situation. Furthermore, in the immediate post War period, the culture of camaraderie probably became even more ingrained into the Metropolitan Police because many recruits were, by virtue of national service, used to living in close quarters with others. Another factor which may have led to high levels of camaraderie amongst new recruits was that at this time the police force was still viewed as a

predominantly working-class occupation – a point made by five of the ex-officers. As one ex-officer attests,

"...I found it the same as when I first joined the RAF...we were from all over the place and we were all in the same boat and we were all with a like mind...same as the police..." (P).

Similarly,

"...When I joined almost everybody...had come out of the services...therefore they were all used to living together and the other big difference I think is...it was fundamentally a working class occupation...and I think this did affect the camaraderie...I think there was a *esprit de corps* which...of course...as in any organisation always leads the other way as well with people sticking together when they shouldn't..." (V).

This last quote highlights two other crucial factors pertaining to police camaraderie. Firstly, it acknowledges the fact that the camaraderie of the police might have largely been due to the fact that the majority police recruits came from traditional working class backgrounds. Secondly, the above quote acknowledges the fact that camaraderie can and does, on occasion, lead to police wrong-doing or malpractice.

Another interviewee, however, implies that if an officer suspected a colleague of failing to adhere by the informal code of conduct they would not stand by them. He claimed that, "...The camaraderie was very, very, good...you backed each other up except if you suspected someone of doing something wrong...then it was a different matter..." (M). Already, therefore, we are coming across the problem of what actually constitutes the boundaries to police camaraderie. It is probably sensible to state that it does appear to depend on the particular individuals involved. So, for instance, one officer might tolerate a colleague's malpractice whereas another might not.

Camaraderie, however, is not unconditional and is subject to certain limiting factors. There is some evidence to suggest that camaraderie (and, therefore, social solidarity) did not always occur between ranks. One ex-officer suggested that intra-rank camaraderie could not always be taken for granted when he said, "...There was keen rivalry between Sergeants as to who was going to get promoted..." (G). This suggestion of a lack of intra-rank camaraderie was also supported by another interviewee who claimed that,

"...When I went from Constable to Sergeant I was sent to Notting Hill...there were 12 Sergeants there. It was a very busy place and not all of them, but most of them, were very unpleasant...I had to rely on the...older men and they were very, very, unpleasant...there's no doubt about that...I had many times crying my blinking eyes out, nearly, at home...The only good help I had was help from the Constables..." (Z).

Due to the demographic make-up of the sample, all the examples of intra-rank friction seem to be regarding problems between individuals holding the ranks of Constable and Sergeant. Skolnick (1994) saw the inherent potential danger of police work as being instrumental in explaining the camaraderie between officers and it may be the case that higher ranks within the police force experience less camaraderie as a result of not longer being involved in 'street' policing where the dangers are greatest. Another related factor might be that there is a lesser need for teamwork the higher up the ranks an officer progresses.

Camaraderie within the police is also affected by officers' perceptions of the 'loner'. Such a person did not provide other officers with the security or trust that they deemed necessary to work as an efficient team. One ex-officer claimed that, "...it's like any other group of people...there was always the odd bod. We had odd bods...guys who didn't really socialise or meet..." (E). Similarly, another ex-officer explained police camaraderie as being similar to military camaraderie when he claimed, "...Well, it was like a mess...but there again you had your loners obviously..." (H).

The issue of police camaraderie tends to become somewhat clouded when investigating CID. CID officers' role differed from that of uniformed officers and this was reflected in their working patterns. Unlike uniformed officers they did not walk beats nor did they adhere to rigid timetables (some of the older interviewees had to call in at precise times from police boxes situated on their beats). Their work tended to be unsupervised and was undertaken alone or in pairs. This freedom appears to have led to a greater autonomy amongst CID officers than uniformed officers and, therefore, less camaraderie. One ex-CID officer claimed that, "...mainly you were doing your own job so you weren't as reliant on the others so much...it's not as if you were going out in twos and threes or anything..." (F). Another ex-CID officer did acknowledge the presence of camaraderie, but showed how it could be limited by operational practices, "...In the CID you worked as a pair...we worked well as a team...but that was camaraderie of a pair..." (C).

Only one of the ex-CID officers, when interviewed, appeared to view CID as having widespread camaraderie. He said,

"...as far as the CID was concerned...it's the best club in the world...I'll just pose this question to you...What other occupation or work do you know that you could pick up your phone in the office...I could pick up my phone and look up the telephone number of, say, Rotherham CID. I could ring them up and say who I am and say "I've got a warrant down here for Bertie Bloggs who lives at 43 so and so and so and so. Can you go and nick him for me and give us a ring"...put the phone down and forget about it because it's done...There's no if's and buts...It's instantaneous camaraderie...At least they know that if the whole world out there hates them they can pick up the phone and speak to someone in Strathclyde...and he'll love them!..." (D).

The above quote might, however, be seen as reinforcing the idea of the CID officer as isolated. The interviewee appears to be construing the concept of

109

camaraderie in a different way from the other two interviewees. He views it in terms of the willingness of similar ranking officers in other parts of the country to assist when needed rather than viewing camaraderie as a mechanism for easing day-to-day work.

It seems generally accepted that CID did not experience the same levels of camaraderie as the uniformed branch or that, if it did, this camaraderie was of a different nature because of their different working methods. For example, CID officers may have experienced a more limited form of camaraderie in that they may have only had a close bond with their particular CID partner and not with the rest of the CID officers. It is also true to say that there often appeared to be little camaraderie between the CID and the uniform branches and this shall be investigated later on in this chapter.

Camaraderie, therefore, may be viewed as an important feature of police work for those uniformed officers working the streets, although it perhaps deserves more research and analysis than it has previously been subjected to. We have to be aware that the camaraderie is, however, open to inter-rank differentiation and is not present to a high degree amongst all groups of officers. Organisational differences and differences between individuals lead to the emergence of both inter-rank and intra-rank hostility as well as the presence of 'loners' who appear not to adhere to the norm of camaraderie.

At first glance, it might appear that such differentiation in camaraderie between groups is dysfunctional. However, it might be the case that camaraderie only serves a purpose at certain levels of police work like, for example, beat work where the potential for dangerous situations to arise necessitates high levels of teamwork. This may be contrasted, however, with CID or plain clothes work which may encourage more individuality than perhaps the uniform culture has to offer due to its more flexible working patterns.

7. Social Solidarity

Social solidarity is used in this chapter to refer to that camaraderie which over spills into officers' leisure time, that is, the propensity of officers to engage in social pursuits with their work colleagues. The pressures of the job and its associated social isolation inevitably tend to lead towards higher than normal levels of social solidarity (Skolnick, 1994), and this is shown by the interviewee who claimed,

"...we used to go out on trips. I mean, we hired a whole train to go to Yarmouth races and that sort of thing...all policemen...The socialising today is not quite as strong but with us it was very strong...Of course, the basis of the sports clubs in the Metropolitan area were, of course, as a result of the 1926 General Strike when *The Times* newspaper raised funds in appreciation of what the police had done during the General Strike...and that money started the social clubs..." (U).

Another interviewee claimed that,

"...Oh yes...you stuck together outside of work...the social life was very varied...different divisions had different things but generally they had dances and things...funnily enough, I used to be a social secretary for these things...I've always said about coppers that if you provide them with taxis to take them, give 'em a fiver to spend, and let them in free...and they'll condescend to come!..." (O).

The last sentence of the above quote could be viewed, by some, as being an indication of a lack of social solidarity amongst police officers. However, in this case it could be that the ex-officer is saying more about the cynicism of the police.

Despite the fact that most of the ex-officers who were interviewed described high levels of solidarity, one described a situation which pointed to the existence of intra-rank but not inter-rank solidarity. He said,

"...if you went to a function...I used to go to the police dances with my girlfriend who became my wife...and there'd be the Inspectors in one corner, the Sergeants in another corner, and the hoi polloi in another...There was no interplay at all...none whatsoever..." (G).

The wives of two members of the sample were reported as finding the social solidarity of the police too stifling. For example,

"...if my wife was still alive she'd have told you that...She said, "All our social life is centred around the job". Although I've got many friends...still got 'em...you know, outside....everything was there...You had the athletic club, you had different clubs, you had Inver Court...We had our own club...terrific...it was absolutely great...I still miss it..." (K).

It was not always just police officer's partners who found this social solidarity stifling. For instance,

"...Again, in those early days of mine...people generally didn't buy their own homes so you ended up going into police accommodation...so you had great blocks of flats or rows of houses that were police houses and you'd see dozens of blue shirts hanging out to dry so you very much had that kind of...almost like a barrack kind of thing...and the wives, I think, suffered a bit too...I was quite set in my own mind that I was not going into police quarters so my wife and I rented a couple of rooms and saved up and we bought a house..." (I).

Generally, however, well over half of the ex-officers interviewed for this research appeared to be very content with the generally high levels of both camaraderie and social solidarity but, for one in particular, the entire police ethos appeared to have become too much. As he explained,

"...But by about 1960 I was feeling the intellectual ghetto state of the police rather acutely and my own interests were extending and so forth...and not having friends outside...and not perhaps too many inside...and I think this happened to other coppers...and sometimes it can be a very acute problem where the chap has to leave..." (V).

The majority of interviewees, however, appeared to view the social solidarity of the Metropolitan Force in positive terms as, for many of them, it provided a secure social life for them.

8. Social Isolation

The large degrees of both camaraderie and social solidarity within the police force are, at the same time, both causes and effects of the social isolation they experience. The term 'social isolation' is used to refer to the isolation police officers feel from the public at large, that is, persons from outside the police.

For the majority of Metropolitan Police Force recruits, the social isolation appeared to begin first at Peel House. Police recruits found that the intensity of the training period left them with little or no time to engage in non-police pursuits and, because all recruits to the Metropolitan Police had to be single, the great majority of their time was monopolised either by the police force or by other officers. Indeed, recruits were dissuaded from maintaining relationships with people from outside the force. One interviewee claimed,

"...Well, we certainly weren't encouraged to mix with Joe Public...we tended to be 100 % police officers...we'd go out drinking, playing snooker together...I mean, I even married a copper's daughter..." (X).

In some cases, it appears that young recruits were discouraged from contact with members of the public in a very direct way by their superior officers. For example, "...You didn't have time to have a lot of contact with the public and one of the things you were told was, "You've got no friends from now on"...." (B). This constraint of recruits' relationships with the public can be viewed as

having two functions. First, it was a means of ensuring that individual officers would treat all members of the public in an unbiased way and therefore make police dealings with the public unhindered by personal favour or prejudice. The second function may be viewed as a means of fostering camaraderie amongst the officers.

It is debatable whether or not the police really needed to instigate such control over the social lives of their recruits because it was sometimes the case that the public themselves did not want to mix with police officers. One interviewee provides a fascinating account of the social isolation of the police force and how it impacted upon the officer's existing friendships and relationships.

"...I celebrated my 21st birthday on April the 19th...a month after Peel House. We invited 87 people, my mother and I did, to my birthday party on the Saturday. On the Saturday morning I got my 86th refusal...Does that tell you anything?...All my friends...alleged friends...because I'd just joined the force. So you know what I did? I phoned up Peel House...we had the men's section, Notting Hill Gate had the women's police section house there and we got...23 females and 24 coppers...great night and then I had the pleasure of going around...'cos I got posted back to Richmond and I'm CID...and I collected quite a few of my ex-friends and the first one I had to do was collect my old headmaster...he'd caned somebody and they'd taken a section 47 assault out on him..." (C).

The social isolation experienced by the majority of the sample was probably also contributed to by the long hours which they often worked. The fact that officers' hours were both unpredictable and unsociable meant that it was easy for them to lose touch with friends who worked in occupations with more structured hours. One ex-WPC commented that, "...you were on duty 24 hours a day...I mean, when I got into the CID in 1950...I could leave home at twenty to eight in the morning and not get home 'til ten o'clock at night..." (J). Similarly,

"...My wife was working and we had no family at the time when we started. When I started there the usual shift was sort of nine 'til one and then six 'til ten but they also wanted someone in the afternoon so as a result...I had no reason to go home...and so I was working an 80 hour week..." (F).

The social isolation which appears to have been experienced by police officers can be seen as being directly related to the other factors of camaraderie and social solidarity. These two categories cover all the major factors forwarded by the interviewees as to why they felt stigmatised from the public at large - from the long and often unsociable hours spent policing to the lack of interaction with members of the public in a non-professional context. Social isolation, although often seen as a negative factor, can be viewed as crucial to the police force in many respects. Realistically, members of the public and members of the police service are dissimilar and rarely share the same status. The police are either serving the public or exercising the power of their authority over the public and the two groups rarely if ever find themselves in equilibrium. Police isolation sustains this necessary disparity.

9. Attitudes to Policewomen The Role of the Policewoman

The police force has long been viewed as a distinctly male occupation and the study of females within the force is a topic of major interest. Between the 1930s and the 1960s the number of women employed within the Metropolitan Force increased, although their role was under-developed compared to that enjoyed by today's female officers. According to Howgrave-Graham (1947) even at the height of World War II the number of female Constables employed by the Metropolitan Force did not exceed 152.

Male officers' attitudes towards women police officers have been documented in the existing literature (see Smith and Gray, 1983, Jones, 1986, & Heidensohn, 1992). The general prejudice among male officers which was noted in the literature was evident in the sample.

One ex-WPC said,

"...I felt the women's role was more community-based...we had to deal with women and children...they didn't want us directing traffic, they didn't want us dealing with the men's jobs...so, yes, our role was very different to the men, really, and, although we shared the same canteens and we would meet and talk together in our lunch breaks, we still sort of worked fairly separate to them" (L).

One ex-PC said that, "...I suppose it sounds wrong but I don't think we looked upon them as being capable...or physically capable of doing things out on the street..."(A).

Female uniformed officers between the 1930s and the 1960s can be viewed as having a markedly reduced role compared to male officers. The decision to make female officers deal with women and children freed up male officers to deal with what at the time was considered 'proper police work'. In essence, therefore, the introduction of females to the police force in the first half of the 20th century may be viewed as a means of hiving off some aspects of the service role of police work to another group (see Heidensohn, 1992). However, as an example later in this chapter will show, on at least one occasion female officers were utilised by the Rubber Heel Squad.

Despite the fact that there was a marked segregation of role between the male and the female officers, many of the former appeared to hold distinct prejudices against the latter. One ex-WPC said,

"...We were bussed down to Peel House every morning...We were treated fine by the chaps in the class, there was good camaraderie, but the change came when we actually went out working on division. The older men...they said, "Go off and do something useful like nursing"..." (L).

Similarly,

"...Well...I can sum it up really...I think the younger men who'd been in the services were more...were happier with women police. They understood them better, and they accepted them..." (W).

Female officers appeared to be frowned upon by some male officers for a number of reasons. Male officers serving between the 1930s and the 1960s may have not have been particularly receptive to notions of gender equality. Similarly, the introduction of female officers may have signified too much of a change to the existing order for some officers and therefore created suspicion. The above quote points to the possibility that such an attitude may have been more prevalent amongst officers who joined in the 1930s rather than the 1940s or the 1950s. Thus, a number of factors may serve to explain resistance to female officers between the 1930s and the 1960s. More fundamentally, however, the objection may have been that male officers perceived the introduction of female officers as an attack on the machismo of the occupation. For example,

"...you'd be in the canteen...six blokes or so...talking about this or that football team or what not...or about a couple of birds...a lady copper would come in and there'd be silence...the public never respected us after they brought them in...call me chauvinist but...you see, policing used to have a machismo thing about it...blokes together...that type of thing..." (X).

It may be the case, however, that by the 1960s some male officers were more prepared to respect their female colleagues. One male interviewee said,

"...To begin with...they were received with extreme caution because if you put a WPC out you've got to have a male officer with them initially and in a fight situation you were handicapped...or appeared to be handicapped. It took a long time to realise that women could be as

efficient, as ruthless, as downright devious as the male officer...they could hold their own..." (C).

Those male officers who professed admiration or respect for female officers tended to applaud them for displaying stereotypically male rather than stereotypically female behaviour. For example, "...those girls...as I remember were very capable kind of girls...you know, they weren't silly nilly delicate things...they were really manly in a way..." (S). Similarly, "...before the War we had some very 'tough'...I think is the word...policewomen and they had quite a lot of fighting on their own amongst the women..." (Z). Another officer said that,

"...some of the CID women were mustard...really good. And a few uniform ones I've met...Sheila Forbes...back to back I'd take her against any male any time you like...She was six foot two...her party trick was to pick up a Solo with two hands...a Solo motorcycle..." (C).

Generally, it appears that the introduction of policewomen into the Metropolitan Force was met with only limited resistance and that was reported as coming predominantly from older officers. That the role of the WPC was markedly different from that of the PC probably did much to reduce resistance: female officers dealt mainly with women and children and were not allowed to walk beats unaccompanied. In other words, therefore, female officers were not seen as a threat to male officers as their roles were fundamentally different. However, it was not unknown, on occasions, for male officers to display sexist behaviour against their female colleagues. One ex-WPC said that, "...They [male officers] were larking about one day...they wanted to put the station stamp on my stomach..." (L).

Smith and Gray (1983) found evidence of this practice as an initiation for newly arrived WPC's at police stations in the Metropolitan area and saw this as symbolic of the male officers' perception of female officers as their 'property'. It

is, however, quite hard to draw definite conclusions on the real extent of sexist behaviour from this information.

10. Attitudes to Women in General

Despite the conditional acceptance of female officers, approximately half of the male officers in the present research appeared to hold sexist views of female members of the public. This was reflected at both organisational and individual levels. At an organisational level, as has been mentioned, Officer H showed how officers who became embroiled in 'domestics' could be punished for their actions. At a more individual level, the fact that male officers tended to have a limited contact with females apparently narrowed their view of women. It would perhaps be fair to say that police officers often reflected the biases and prejudices of the times in which they lived and, in many cases, they exhibited behaviour which may be considered as sexist by today's standards. For example, earlier in the chapter an incident was referred to by a male officer in which a chorus girl would be arrested purely because she would, without fail, perform an impromptu striptease in the charge room. Several of the male interviewees appeared to view women, in general, in such sexist ways. One male interviewee said,

"...We had to work late turn and late turn for a single man was a write-off, your social life was gone, so what we used to do at Golders Green there, living over the nick, one of the lads bought a Ford V8 Pilot which was some car...it had a 3 or 4 litre engine, it was big and it pulled, shall we say...we used to sit outside...we used to come off late turn at 10 o'clock, have a shower, get changed, jump in this Ford Pilot and just sit outside the coffee bars and wait for the girls to come out and, many an evening,...we'd literally flash the warrant cards and say, "Would you like a lift home girls?"...It very seldom failed..." (E).

Male attitudes towards women could also manifest themselves in callous statements regarding prostitutes. One ex-officer, whilst talking about the danger faced by prostitutes, stated that, "...I couldn't care two hoots if some tom gets

murdered...doesn't affect me does it?..." (G). At the same time, even female police officers were capable of displaying unsympathetic attitudes to female victims of crime. One ex-WPC who served between 1947 and 1967 claimed, "...if somebody said, "Rape!"...in those days I'm afraid we didn't believe them..." (J).

Similarly, it appears that inappropriate behaviours could also be directed against female prisoners. One ex-officer's journal noted that,

> "...I remember once or twice working as a gaoler with a well known Inspector when a dreadful negress was brought in and I took her "dabs". This Inspector would take her to the filthy cells where he dismissed the matron for 1/2 an hour!?..." (from the journal of Officer Z, p.16).

It is impossible to know exactly what took place in the cell in the above extract. However, the fact that the Inspector dismissed the matron so he could be alone with the prisoner does suggest that some illegal act may have taken place. Generally, however, attitudes of both male and female officers towards female members of the public were often unsympathetic with male officers viewing young women as sex objects and there appearing to be a general reluctance to address seriously the issue of sexual crime.

11. Attitudes to Ethnic Minority Groups Relations with Ethnic Minority Groups

Throughout its history, the Metropolitan Police has had a problematic relationship with minority groups and racism has been a perennial problem. Both academic and media concern in the 1990s has predominantly been centred upon police relations with people of Afro-Caribbean descent, yet the Irish population of London have also been a target for the xenophobic tendencies of individual officers who viewed them as both drunken and violent. For example,

"...there was a very large contingent of Irish around Paddington and most of the fights and violence...there were 4 Irish clubs in Paddington sub-division..." (A).

Another interviewee claimed that,

"...We had Cricklewood with a large Irish population as part of our territory so we used to have regular fights over there. There used to be a pub on Cricklewood Broadway...I think it was the Crown...and they actually had a police box at the end of their forecourt and the favourite game on a Friday and Saturday for the Irish guys was to pick up the phone in the police box and say they were just being assaulted by 20 people and could we come and help. Basically, when we got there in the cars and the van and whatever we'd find them all out on the forecourt applauding...so we could never give that a miss so we'd get out of the van and give 'em a thump anyway. So, I mean we had that kind of fun..." (E).

The above quote describes an incident of police violence instigated by an attempt to wind up the police by Irish individuals and is of concern for two reasons. Firstly, such an incident was seen as a legitimate excuse for the use of police force and, secondly, the incident was viewed as fun, a point which appears to coincide with the views of some officers interviewed for the PSI study (1983).

As soon as Afro-Caribbeans began to establish themselves in large communities within the Metropolitan area they appeared to become the main target for any xenophobia amongst police officers. One ex-officer said,

"...House break-ins...stolen goods...around Paddington you got A.B.H.'s 'cos you had an Irish element and a coloured element...and they didn't mix. Obviously, you had Irish pubs and you had coloured pubs and if

they turned out at the same time it was...World War 3 started on a Saturday night..." (C).

The above quote appears to imply that police officers viewed Afro-Caribbean people in the same way they viewed Irish people. Both were seen by officers as not mixing outside of their own social group (implied by the fact that there were 'Irish pubs' and 'coloured pubs') and as being violent and therefore explaining violent public incidents in the area. At the same time, both groups were viewed as antagonistic to each other which, to the police, could be viewed as further proof of their uncivilised nature. The fact that both groups were seen as 'troublemakers' implies that the police role was one of peacekeepers in the midst of threatened anarchy and this may have been used to justify any heavy-handed policing that took place.

At the same time Afro-Caribbeans were viewed as being over-sensitive and being 'thin-skinned' by a number of interviewees. Much literature (for example, Smith and Gray, 1983, and Skolnick ,1994, & Walker, 1987) points towards the fact that police officers exert a disproportionate amount of their attention to the activities of young, black, males. However, any questioning of the actions of the police by members of black communities tended to be explained away in terms of the 'thin-skinned' or 'sensitive' nature of ethnic minorities. The first of the following quotes also disparages two of the main mechanisms of accountability with which members of ethnic minorities could pursue allegations of racism. This implies that some officers, at least, may believe that such individuals should not be granted avenues of redress against police behaviour which might be deemed racist. One ex-officer said,

"...I'll tell you the worst thing that ever happened was the complaints authority, the Police Complaints Authority...it's like the Race Relations Board...they make mountains out of molehills...Why are our ethnic cousins so thin-skinned?..." (G).

Similarly,

"...I mean, today, you get a young West Indian knocked off, say, at Stoke Newington police station for cannabis...drugs...he's knocked off by a young copper for possessing drugs and he's taken to the station. Within ten minutes you've got half the West Indian community of Stoke Newington outside the station..." (X).

Another stereotype invoked by one ex-officer was that which views Afro-Caribbeans as being more likely than whites to perpetrate crimes of a sexual nature. He claimed that,

"...Blacks are the fly in the ointment...I had nine cases of child sexual assaults while I was in the job...they were called U.C.K.'s in those days...unlawful carnal knowledge...all but one were Black...it's all about Black Power..." (B).

One white ex-officer who asked for a transfer experienced the racism of a higher ranking officer who berated the officer in question for having a relationship with a black woman. The interviewee said,

"...The laugh was that the Superintendent or whatever he was...said, "I know why you want to go there...'cos your coloured"...which is a great sin..."mistress lives there"...I said, "My coloured girlfriend happens to live, sir, in White City Estate"...I just had enough guts to say that..." (V).

While the Irish and the Afro-Caribbeans seemed to be the main target for racist sentiments or behaviours, one officer claimed that members of the Jewish community enjoyed a relatively close relationship with the police. The ex-officer claimed,

"...One remembers a slight amount of anti-Semitism, generally, but nothing too terrible...the relationships were good. I think, probably, the

Jewish population were very pleased to have you there...very pleased for what you were doing..." (E).

Although the above quote is an isolated one there is some evidence to suggest that there was quite a close bond between the police and Jewish communities. Temple (1995) wrote,

"Many officers were not only genuinely free from pro-Fascist sympathies but were concerned enough about the disruptive impact of the BUF on the East End to press for the use of the Public Order Act to ban political demonstrations in the area" (p. 43).

12. Complaints against the Police

Between the 1930s and the 1960s complaints against the police were, according to the interviewees, infrequent and generally trivial in nature. Amongst the public there seemed an unwillingness to make complaints against the police and there appear to be a number of reasons to explain this. One interviewee stated that,

"...You didn't get a lot of complaints against the police because, in those days, people thought that it was a waste of time...in those days what a policeman said was right..." (X).

One might also suggest that through the above officer's use of language he himself believed that police status guaranteed integrity. Another ex-officer commented that, "...in the old days, coppers could rely on bluffing...they knew more law than anybody else did...and if you told somebody something they would believe that was right..." (P).

This second view differs slightly from the former in that there is no assumption that the officer is always right. The above ex-officer believed that merely by being seen to have a greater knowledge of the law than the public meant that an officer could mislead someone and that the individual would automatically assume that they were being treated in a just manner. Such an assumption

relies, however, as the above officer claims on the public believing that the police have a greater knowledge of the law than they do.

The above two quotes suggest three particular factors which inhibited members of the public from making complaints against the police. Firstly, there appeared to be a generally held assumption that the police were right. Secondly, there was an assumption that the public would believe them to be right. Thirdly, the public were largely unaware of mechanisms of police accountability and complaint procedures and this really only began to change with the creation of section 49 of the Police Act 1964 which created a more structured complaints procedure. These factors, it must be noted, can be viewed as decreasing in their effect proportionally to any increase, amongst members of the public, in the knowledge of law.

On the occasions when complaints were made, the complainants often appeared to be dismissed as time-wasters or trouble-makers and it appears that individual officers were protected by their superiors who appeared to find complaints against their officers quite distasteful. As one interviewee stated,

"...My first DDI, Divisional Detective Inspector...he was a man who'd stand by you...if you had a complaint, a number 1 docket - a number 1 docket was where somebody wrote in and complained...it was made into a file...If you had a number one docket you were in the shit...The DDI would send for you and say, "What's all this, Laddy?" You'd tell him the truth and he'd say, "Is that straight?" and you'd say, "Yes"...and on the number one complaint he would write, "I will not have this Jew make these complaints against my men"...and bung it back..." (N).

The interviewees were of the opinion that complaints against the police were relatively uncommon during their days in the force and that this was due to two reasons. First, there was a widely held view that a police officer was always right. Second, there was also a widely held view that even if a police officer had acted improperly then it was a waste of time pursuing the matter.

13. Corruption

The oral testimonies of the interviewees indicated a sizeable amount of corrupt behaviour within the Metropolitan Police Force. Because of the different forms that police corruption took this section is divided into the following categories – perjury and the 'embroidering of evidence', violence against prisoners, bribes, robbery/theft and general malpractice

i)Perjury and the 'Embroidering of Evidence'

Perjury and 'the embroidering of evidence' (or 'gilding the lily') appear to have been widespread within the Metropolitan Police. To the officers involved it was not viewed as corruption because it was only used against individuals who were believed to be guilty. Every ex-officer who admitted to 'embroidering' evidence stressed that it was never used to incriminate an innocent person. The camaraderie of the force, coupled with the idea that perjury is acceptable practice under certain conditions ensured that their colleagues would back up such evidence in court. One interviewee said,

"...One time...some of the blokes in CID had...basically...bodged a case...they'd been informed that a warehouse was going to get broken into on the 12th...I think it was...of a certain month...They'd bodged it up by going in for them before the villains themselves had actually got in...Anyhow...they needed some extra evidence and...basically...they asked me to say something in court...say that I'd seen so and so do so and so on the evening of the 12th. Anyhow, I went to court...and did what they asked me...It wasn't until I left the court that I realised I hadn't even been on duty on the bloody 12th!..." (X).

Another interviewee said that,

"...When you had a job of arresting somebody which sometimes was a bit dodgy in as much that the person who had committed the crime...you knew full well...you had to stretch the evidence a bit. To get a conviction

you could rely a hundred per cent on whatever you said would be backed up by your fellow officer...but the thing was you never, ever got an innocent man down. If you knew that person was guilty you did anything you could to make sure that he was convicted...but you never, ever stretched it a bit to get an innocent man in the dock..." (D).

Similarly,

"...I don't advocate or I would not condone what I call, what is known in the police, as 'villainy'...that is to get a bloke who hasn't done anything and go up and swear blind he has. But where the chap knows he's done it...I mean, just to add a little embroidery to it...it's never harmed anyone...it's a game..." (R).

The above quotes are interesting in that they highlight a number of factors relating to police perjury. Firstly, they demonstrate the apparent willingness of officers to lie under oath in court. Secondly, they demonstrate the ease with which officers commit such a crime and how their perjured evidence is backed up by fellow officers thus making it difficult for a court to see the inaccuracies contained therein. Thirdly, they show how officers attempted to justify such actions by explaining that they only submitted perjured evidence when they 'knew' that the defendant was guilty and would, therefore, not indulge in what officer referred to as 'villainy'. This leads to what might be termed a 'dual mentality' towards perjury which views it as acceptable if the officers involved *believe* the defendant to be guilty even if there is no real hard evidence to support this view. This is supported by the testimony of Officer X above where it appears that there did not exist enough evidence to convict an individual yet this did little to convince the officer involved that the individual was anything but guilty.

However, one officer especially was not comfortable with this situation,

"...Terrible, terrible...planting of evidence, all that stuff. If you got caught up in it...you had to do one of two things...you had to turn a blind eye, pretend it wasn't happening which, to be frank, everybody did...and I'm ashamed to say I've done that myself because if you did anything about it...you were dead, you were out, finished...we had the old 'sus' laws in those days and what the young, budding CID man would do to bring himself to notice for his role as a CID officer...they would bring these guys in under the old 'sus' laws and if the lily needed gilding a little on the way then...so be it. And that's what used to happen. But, it was a very close knit community so everything was hushed up...and, of course, the guy's lying isn't he? If a guy stands up in the dock and says, "The police planted evidence on me"...the magistrate or the judge would say, "Tut tut tut...disgusting...the police wouldn't do that..." (I).

It appears that not all officers felt happy to accept perjury as an integral part of the job, but there were unofficial or cultural sanctions which could be brought to bear on such officers. Those who committed perjury were doubly-protected because of the reluctance on the part of the judges or magistrates to accept that an officer might lie in court.

As documented earlier in this chapter, there was a distinct pressure for both aides to CID as well as CID officers to secure convictions and this probably led to the institutionalised practice of perjury. The above interviewee continued by saying that,

"...the CID suffered, if that's the right word, several notable, well publicised excesses, shall we say...strangely enough a guy from Croydon, I remember...a guy called Harry Challenor and he was putting lumps of brick in yobbos pockets at demos for offensive weapons...and that was fairly standard sort of practice...and if you wanted to be a CID officer you had to be party to all that. But what happened was...the shit hit the fan and suddenly everybody's covering their back...There were several cases like that and...they set up a squad of what were known as

Rubber Heelers, and they still have the same department today, which investigates...just like the American Internal Affairs...but you can screw the man down who's doing the more mundane routine work...but what you can't screw down is the guy whose doing the more fly by night secret work...and by its very nature CID work is underground and subterfuge and so on...and I've actually done this myself...twice a week they have what are called Police Orders which is a publication...it's like an internal means of communication so you've got all the people who are playing football, all the people who have died, and all that...And another part had all those people who'd been disciplined so you'd have, 'Joe Bloggs: Drinking on Duty'...and that's a PC doing a six day week, working all hours of the day and night,...he goes in a pub, has a crafty pint, he gets caught, he gets disciplined. You get a CID officer planting evidence...nobody gives a toss about that...so there was this big problem. But, it's easier to catch the guy in a pub having a drink than it is to catch the guy planting evidence...But going back to the Police Orders, and I've actually done this myself, if you go back through all the police forces, add up how many Constables in uniform have been disciplined, as opposed to Detective Constables...the ratio is something like a hundred to one. Go above Sergeant and see how many police officers have been disciplined, go above Inspector, and how many do you think you'll find?...None. It's very much the case that the more senior you are the safer you are...we used to call it being fireproof...if you were a DI you were virtually fireproof..." (I).

The above quote implies that the planting of evidence on suspects also took place and that it was, "a fairly standard sort of practice". Of course, this is an isolated quote and merely the opinion of one ex-officer yet does bare closer examination. The ex-officer also implies that, amongst CID officers, such malpractice was part of the job and that, therefore, even those officers who did not engage in such behaviour were aware that it existed. Presumably, very few, if any, officers reported such behaviour and this may be viewed as supporting the theory that much police corruption goes unreported due to the cultural

dynamics of the police restraining fellow officers from taking any action. This suggests that, like white-collar crime, plain clothes and CID crime was often hidden and, therefore, went unreported. A related fact is that most victims of such malpractice would not be viewed by the courts as reliable or trustworthy witnesses.

When officers did get convicted it soon becomes obvious on which side their colleagues' sympathies lay. One ex-officer said,

> "...One I know from Croydon who was put away for 5 months...it was most unfortunate because he knew he was on the track of a criminal...he'd been chasing him with a Sergeant...they'd been trying to pin this bloke down and they made this mistake...in about a couple of hours one afternoon...and they said they knew where he was and...he wasn't...he had an alibi. Well, this is corruption really, I suppose...this PC filled in the gap. He knew damn well, he was sure...so was the Sergeant...that this villain was doing what they accused him of doing...but they just added a little bit too much to the evidence and...it all went the wrong way..." (P).

The above quote also highlights a recurring theme within this research's findings - that police officers believe themselves to have an innate sense which allows them to separate the innocent from the guilty.

ii) Violence/Violence against Prisoners

Whilst it would be unfair to claim that the Metropolitan Police between the 1930s and the 1960s adopted a culture of violence, eight of the interviewees in the present research spoke of the use of violence by officers. The following three quotes go some way towards demonstrating the existence of an 'unwritten rule' ethos, regarding violence, amongst police officers. For example, "...In those days you could hit 'em and leave 'em...and it was accepted..." (Q). Similarly,

"...I think, in those days, if a policeman was attacked they expected to be hit back...there was a sort of uneasy set of unwritten rules..."Well, you kicked me in the shins so I'm gonna give you a black eye"...and people didn't complain because it was in the East End of London and they probably wouldn't know how to complain...if it had been in Kensington it might have been different..." (U).

Similarly, "...See...in those days if someone whopped you you'd often whopp 'em back and tell them to, well, behave themself..." (T).

The above quotes appear to indicate that, during the period being researched, there was what might be referred to as a 'common sense' approach to the use of physical force by police officers. While the majority of the ex-officers who spoke of police violence justified it in terms of self defence, some officers appeared to take the 'unwritten code' one step further. For example,

"...I can remember one guy at Golders Green nick who was a driver...I haven't a clue what his name was...if you brought a prisoner in he'd automatically thump him...for being a prisoner..." (E).

The above quote suggests that some officers may have exploited the fact that police violence was often condoned under certain circumstances (for example, as regards to self-defence). The fact that an officer might assault a prisoner, apparently regardless of the nature of the crime they had committed, does not appear to have been addressed in existing literature concerning police violence. It may be that most officers would not condone such arbitrary violence yet, at the same time, few would report the offending officer due to the police norm that inhibits the reporting of other officers for breaches of the disciplinary code.

Those officers who witnessed what they thought to be an over-the-top or unprovoked attack perpetrated by a fellow officer and wanted to act against it would, on occasion, intervene. The following two quotes demonstrate examples of such interventions,

"...I have, on occasion, rescued a prisoner...somebody else's prisoner from being thumped...and two of us went and pulled this copper off this chap and said a few words of wisdom...but that was an isolated incident and he left the job under dodgy circumstances...he started poncing actually...which fired bad feeling amongst senior officers..." (V).

Similarly,

"...it depended on the CID. You see, there was a CID officer at Brockley who didn't like me a bit. That was because when I was aide to CID...I stopped him thumping a prisoner. Now, he had been a professional boxer before he joined the police. I said, "This is not our job to thump people"...he was a nasty piece of work. He got as far as first class CID Sergeant...he never made Detective Inspector..." (G).

The above quotes show how physical intervention appeared to be the only feasible recourse for officers who saw a fellow officer engaging in what they thought was excessive violence. They also indicate that officers who engaged in such behaviour had a good chance of being found out. No evidence arose during the present research to suggest that officers ever officially reported such behaviour to a senior officer. It does appear, however, that perhaps informal systems of punishment may have been used and that these may have accounted for, for example, a lack of promotion for the officer in the above quote. The unwritten assumption underlying this may be that in some Metropolitan stations between the 1930s and the 1960s the police were trusted to police themselves with regard to internal discipline.

Most episodes of police violence uncovered during the present research, however, were not as arbitrary as some of those recounted earlier in this section and do appear to have had a motive. For example,

"Now, I'll quote you instances...Shepherds Bush...Timothy Hornibrook was wanted for shop-breaking and he was more or less caught on the job and he kicked somebody in the gooleys and he got away. A few weeks later a couple of the aides caught Timothy Hornibrook and brought him in....and the DI, Taffy Pinham, was off that afternoon and came back at 6 o'clock...They said, "We've got Timmy Hornibrook in, Guv'nor". "Is he conscious?" he said...took off his jacket, got the cell keys, went down the cell on his own...You should have heard him, "I'll teach you to kick my men in the balls you bastard!"...BANG, BANG, BANG...gave him a bloody good hiding. Now, those Guv'nors...you'd do anything for 'cos they'd do anything for you...and it wasn't a case of brutality or a gang-bang or anything like that...He went in on his own, took his jacket off, and said, "I'll teach you to..."...He was a bloody villain was Timmy Hornibrook....Now those sort of men instilled loyalty...All our Guv'nors in those days were men who'd come up from the ranks...There was no rapid promotion in those days....they'd been through the mill themselves...they knew all about it" (N).

Thus, we can suppose that some instances of police assault were motivated not by a desire for indiscriminate violence (as shown by some examples of arbitrary violence described earlier in this section) but by a desire to exact revenge for what the police saw as a brutal attack. Such occurrences were, therefore, enabled by the camaraderie of the police and also the moral code which appears to abhor what are seen as cowardly and unprovoked attacks. The ferocity of the attack upon the prisoner may also be viewed as a way of punishing his previous attack upon an officer and therefore upon the authority of the police. If such attacks went unpunished, it is possible that news of it would travel throughout a community and lead to a decrease in police authority in the area.

The two police officers who spoke of the police treatment of paedophiles appeared to show how officers have few qualms regarding the morality of the use of excessive force in such instances. One ex-officer said that,

"In those days, if anybody ever assaulted a child for instance...which often happened...he was 'seen to'. In other words, when he got to the station he got a good hiding...I can remember one bloke I knocked off for assaulting a little girl of 3...he was a foreigner...an Arab or something like that...what he did was...he took this child into a house. He never sexually assaulted her but he sexually abused her...so anyway...we took this bloke to the station and the first thing that happened to him when he got to the station was he got taken to the CID office and the CID bloke...a bloke named Thomas...said, "Why did you do this to the child?" He gave some excuse...admitted it. So he said, "Take your belt off"...He said, "Bend over" and gave him 12 cuts across his behind with his belt...that's the sort of thing that happened in those days. Now this bloke was charged and taken down to a cell...at 2 o'clock a Scotch PC came on and said, "Where's this bloke whose assaulted this little girl"..."Oh, he's down in number 3 cell down the passage there"...He said, "Give us the keys". So he was given the keys by the Sergeant and he went down there and said to him, "Don't mark him too much". He went in there and gave him one or two. Now that sort of thing couldn't happen today...you'd be in real right trouble...but that was the sort of thing that used to happen...but when you talk about camaraderie that sort of thing was known to the station...But no you would never tell on the PC who did that" (X).

Thus, it appears that, in some cases, excessive violence by officers might be tolerated (because in relation to the crime it is not viewed as excessive) even by other officers who, under normal circumstances, might be tempted to intervene. The above quote demonstrates the possible dilemma that could face officers when dealing with paedophiles. There may be an urge to exact retributive violence against the perpetrator of such a brutal crime yet this is tempered by the realisation that to harm the prisoner might affect the outcome of the ensuing court case. In the following quote, the possible effects of presenting a 'damaged' prisoner in court appears to be the sole factor restraining the officers from

assaulting the prisoner - a course of action which, under the circumstances, appears to them as morally acceptable,

"...We hated sex offenders, child murderers...we had one at St. Thomas's...a bloke goes in there and takes a nine week old baby, buggers it, and rapes it, and he was still in the grounds when we got there and we got him...We didn't touch him...I felt like it, I felt like it...oh, I honestly did...but we didn't touch him...could've killed him. A thing like that, it's hard to keep your hands off him but we did it by the book. Otherwise, if you didn't do it by the book, you'd lose him in court. How we kept our hands off him...there was an awful atmosphere in the Q car and we took him in...you do get hatred towards them...if they go into court damaged half your case is gone..." (C).

Through addressing police violence in this study, it appears that officers tend to have a quite strongly defined sense of when violence is justified and when it is not. Paedophiles and those who assault police officers were seen as just targets for violence as they represent, respectively, an attack on public decency and police authority. Members of London Irish communities were often seen as a just target for police violence although such incidents seemed to be viewed light-heartedly as the violence was not generally serious and neither side would take the matter further. It appears, however, that in many cases camaraderie stretches the limits of what can be considered justified force.

Violence is not seen to be justified when it is seen as being unfair - namely, when an individual is not perceived to have committed a crime or where the crime is not serious enough to be worthy of violence. When Officer G speaks of the officer committing the violent act as having been 'a professional boxer' it shows that the element of a 'fair fight' is absent and this transgresses the code of fairness.

iii) Bribes

There did not appear to be, amongst those ex-officers who were interviewed, as great a propensity to accept bribes as there was to indulge in violence. The acceptance of bribes was altogether more frowned upon than violent behaviour. The 1906 Street Betting Act prohibited bookmaking in public and was fully supported by senior members of the police who, according to Emsley (1996) believed that, "...betting was having a corrosive effect on the working class and that it could be eradicated by strong laws and vigorous enforcement" (pp. 153-154). However, the legislation was unpopular with beat officers who, Emsley (1996) claims, not only under enforced it but also liased closely with the bookmakers. The 'bookmaker problems' alluded to in the following quote refer to the fact that apparently many officers received bribes off street bookmakers in return for going about their illegal trade unhindered,

"...When I joined, in 1935, the old policemen hardly spoke to you because a week or two before, while I was in Peel House, there were 13 Sergeants at Lemon Street...12 of them were dismissed through bookmaker problems...some may have been guilty...some may not have been guilty...they were all involved..." (U).

The other main source of police bribes were the barrow boys or costermongers who, in return for a sum of money, would not be reported for contravening the Highways Act. One interviewee said,

"...You see, it's a question of live and let live...Now don't think I'm goody goody but I would never take money off a bloody barrow boy...but at Brixton, for instance, there were certain PC's there...it'd only be about half a crown...just to let 'em work...and that sort of thing...I mean, they'd go round the streets...People would, say, see the bloke at the end of the month and he'd find he'd got a ten bob note in his pocket...or something of the sort. It was corruption...I'm not making any bones about it...It was corruption but, I mean, it didn't hurt anyone...It wasn't regarded by the

majority of policemen at all as a crime or as something to be suppressed..." (R).

Similarly, "...There was a lot of 'slip us a coin'...but I don't know a lot about it really..." (Z).

The above two quotes highlight a number of issues surrounding police acceptance of bribes which predominantly appeared to be offered to the police by either barrow boys or street bookmakers. Firstly, the practice appeared to be quite widespread and involved very small amounts of money. Secondly, the police appeared to be more open to accepting such bribes as they did not believe that the laws they were meant to be enforcing were important. Therefore, in part, the reluctance to impose these unpopular laws shows how the police actively negotiated order with the public to provide an unofficial form of consensus policing. Thirdly, it appears that perhaps the main control mechanism to inhibit the acceptance of such bribes was professionalism in that they saw themselves as above accepting bribes.

The following interviewee provides two possible reasons which might have been instrumental in making the police acceptance of bribes relatively widespread,

"...I know it's no excuse to say so but the pay was very, very, low and even the half a crown offered to you would be an incentive to forget about it. Street bookmakers had look-outs and runners and so you quite rarely got to the bookmaker...I don't know why it was looked upon so seriously...I never looked upon it in a serious manner..." (A).

Firstly, it appears that the low pay of police officers might have tempted some of them to supplement their income through such illegal means and, secondly, there appears to have been a sense of futility amongst officers about expending energy trying to enforce the street bookmaking laws. As the above quote implies, the enforcement of such laws was seen as having a very limited effect. There appears also to be a feeling amongst some of the officers that the street

bookmaking legislation was biased against the working classes because the placing of bets was tolerated when it was engaged in by members of the upper classes. because, in such cases, it did not take place in public.

Not all the ex-officers who were interviewed were offered money by barrow boys in return for their 'co-operation'. One interviewee said,

"...Well, in fact it was awkward actually...at first they would start giving me a bag of oranges, bag of apples...another would give me a bunch of bananas...I couldn't take them...you know, it's wrong! And because I wouldn't take them what used to happen when my mother-in-law used to go shopping they knew her...ha ha ha...so the mother -in-law used to come back..."Look what I've got!"...you know, they'd put a bunch of bananas into her bag or whatever...so she didn't buy fruit for quite a long time actually..." (S).

With regards to the bribes of the barrow boys and the street bookmakers, therefore, it appears that certain conclusions may be drawn. Although relatively widespread, such bribery was not viewed as particularly deceitful or corrupt and was referred to, by one interviewee, as, "a case of live and let live". In other words, such bribery benefited both parties - the officers did not have to expend time and energy enforcing a law which they did not believe in and the barrow boys or street bookmakers were given the opportunity to pursue their trade. The fact that small amounts of money (or bags of fruit) were offered implied that the crime being committed was not a particularly heinous one whereas if the financial benefit to the individual officers was larger then their perception of the seriousness of the crime might have been greater.

The present research uncovered very little evidence of bribes being offered in relation to more serious crimes. The following quote details an example of an attempted higher level bribe and the interviewee's reaction to it,

"...once you've done it...you're hooked. They've got you for the rest of your service. Only a youngster would do that, not an old timer. I was offered £2,000 to let a tom go one night...I didn't...in notes. Next morning go to court, her husband's in court. She's working from Southend...she lived in Southend and her husband found out she'd been nicked...that was the proof he wanted for a divorce. £2,000 for a divorce to let her go not to be charged. In those days £2,000 was a lot, a lot of money that was 1953. It's an insult...you do not need it..." (C).

The final quote in this section demonstrates perhaps a consensus among most of the officers to the issue of accepting low level bribes,

"...There's three kinds of things that coppers can do...take money in the 'drop', assault prisoners, or commit perjury. I, myself, always regarded the last one the rather more serious of the three. I had a certain arrogance, myself, that I didn't want to fucking well take the fucking money from someone..." (V).

Once again, it appears that a possible inhibiting factor for the acceptance of bribes by officers was professional pride rather than any deep-rooted belief that it was actually morally wrong. As with other forms of corruption, all of this suggests there were (in the minds of these officers) clear boundaries. Just like police violence was justified in certain contexts, accepting small bribes from street bookmakers was not viewed as committing a 'real' crime because in most respects it was victimless. Officers appear to implicitly present the boundaries on behaviour as clear, rational, common sensical and generally accepted. However, there are hints that not all officers agreed on these boundaries which actually makes different behaviours acceptable to different officers in different situations. The boundaries may in fact be justified and re-negotiated in line with the peculiarities of a given situation.

iv) Robbery/Theft

Between the 1930s and the 1960s it was not unknown for officers to steal property or even break and enter into private property in order to commit a theft, although this particular type of corruption was only referred to by a small number of the sample. One ex-officer recalled a case of theft by a fellow officer as follows,

"...In all my time in the police I only knew of one bad copper, personally, and he got sent down for three months...I didn't like him...he was a real spiv. He was a spiv before he even joined the police...Spiv Spencer we called him. He got called to a house where the neighbours thought the woman who lived there had died...and there was some money in the house and he pocketed it. Anyway, she wasn't dead...she got put in hospital and she got better...Anyone else would have returned the money...and, of course, he got found out. He was the only one I knew of..." (Q).

Similarly,

"There was one...well, I suppose you always have a rotten apple and there was one chappy...and, funnily enough, they advise you about him. They say, "Be careful...be careful because he had a rep or reputation for not being very straightforward when it came to...he used to go to house break-ins, burglaries...and things would go missing. People would see things in his cubicle in the section house. And, of course, we thought this could be dangerous...See, if you and this chappy were called to a break-in at a house...we always used to make sure that we didn't go in with him. We'd say, "You go in. I'll stay...keep watch"...'cos you can imagine what'd happen if someone said something had gone missing...we'd make sure that we'd stay outside and we'd make a point of entering it in our books...so no one could say anything..." (S).

The above two quotes appear to highlight the fact that officers could commit opportunistic rather than pre-planned crimes. Such crimes were committed when police officers had access to a property for the purpose of following up an investigation or to mind when the home owner was absent. Again, particularly in the second quote, we can see how fellow officers, despite being aware of the dubious behaviour of another officer, may be apparently reluctant to inform their superiors. Indeed, the more law-abiding officers devised a system whereby they could not be implicated in any further possible incidents of police theft by making sure that they were not inside any given premises at the same time as the corrupt officer. Thus, it appears that, in such situations, an officer's first consideration is to his or herself rather than 'duty' to the public. The first quote appears to imply, also, that the corrupt police officer had criminal tendencies before joining the force thus demonstrating that, to some extent at least, police criminality might have, at the time, been the result of an inadequate vetting procedure of new police recruits. It may also be used to imply that there was nothing inherent in policing that led to criminality and that such malpractice was, in fact, abnormal.

The present research also apparently uncovered some evidence to support the idea that some police officers also indulged in pre-planned, or non-opportunistic, crimes. One interviewee said,

"...I managed very well with the uniform branch except when I was at Lavender Hill...two or three minor things...Lavender Hill was a poorer type of area and several kitchens...piddling little house break-ins...where people walk in and pinch some money off the shelf...you know, the rent money and the coal money...and on one occasion I went...two or three had been done and I checked all the fences and on one of the splinters of the fence there was some blue fabric, some blue fibre,...What made me think was that there was a mark on the window and the pattern was the pattern of the woollen police glove...I recognised the stitching...it was the police glove....It came back from the lab as police great coat fibres...the stuff on the fence...so I started going through the duty...to see

if I could match up the beats where this happened with a certain officer...but it was obviously a copper...it was somebody doing it on someone else's beat..." (N).

Similarly,

"...the chappie being way off his beat...it doesn't look good because this is where you get wrong 'uns...they don't commit their offences that they're going to commit on their own beat, you see..." (S).

Thus, it appears that non-opportunistic crimes, most notably break-ins, were committed by some officers and these can be viewed as having two sets of implications. Firstly, of course, it may strike some as unbelievable that an officer employed by the state to protect private property might themselves perpetrate a pre-planned break-in and theft on a premises. Secondly, the fact that such officers, sensibly, did not tend to break into premises on their own beat meant that in the aftermath of such a crime an innocent officer on another beat would be immediately implicated. Such actions go totally against the code of camaraderie which runs thick amongst many officers and it is unsurprising that this kind of malpractice was detested by many officers. One officer spoke of police break-ins as follows,

"...Especially night duty...if you got two or three rather unexplained shop break-ins...you didn't get many...but you did get it. It's no good gainsaying it. You did get a certain amount of people that would, if they had the chance to, you know...they would. Generally speaking, I must say I've found that they always stick together...If you've got a wrong one...get him out..." (R).

The above quote is one of the only instances in the present study when an interviewee, speaking of the dishonesty of another officer, claimed that the offender should be got rid of. It is difficult to tell whether such a harsh attitude to the crimes of another officer reflect upon the severity of the crime itself or merely

its repercussions upon other officers in the locality. Again, there appears to be a real tension between the wish to get rid of a colleague who is corrupt and the unwritten rule that dictates that an officer should never report a colleague.

V) General Malpractice

Other influences and behaviours, between the 1930s and the 1960s, may have had a bearing on the appropriateness of police behaviour. Two members of the sample mentioned both the Freemasons and the Catholic Guild as being able to positively influence individuals' promotion prospects with one of them claiming that the latter was much more powerful and influential than the former. One interviewee spoke of the extent of the black-market during the war years and how even the police would often sell goods on it. Stopping on suspicion of public order offences such as the 'sus' offence of the 1824 Vagrancy Act did, according to Reiner (1992) "...form a high proportion of patrol arrests" (p.151). According to two interviewees within the present research, the 'sus' laws were subject to widespread abuse by the young and ambitious within the force as it enabled them to feasibly stop any individual. One ex-CID officer spoke of his own misuse of the 'sus laws and said,

> "I think anyone who's a decent person and has worked in the CID, especially at that time, can't look back without regretting a lot of the stuff they've done...a lot of it was wrong but we were young and we thought what we were doing was right" (E).

Many of the quotes in this section may give one the view of police officers as cynical and devious. However, we must temper this with those occasions where the individual officers show sympathy for those whom they have brought to court. For example,

> "...a case of dangerous driving down at Purley Corner...when we sat down and heard the summing up by the judge...we thought...'God, no! He's gonna go down for six months or something...this poor driver' and

we had every sympathy with him...anyway, the jury came up trumps and found him 'Not Guilty'...You're sat in court and you know what the verdict ought to be and sometimes you know what the sentence should be as well...but you're not the judge and the jury..." (P).

14. Relationship with Barrow Boys and Street Bookmakers

Officers of the Metropolitan Police for a long time have had an ambiguous relationship with these two groups of society. On the one hand, they were viewed as groups to be monitored: barrow boys were constantly committing obstruction offences and street bookmaking was an illegal act. However, the police relationship with these individuals was tempered by the fact that they were not regarded as 'criminals'. Examining this relationship allows us to investigate some of the vagaries of the police/public relationship. For example,

"...I got up there and there was a bloke who had a stall and he used to sell ladies clothes...and jackets and things like that...and I 'd go up there and he'd shout at me stuff like, "Gawd. He could do with a good steak...". Basically, he was taking the piss...then he'd say stuff like, "C'mon ladies, all this stuff has been approved by the police...it's all stolen gear". And all this sort of thing...and he did it just to wind me up. One day, I was in the canteen and there was an old PC in there, a driver, and in those days a driver was like God...old Bert was ex-Palestine police...and I was sat in the canteen and having my soup and he comes over and says, "Hey Tony...what's up?"...I said, "Nothing much". He says, "What's your problem?"...'cos these boys used to watch over you. I said, "Oh, I'm just getting fed up with it, Bert...I don't know what to do with this chap". He said, "Not a problem...", he said, "not a problem. I'll have a walk out with you later". I said, "No...it doesn't matter". He said, "No...I could do with a stroll anyway"...He was a driver, he had a flat hat...he was the business. He put his flat hat on and he walked out with me...he say, "Which bloke?" I said, ""That one over there...". He walked along pulled himself to his full height and knocked his helmet off on his stall...on the overhang...he purposely walked straight in there...and BONK...his helmet came off and

fell on the floor. He looked down, picked it up, he turned round to the stall-holder and he said, "You're not on your pitch", he said...his boxes were obscuring the white line, "That's not the right height, that's not the right size of your pitch...Oh, I'm sorry...this place is closed". This bloke's going, "You what? Leave off"...and all this sort of business...Bert said, "Just be quiet...I'll speak to you in a minute"...That was it...he closed his stall...And then he said to the bloke, "Look. If you're going to make a lot of noise with ribald remarks about stolen goods being sold from your stall, passing comments about police officers...whether they need filling up or one thing or another...which I assume is part of your selling ploy, make sure that your house is in order because you draw attention to yourself which is what you've done now because I've knocked my helmet off. Now you're closed for the day and when I see you here tomorrow I expect your stall to be within the white lines". With that we just strolled away. Later on that day, that was the early shift, 6 'til 2,...we were just coming off at 2 o'clock a PC came in and said, "Here...there's a bloke waiting for you round the back of the yard". I said, "What bloke?" He said, "I don't know...he's just hanging around the yard...he wants to see you". So I went out and looked over the fire escape...it was the stallholder. I was like "Oh God...what's happened here, you know?" I went and saw Bert who was just getting on his bike...I said, "Bert...it's the stall-holder". He said, "I'll go and have a word with him". Bert went out and I saw them talking...and the bloke walked off. Anyhow, Bert came round and said, "Oh, he wanted to take us for a drink. He apologises for any inconvenience. I told him that it wasn't any inconvenience to us that he was the one who was inconvenienced". After that I used to get, "Morning officer, morning, morning". You know what I mean? It was just so beautifully done...there was no heavy handedness...".(D).

One officer spoke of how new officers sometimes had to prove to the barrow boys that he or she was not to be messed with. For example,

"...Costermongers were quite common along the Brompton Road...as a young copper you'd go up to them and say, "Move it". They'd say, "It's all right...I've got permission to stand here". Then you found out off an old copper that they shouldn't be there...and the next time you saw 'em they knew you'd found out...I knew one notorious character whose name was Scotty...in those days we used to nick 'em now and again...they'd be on street corners. Anyhow, Old Scotty, one day was going, "I'll have you you fucking bastards!" I said, "Come on, Scotty. Get your fucking barrow out of the road"..."Oh. Alright Guv"..." (O).

Five officers spoke of the respect between the police and the barrow boys, a fact which, no doubt, precipitated the scandals of the 1930s regarding the bribing of police officers by barrow boys. This respect is shown by the following quotes,

"...Well, in fact it was awkward actually...at first they would start giving me a bag of oranges, bag of apples...another would give me a bunch of bananas...I couldn't take them...you know, it's wrong!..." (S).

"...They were entitled to a certain length and width but, there again, they used to push it a bit further so they could get more stuff on show...and it was an offence where they could be summoned and would have to pay and...all fair play to them...they were all hard-working blokes and I know I was always a bit lax with them. I was living just a couple of turnings away...I knew most of them..." (S).

"...Barrow boys...we had two, but I always made sure that if I was posted on that beat or patrol...I'd say, "When you see my helmet come round the corner I want to see you moving it"...and they moved it...and that's all there is to it..." (K).

The street bookmakers, like the barrow boys, were tolerated by officers and even though they were in breach of the law many officers sympathised with them. For example,

"...There was a lot of street betting...just about every mews you went past...there was a street bookmaker and they used to get arrested regularly...but it always seemed to me...although I arrested them and that sort of thing and charged them...it always seemed to me that it was a bit pathetic really that we had to go out and enforce the law on this when if you were a more wealthy person you could have an account with Coates or whatever bookmaker it was and have a bet whenever you liked...you know, on lifting up the telephone...and, yet, these people who wanted a shilling on the Grand National or something were deprived of the opportunity...Usually they were very good because you went down and said to them, "Bert...it's your turn today"...and they would come with you, you know..." (T).

Similarly,

"...The whole business of street bookmaking was ridiculous really...it should never have been an offence really...it lead to so many policemen getting into trouble..." (U).

15. Relationship with Prostitutes

Five of the ex-officers interviewed during the course of the research appeared to have a very amiable working relationship with many of the prostitutes on their beat. One interviewee said that,

"...there were crowds of these prostitutes...they were all part of the scene in those days you know...and policemen knew most of 'em and I can remember my mother, when I was leaving home on the Sunday, "...Now don't get talking to any strange women!"...You weren't allowed to talk to them in public...it was a terrible crime although, of course, we used to talk to them day in, day out...the prostitutes were handy to us coppers..." (Z).

147

The good relationship between the officers and the women probably developed from the fact that on several occasions prostitutes stepped in to save police officers who were being assaulted and such instances would often result in a prostitute being accorded a special status whereby she would not be arrested. As one interviewee said,

"...I remember there was one prostitute...Nellie Currie...and she was never arrested...never...and this was because she had once helped save a copper when he was taking a beating off some blokes...she rushed up and grabbed his whistle and blew for assistance...and she very probably saved his life...so she was never to be arrested..." (X).

Another interviewee recalled a similar incident,

"...I was saved in Edgware Road. There was a bus pulled up and there was a conductress, shows how long ago it was, on the top deck. She'd been touched up by a coloured fella and we were in plain clothes, we went up there...she pointed him out so we arrested him...What we didn't realise was that all his friends were downstairs so we had our backs to the wall...Jock had forgotten his stick that day so we only had one stick between us...Jock was hanging on to the prisoner in the doorway and I was trying to defend the doorway and a group of the girls realised we were in trouble and went into this group of coloured fellas, coloured people...with their high-heeled shoes which are lethal weapons if they're held with this band that stilettos had on in those days...they wiped the floor with them. We had a good working relationship with the girls...I always fully endorse that there was a great deal of camaraderie between the girls and uniform...they weren't too keen on the OPD squad...that's Outrage and Public Decency...they weren't too keen on that squad..." (C).

One reason which might account for the apparently strong relationship which could grow between the two groups was that their occupations had quite a lot in

148

common. Both groups walked the streets, witnessed the seedier sides of life and, on occasion, had to deal with violent incidents. One officer said,

"...It's a funny thing...but I met a tom...a few years ago now...and she said, "We were a little community weren't we?" I said, "Well, yes...in a strange way that's true"...the night duty coppers would get up about the same time as the night duty denizens..." (V).

The officers sensed that a symbiotic relationship emerged between the police and prostitutes as they realised that, to a certain extent, both groups benefited from the other's presence,

"...the little bit from Brixton Station up to the Town Hall...there was about three regular prostitutes and they were all known by their Christian names...and they'd all say, "Hello, mate!" and that sort of thing to you...it was sort of live and let live when they were arrested...they were no trouble...they used to be told, "Your turn tomorrow night"...Anyway, they would make a bit of a show the next night and, say, just after ten she'd be rolled in and charged and she, of course, wouldn't make any trouble...at half past ten she'd be soliciting again. In the West End...to a large extent they'd perhaps go up to one of the PC's and say, "Take me tonight 'cos I want to work so and so". It doesn't seem possible but it all worked that way...it used to work like clockwork...go up to the court...he'd say, "40 shillings" and that would be the end of it. They'd be alright for another week or something..." (R).

This cordiality which officers saw as existing between the police and prostitutes resulted in the practice whereby the latter were informed of when they would next be arrested. If this proposed time was not convenient to the prostitute, she might suggest another more suitable time and would invariably turn up as arranged. Negotiable arrests such as these were seen as helping maintain an invaluable relationship between the two groups which neither could afford to lose. The prostitutes were, it was believed by the officers, unwilling to sacrifice

the protection that the police offered and the police were unwilling to sacrifice what they saw as both allies and information sources. This last point is borne out by Officer Z who claims that although it was a disciplinary offence to talk to prostitutes in public they did so on a daily basis because, "the prostitutes were handy".

16. The Rubber Heel Squad

Little, if any, of the literature of police corruption appears to have addressed the issue of the 'Rubber Heel Squad', although the subject does come up in a series of interviews with retired officers by Dr B.Weinberger currently held at the National Sound Archive (Collection C684). Growing concern within the hierarchy of the Metropolitan Police lead to the introduction of what became known as the 'Rubber Heel Squad' (or 'OGPU') a group of officers whose aim was to pose as 'normal' officers in police stations and to investigate any corrupt activities of fellow officers. As well as providing an example of the nature of the work undertaken by the Rubber Heel Squad, the following extract shows how not all Metropolitan Officers appeared to condone the taking of small bribes.

One officer wrote of the Rubber Heel Squad as follows,

"...In the 1920s/30s in Russia there was a Russian government service of a secret nature who, according to newspaper reports, conducted a regime of terror. The service was known here by the initials, -OGPU...When I joined the Met; Police in 1931 the Police hierarchy had just completed an enquiry into the allegations by Oxford Street barrow-boys of policemen taking bribes. The idea was apparently to allow the barrows to carry on their lucrative trade without "interference". The result of the enquiry led to the punishment and dismissal of nearly all the complement (of all ranks) at Great Marlborough Street Police Station. I was a recruit at Vine Street where I learned that the "upheaval", as described above was largely due to the activities of "OGPU" (as they were known - secretly) - a body of Women Police spies employed by Scotland Yard. I was already nervously aware of all superior officers including Sergeants so to learn of these

women "undercover" officers, made me more wary than ever! e.g. on the beat covering the stalls in Berwick Street market I discontinued my friendliness towards the (legally static) licence holders. The market was always crowded; so was the girl in the fox fur, "OGPU" and following me (It was darkly hinted that they invented evidence! against policemen)...Incidentally I believe "OGPU" did some valiant work regarding the street- bookmakers and those policemen who were too friendly with them..." (from the journal of Officer Z, p.15).

Contrary to the views expressed in the above journal extract, members of the Rubber Heel Squad were not exclusively female although one WPC from the sample refused to join in such work when approached. She said,

"...of course...WPC's could be entailed upon to do OGPU work...you know...Rubber Heels...I myself was approached for that...but I turned it down. I said, "I was taught at my school not to sneak"..." (W).

The above quote addresses, therefore, one of the main concerns of officers regarding the Rubber Heel Squad, namely that it involved a breach of the code of camaraderie by pitting officer against officer. The continued presence of the Rubber Heel Squad resulted in a widespread resentment amongst officers, not because they thought they had something to hide but because they abhorred the idea that one of their colleagues might be 'spying' on them. This depth of feeling is demonstrated by the following quote,

"...All they're concerned about is checking and following policemen. There were always a couple in each station and you didn't always know who they were...and that was the point you see...Once you got to know who they were...they were useless...It did cause resentment 'cos you got to a point where you didn't know who was who...It got to a point where your best mate could've been one and you didn't know this. Oh no...that was very much resented..." (S).

Similarly,

"...We used to spot them...the word used to go round...'The Rubber Heel Squad's' on division...they were spies...police officers but put out as spies..." (N).

The introduction of the Rubber Heel Squad appeared to cause some consternation amongst officers by suggesting that, firstly, there was a large problem regarding police corruption and, secondly, that Sergeants were incapable of controlling the actions of their Constables. Officers resented the presence of the Rubber Heelers but, more often than not, felt able to spot them or were tipped off about their presence. Outwitting the 'Rubber Heelers' thus appeared to become a bit of a favourite pastime for some Metropolitan officers. One ex-officer stated that,

"...That was rife when we first went to Paddington. That was rife...they were trying to catch any copper, that was rife. They'd drop a pen, a five pound note and see who'd taken it. They would clock you going for a cup of tea at a restaurant. It was rife and it did more harm than good. We knew when they were on the ground...well, you didn't know but if you suddenly saw a car following you and you did a check on it and it came back 'no trace' and you'd do a CID check...and if it came back as 'police vehicle' you knew you'd got bloody 'Rubber Heels' on the ground. So we used to get area cars and send them over...stuff like that. We used to get the area car to do a section 66 on it or otherwise two vehicles would basically come in so they were nose to nose and they couldn't get out. That happened a few times..." (C).

The above interviewees appeared to be of the opinion that the problem of corruption in the Metropolitan Police Force was not widespread enough or serious enough to warrant a group like the Rubber Heel Squad. It appears that, at first, the presence of the Rubber Heel Squad generated a lot of suspicion between police officers and that this served to cause a decrease in the

camaraderie. However, over time it appears that the influence of the Rubber Heel Squad was undermined as officers learned to recognise who was and who was not on 'their side' and that this served to strengthen the bond between officers.

17. The Relationship between CID and Uniform

The relationship between CID officers and uniform officers has, generally, been viewed as strained and this may be traced back, in part to the fact that CID officers, according to Graef (1989), tend to look down upon their uniform colleagues. Over half of the ex-officers in the present research believed that the CID officers viewed themselves as superior to the uniform officers. For example,

"...Once...some CID shouted at me, "Oi! Sergeant! Get off your fucking arse!"...and I told the individual concerned, "Don't ever fucking talk to me like that again or I shall report you..." (V).

Similarly, "...They always used to look down on the uniform man really. They always classed themselves as a bit above the uniform man..." (R).

This was confirmed by the following plain clothes officer,

"...I was in the Flying Squad for 17 years...the attitude was by the CID...because they always made it sort of known to the general public that they were brighter than the officers in uniform. And they used to talk in a sort of manner about the officers...like calling them 'Noddies' and stuff like that..." (A).

One factor that probably did little to ingratiate CID officers among uniform officers was that they sometimes appeared to be a law unto themselves. One officer recounted an incident in his journal which illustrated this. After a German bomb hit West End Central police station,

"...Insp Pill (from the Grenadier Guards prior to police service) restored some sort of order, including a water-pail chain of men on the stairs because the C.I.D. office was ablaze. It had been empty at the crucial time, but while still burning fiercely the C.I.D. men erupted from a neighbouring pub and ignoring calls for assistance emptied their filing cabinets on to the burning furniture!..." (from the journal of Officer Z, p.5).

Another aspect of the CID which annoyed one interviewee was the fact that they appeared to be, to use a police term, 'fire-proof'. For example,

"...I arrested three CID officers and it was all 'squared -up' as we used to say, to use the parlance,...all 'squared-up', the big wigs get called out..."Forget this. Close your eyes. Look the other way"...CID were absolutely totally immune from any kind of...what one would call 'normal' policing. I mean, they lived their own lives...they were like a secret police without being secret...if that makes any sense. They were totally above and beyond the rest of the police service in any shape or form..." (I).

Around a quarter of interviewees appeared to view CID officers as being ambitious and obsessed by results to the detriment of 'fair' policing. For example, "...there were aides to CID...carrying all sorts of things with them...like sets of keys, knives, all sorts of stuff..." (E).

The previous three quotes appear to show CID officers as above recourse of any kind. Such immunity from the police disciplinary procedure may have been a result of the acknowledgement by senior officers that CID officers had to resort to questionable tactics (for example, planting evidence) in order to secure 'results'.

There were other factors which affected the poor condition of the plain clothes officers' relationship with the uniform officers. The fact that their role led to CID officers having more freedom and the opportunity to hang around in pubs and clubs encouraged uniform officers to believe that the two branches had little in

common. This, in turn, created the belief among some uniformed officers that the CID would pursue, to the bitter end, any cases where it appeared that a uniformed officer had committed an offence.

At the same time, the clash of interests between the uniformed and CID branches was highlighted when a uniform officer (unwittingly) arrested one of the CID's informers. For example,

"...I stopped a van one morning...anyway he went to court eventually and he was on his way to pay a hundred pound fine for illicit dealing in eggs which were rationed and he was also the prime informer for the CID...Well, of course, once they heard about it...my name was mud wasn't it? So you got a clash of interests you might say. We would arrest people or summons them...we didn't know whether they were an informer. They were probably good informers for the CID but...we had to do it. Once you started it you couldn't say, "Oh, alright...off you go...I don't want to see you anymore"..." (T).

Such incidents probably served to fuel the tension between the two groups and, on occasion, such tension appears to have over-spilled into physical confrontation. One ex-uniform officer said,

"...I'll give you an example...I mean, if you raid a club...going back to my time up in Central London, the big drug scene such as it was with Purple Hearts, Drinamil, things like that...and we had a lot of Greek people in Camden then, and around Euston,...that area...and they were very fond of these little basement dives...Well, we'd raid them, periodically, and what you did or didn't know, depending on the state of communication, was that there might be CID in there...although they used to stick out like a sore thumb...and they'd get scooped up by mistake. And they'd bring in guys from neighbouring divisions...well, if there was any skulduggery going on...it was not a bad opportunity for a CID officer to get a little 'spanking'...it was very much...poles apart..." (I).

However, it must be stated, that although over half of those officers who were interviewed claimed that there was a poor relationship between the uniform and CID branches, some officers disagreed. One officer claimed that although there was a division between the two groups the relationship was probably not as strained as it is often portrayed. He said, "...Well, it wasn't too bad...It was always recognised that there was some sort of barrier between us..." (Z).

Another interviewee said that, "...I always found it very, very good..." (F).

The evidence from the present research appears to point to variations in officer perceptions of the relationship between CID officers and uniform officers. Several factors might go some way towards explaining any such possible differentiation in the relationship. One ex-officer appeared to blame the misrepresentation of the relationship in the media. He said, "...Yes, it was better than what the media make it to be...I mean, the media's made a right dogs dinner of that..." (H).

Three officers believed that the personal attitudes of the individuals concerned were instrumental in defining the closeness of the two groups. One ex-officer said,

"...I think a great deal depended upon the officers concerned...maybe it was my attitude to the rest of them there. I mean, people would come to me and ask for advice...that sort of thing...and I would tell them and help them out. I never felt it myself, but I do know, in some cases, that there was animosity between the two branches, but I never met it..." (M).

Another ex-officer expressed a similar view but appeared to limit the responsibility to members of the CID. He said,

"...it depended entirely on the CID themselves. If they came and started trying to be too clever...that sort of thing...no one would work with them,

but, the majority of them, they soon realised that they'd got to work with the uniform...the relationship was good but it depended largely on the Divisional Detective Inspector..." (R).

One ex-officer saw the closeness of the relationship as dependent on the attitudes of both senior uniform and senior CID officers. He said, "...It depended on the top...and how the top of the two sides got on...I don't remember anyone moaning about CID officers or moaning about uniform..." (J).

Another interviewee appeared to view the decisive factor in determining the relationship as the existing culture in a particular station. He claimed,

"...Well, it was good at Shepherd's Bush, but I know from talking to other officers in other places...that in some places the relationship was not ideal. You see, with CID it depends on the particular station...it's one of those things which is different depending on which station you're at..." (Q).

Another interviewee seemed to be of the opinion that smaller stations were more conducive to good uniform/CID relationships. He said, "...when I moved to Kensington, which was a smaller station, we had a very good relationship with CID..." (L).

Another interviewee viewed the more outlying police stations as probably enjoying a closer relationship. He said,

"...It depended a lot, I think, on where you were...In inner London I would say that they really had got the two separate jobs to do...outer London, like we were, you did muck in a bit more. I would have said that the relationship was reasonable..." (J).

18. Relationship with Magistrates

According to the interviewees, It appears that between the 1930s and the 1960s many officers enjoyed what could be described as an amicable relationship, generally, with the magistrates. One ex-officer said that, "...Well, as far as I'm concerned, very good...they looked after you..." (K).

By and large, magistrates appeared to be on the side of the police and were quick to protect them if they thought that they had been the victim of an assault. For example,

"...generally speaking, the stipendaries were very, very friendly and they looked upon us as their personal property really. I remember one magistrate saying, "...I'm not having my officers assaulted in the street. You'll go to prison for three months!"..." (A).

The following interviewee recounted an anecdote which shows that one magistrate was so eager to sentence two defendants that he forgot an important part of the judicial process. He said,

"...It was St. Patrick's Day and I walked into a Paddy fight amongst themselves. Twelve of them having a punch up in Edgware tube station toilets...it was like a blood bath..."Bejesus Sir. It's a friendly fight!"..."You're nicked. You can't do that in a public place"...So there's me walking from the Edgware tube station with these twelve in front of me...two of 'em swung punches and they both missed each other and hit me...it was by accident. And Roland Thomas the next morning...came into the box and there's me with an eye out here somewhere and a jaw out here somewhere...he said, "Those two are doing six months!" "Excuse me, Sir. You haven't heard the evidence yet"..." (C).

The fact that some magistrates appeared to view officers in such a possessive way meant that it was very difficult for defendants to make allegations of police

brutality. One interviewee recalled the apparent common-sense approach of one judge to the issue of police use of force. He said,

"...This bloke...Ginger...complained to the court that I'd hit him...The judge turned to me and he said, "Did you hit him?" I said, "Yes Sir". He said, "Why did you hit him?" I said, "He was hitting me". He said, "That's fair enough"..." (M).

One of the interviewees had the following to say on what he believed made a good magistrate. "...They were on our side...but then a good magistrate is always on the side of the police...except when he's a woman..." (Y).

Despite the generally good relationship with the courts, the officers had to be careful to ensure that they did not try to stretch the truth too far, and that they could present the evidence in an acceptable manner. It is probably the case that, generally, the police relationship with magistrates was one of mutual respect. On occasions, however, magistrates perceived police officers to be breaching this boundary. According to one interviewee, a number of officers suffered at the hands of one magistrate. He said,

"...Another magistrate he was a bugger...He'd send the copper out if he didn't present his evidence one hundred per cent perfect...at Lavender Hill they were going to have ties made with a door knob on for those who'd been sent out the bloody door...and they heard about it at the Yard and they said, "No, don't do that. It's a bit disrespectful"..." (N).

Other magistrates, on occasion, would, according to another interviewee, display very little patience towards officers. He said,

"...One or two had their liverish days like the famous Sue Campbell and the famous Eric Guest who had been known to tear up officers' notebooks and sling them across the court..." (H).

159

According to the account of another interviewee, the magistrates would not stand for what they might perceive as the repeated harassment of a member of the public,

"...the magistrates supported the police as well as they possibly could. But they were human and they would get to know if certain officers made a habit of coming to them with certain things and the chap would always plead 'not guilty' and perhaps make certain allegations about something. You know...after a bit they would smell a rat and they would dismiss it..." (R).

Magistrates would also apparently become wise to some 'tricks' that police officers might try to pull. One ex-officer claimed that,

"...I've seen police with sticking plasters, I mean, this is unofficial, a PC would put some sticking plaster on and a poor bloke got three months for a piece of sticking plaster...it was unbelievable in those days. But, then young PC's were trying to pull a fast one...then the magistrates heard of that one and would say, "Take your sticking plaster off!"...oops (laughs)"...(C).

Similarly, "...Well, it is hard to generalise but the magistrates, I found, got to know you and they got to know whether you were...telling the truth or not..." (M).

Although officers appeared to enjoy a generally good relationship with the magistrates it should be noted that this cordiality could not be taken for granted. In the view of one of the ex-officers interviewed, the relationship began to decline at some point during the 1960s. For example, "...certainly by the time I left there wasn't that...all the cosy bit had gone...they were just doing a job of work..." (I).

In the absence of the interviewees forwarding any reasons for the decline in the police/magistrate relationship, it may be possible to tentatively suggest some.

The perceived need for greater accountability in the criminal justice system might have meant that a few of the more 'colourful' magistrates stepped down. It may be the case that officers became better trained in giving evidence and, therefore, did not provoke such lively outbursts from the bench. Finally, it may be the case that the perception of an amiable relationship with the magistrates is related to a wider perception of a 'Golden Age' of British policing and has less basis in fact than officers might actually wish.

19. The Relationship with the Public

It is quite difficult to chart the entire topic of the police/public relationship within the confines of one sub-section so the subject will be dealt with in three related sections: The Relationship with the Public, Differences in the Police/Public Relationship Between Areas and Perceived Changes in the Police/Public Relationship over Time.

When investigating the police relationship with the public in the Metropolitan area, a number of problematic factors soon begin to emerge. One is the fact that there is the possibility that many of the ex-officers who were interviewed for this research may have had a 'Golden Age' view of the police relationship with the public. Almost all of the officers who served in the era prior to the Second World War reported having an excellent relationship with the public and it is hard to verify whether or not this coincides with the views of members of the public at the time. We must also be aware of the fact that the public of London cannot be seen as a homogeneous group and that generalising a small number of police opinions which espouse a positive view of the police/public relationship for the rest of the city's population may be problematic.

Recollections of the pre-War years tend to stress the public service role of the police more than the law enforcement role. One interviewee claimed that,

> "...The old copper was renowned for his kindness to people. When I was doing station duty...on several occasions you'd get people who were stranded...and hadn't got the money to get back home...You were

allowed to give them a certain amount of money and then you'd have to write reports on it and all this sort of thing...on a promise from them that they would return it and God knows what. Well, it was too much of a problem...so if you got somebody you thought was genuine...very often you'd give them half a crown...and you'd forget all about it. And, of course, the other situation was lost children and all this sort of thing. Whenever they were brought into the police station...My God! They were made a fuss of...The first thing that happened was that they were given sticky buns out of the canteen and we had several kids...poor kids down Harrow Road who repeatedly came in and said, "I'm lost"...just so they could get spoilt with cake and that sort of thing. In a way, policemen, as far as certainly women and children were concerned, were very, very soft-hearted...they were a bunch of old softies..." (T).

Similarly, another quote appears to show how the 'Bobby' was known for his compassion for the old and needy,

"...I remember, we called one Saturday morning to a poor old lady that lived in a two up two down place off Brixton Hill...and it was three and six for a doctor just to give a bottle of medicine and it was ten and six for the doctor to be called out. Well, in those days they just didn't have the money...The rest of 'em soon gave us half a crown each and I was able to take up to the old lady another 10 bob just to help things with her...and it was so much like that in those days. I don't say we police were all angels or that but they used to help people in small ways...but it was more of a family thing. In, say Brixton, it was a working class area and it was all like a big family to a certain extent...so that was another big change I think in the police..." (R).

The above quote highlights the compassionate self-image some officers may have held and also the fact that the interviewees viewed themselves as an integral and valued part of the community. Over half of the officers were of the opinion that they were viewed by the public as both knowledgeable and helpful,

162

and that this led them to believe that members of the public viewed the police as, predominantly, a public service. One interviewee recalled that,

"...people used to come up to you on the street and ask advice about stuff...I don't always say you could give 'em the right advice...but you'd always tell them something and they were happy..." (R).

Similarly,

"...Yeah...very close really and I think they looked upon us as a friendly, helping hand...this is how the reputation was built up about the police in this country because of their attitude towards the public...it was friendly and you expected them to be friendly towards you. Very often, if you were in trouble, they would come to your assistance...I've done that...lend members of the public money...especially people at Paddington Station. I mean, you could pick out the genuine ones from the 'mumpers' and the beggars of which there were a lot round Paddington Station, of course. And very often they would come to you because they looked upon you in that way. I mean, a lot of your duty was more in helping people than disciplining them or any heavy-handed type of law enforcement...very often they would look upon you for guidance and help..." (A).

The above quote again highlights the police self-view of being perceptive at assessing members of the public. As many officers pride themselves on their ability to distinguish between the guilty and the not guilty, so it appears that some may view themselves as being able to distinguish between those in need of help and the 'mumpers'.

This view of the police as providing a public service was no doubt aided by the fact that the beat work of uniform officers was usually conducted on foot. This meant that, over time, a great deal of contact was made between members of the public and the local officer and trust began to develop. Another strand central

to this 'Golden Age' view of policing is that, the officers claimed, the power vested in the police was seldom if ever used. One interviewee said that,

"...It's unbelievable...we kept the peace and nobody argued with us...we had a truncheon down our trouser pocket which was out of sight...very seldom, if ever, used...in fact, you could almost go through the whole of thirty years service and never, ever use it..." (T).

Another benefit to the police of this close relationship with the public was that the latter became a vital source of information in the community, especially with regard to the crime detection aspect of police work. One ex-officer claimed,

"...Well, generally speaking we had an absolutely marvellous rapport with the general public and they used to come up to you in the street and they would tell you all their history and all their complaints and all about the bloke next door who'd done a bit of thieving. This is where a lot of the information came people, well most of the people who lived around that particular area and then you went on to another beat and you would spend a month there...and then of course you had to do schools, seeing the children across the road, you got to know all the mothers...it was such a close relationship with the public..." (A).

Two beat officers also spoke of the relationship which they had with the employees of the London transport networks. For example,

"...Brixton, right outside the station there was a chap where the trams went from overhead to conduit...and there was a bloke who always used to pull the points over. So...the drivers, when they got there, they'd shout out, "Peter, nip into the station and say a policeman needs assistance at Brixton Hill. And you'd rely on all that sort of thing, you know...it doesn't seem possible does it?..." (R).

Officers could also expect to be informed by such employees of the imminent arrival of a superior undertaking an inspection. For example,

"...When I went to Lavender Hill...it was very noticeable there...we had the trams coming along on a night time, the all-night trams, and if it was an Inspector they'd do one pip or two pips...or if it was a Sergeant they'd do three stripes...we did have a great relationship with most people in those days..." (A).

The amiable relationship which the police enjoyed with the transport staff was perhaps not as one-way as the above two quotes might suggest. The police were allowed to travel free on public transport, not as a concession, but as a means of keeping order on public transport especially at night-time.

20. Differences in the Police/Public Relationship between Areas

The relationship between the police and the working classes may have been, to a large extent, informed by shared values originating in common cultural roots. On the other hand, however, the relationship with the upper classes appeared to be, for the police officers, to an extent informed by class deference and respect for those of a higher status. One example of such deference is illustrated by the following journal extract from an ex-officer,

"...I was on my two years probation and was led to believe, posted to a Berkeley Sq. beat because the Sergeants were instructed to post "only, young, courteous, reliable" P.C.'s there! I was slowly walking along Charles Street at 2.30 pm when I noticed an elderly lady waving to me from her window seat. There were no people watching as the servant opened the main door and beckoned me to enter. Marvellous! I had a nice chat with the Queen-like lady who helped to tea and cakes the good looking officer ogled at the same time by an equally good looking serving wench! It was not unusual but the old lady only invited the "good looking" officers? As with all such social activity which included the "Mayfair" policemen, the superior officers turned a blind eye. The rich inhabitants

loved to entertain their local bobby, with their aristocratic conversation. I remember distinctly as a recruit walking to the top of Farm Street "Mayfair" when a male voice said, "I say;- Officer" Standing at the entrance to a house, was a tall striking elderly man beautifully dressed in dark clothes with a large sombrero and cloak. He said he was pleased to see me and after explaining that he was a Russian tenor previously employed by the TSAR gave me some letters to POST..." (from the journal of Officer Z, pp. 23-24).

Another interviewee described the social life of a home beat officer in a high-class area,

"...When I was on the home beat system, I had to have two diaries, and run two diaries, one was social and one was for work, 'cos that was high class residential...you were invited to birthdays, christenings, weddings..." (C).

The above quotes appear to show that the upper classes could view the police in one of two ways. The first quote shows how the police could be deferential to the upper classes and, in turn, viewed in an almost servile light. The second quote, however, shows how the upper classes could view police officers as an integral and respected part of the locality.

The working classes (especially in areas such as the East End) tended to be regarded as friendly and honest and as being committed to the notion of community. It must be said, however, that the cordial relationship which existed between the working class and the police had to be nurtured. In some cases, this meant merely treating the denizens of the community with respect, but, in others, it might mean facing up to one of the local villains and coming out of the skirmish with dignity intact. One ex-officer spoke of his affinity with the inhabitants of the East End,

"...I love the East End of London...I love them all...villains, people, the whole thing...because it was a community and you were a very important part of that community. I was more conscious then of the role that you had to play than I ever was subsequently..." (D).

The realisation that, in the East End, an officer was as much a part of the social fabric as, for example, the costermongers appeared for the above officer at least to confirm the validity of his role there. Another ex-officer said of his experiences in the same area,

"...Basically, they were honest people in the East End...although they were poor they never used to commit crime because they were poor. The people that committed crime were the criminals. Normal people...they used to help one another in the East End in those days..." (X).

For this officer, the experience of working in the East End seemed to dispel much of the cynicism with which many officers view the inhabitants of where they police. One ex-officer said of his experiences with the working classes outside the East End,

"...Great relationship in Putney and Paddington...there was a very good relationship, especially when the home beat system came in, especially the coppers in Paddington...when you got given a beat in Paddington you had to go and either get beaten up or stand up to the villain who was in charge of that area and you literally had to have a punch up to prove yourself...that you could take him. Patrick Quirk was mine...he was built like a brick something or other...he was a bit tasty. So I think we came out of that a draw. But after that we had no trouble on the beat...but you had to go out and prove it..." (C).

Although the 'ceremony' detailed above might be viewed by some as somewhat brutal, this rite of passage may be symbolically viewed as an initiation into

becoming part of, or belonging to, a particular community. To come out of such an encounter with dignity intact ensured the officer of both public support and acceptance in the area.

Six of the interviewees articulated a dissatisfaction with the attitudes of the middle classes towards the police. For example,

"...I found that people in the poorer areas were more co-operative than in the what's its name areas. I mean in some of these posher areas, when they're broken into, they say, 'Go round the side entrance'...or the back entrance..." (M).

Similarly, "...The middle class knew very little, or nothing, about you and they had all kinds of illusions...much more than today. There weren't very many cop dislikers or haters in that class..." (V).

Similarly,

"...all the coppers at home...I'm talking about county coppers...everybody had a great deal of respect for them. They were always talking to them and asking for help from them, but when I came to Ealing...and that's Queen of the Suburbs...I mean...they're not 'roughs' in the true sense...but they still had a disdained approach towards policemen. You know, it was peculiar...it was honestly...I'm just beginning to realise it now and so even though you were trying to help them they still didn't seem comfortable in your company..." (S).

Whereas the working classes often treated the police as equals and the upper classes appeared to treat them in an almost paternalistic manner, the middle classes appeared unsure as to how to react to the police.

21. Perceived Changes in the Police/Public Relationship over Time

Almost all those ex-officers who were interviewed expressed their opinions on how the police's relationship with the public had changed in recent years. This is generally viewed in terms of a decrease in respect for the police coupled with an increased knowledge amongst the public of their legal rights. However, those ex-officers who were interviewed also believed that modern day police practices were doing little to ease the problem. One ex-officer commented that, "...They don't realise there's the human side to it at all..." (R).

Similarly,

"...You can't really get to know anybody whose not there, can you quite honestly? I think that it's a shame really because this lovely feeling between public and police was built up over many, many years, you know, generations in fact and it's about to be destroyed..." (A).

The previous two quotes appear to refer to the obvious damage that the police/public relationship has sustained as a result of (among other things) the great decrease in foot patrols in recent years. Such a change is seen as contributing to the ever-widening gap between today's communities and the police who serve them.

However, another officer blamed the decline of the police/public relationship on what he saw as the growing culture of complaining amongst the public,

"...after the War, the relationship was very good still...but it has, I think probably deteriorated a bit from what you read in the papers. I think nowadays people know more and more about how to complain and get money out of something or the other..." (F).

Such quotes, though possibly ill-informed, tell us something about policing in the past and how the officers perceived it. These officers appear to locate their yardstick for British policing - the 'Golden Age' - sometime in the Second World

War. All subsequent eras of policing appear to be compared to this. As one ex-officer commented,

"...The War brought on a good relationship 'cos we were helping...we were stopping plundering and looting...and helping out. We were the experienced bodies that could handle situations like that..." (N).

This last quote implies that the experience of the police was instrumental in putting an end to situations of civil disorder during the Second World War and that their control of such situations made the public both respect and appreciate the police's efforts.

The years immediately after the War ended, however, are seen as signalling an abrupt end to the relationship which, for a short time, had been, more or less, perfect. The next quote appears to sum up the haste with which the British public forgot about the service provided by the policing during the War years,

"...I found that with the public it was all much friendlier, I thought, until the end of the War. After the end of the War they sort of got back into their various grooves and they didn't want to know you..." (Z).

Similarly,

"...All the camaraderie that was going on during the War with the public...that all gradually fizzled away. Gradually things began to take shape, get back to normal as it were...the policeman was always the first one they called when there was problems...Mind you, before the War there was a lot more respect for the bobby on the beat than there was after the War..." (O).

The end of the War appeared to signal a deepening malaise in the relationship between the British police and the British public which went on until tensions

appeared to explode in the 1960s, according to one ex-officer, and in the 1970s and 1980s according to another. One of these ex-officers said,

"My first impressions were that everything was relatively cosy...I mean, at that time we had that Dixon of Dock Green image...but I mean you had violence...I remember the very first Notting Hill Riots were in 1960...they overturned a coach one time. So we had all that type of thing going on but it was the exception...and it was all a bit of a laugh, all a bit of fun, you know...you went and...you kind of got stuck in and did what you had to do. But it started to get nasty I suppose by the time..'65, '66...mid Sixties it was just starting to get a bit nastier. Football crowds weren't quite the happy go lucky cheering-their-team-on types that perhaps they were...you know, there were gangs of yobbos running amok...I mean, the Grosvenor Square Riot was quite frightening...that was in the Vietnam War. Now that was frightening...I mean, they were throwing darts at the police horses...they were hurling things like that at the police horses...There's lots of photographs of police horses with darts hanging out of their flesh and they were getting ball bearings along the ground to trip the horses...I think, at the time...and I still think it's the case...that, what was happening, there was a radical, extreme left-wing element that was filtering in to the system, if you like, and using policing as a kind of vehicle for political change...there was always that kind of political thing which, I think, kind of went part-and-parcel with public disorder...so, as public disaffection or disobedience became more the norm so it became very politically involved" (I).

The other ex-officer, referred to above, said,

"...To me it all seemed very sudden...in the Seventies and Eighties...but I didn't find it too bad. Certainly, the Fifties and the Sixties were...you were the Guv'nor and when people were taught, if you like, different ways of complaining and what to complain about...things like that...then the problems started..." (H).

171

Regardless of the exact time-scale of events, within the space of a few short years the police/public relationship would, according to ex-officers, descend to the lowest point in its 170 year history. The next quote indicates an ex-officer's view of public disorder being the chief characteristic of the new relationship,

"...There was the idea of that cosy Dixon thing and you went from that to people buying their own body armour...Certainly for me, personally, looking back...it all went downhill and I think the public disorder was one of the things that kind of landmarked it...People argued back...You know, 'Leave your car, Sir, please', 'Why?'...that kind of thing..." (I).

Similarly, he said,

"...Looking back at Grunwick...a union dispute...it was sort of pre-Arthur Scargill with his flying pickets and that kind of thing...and there was a polarising of the police and the public...I think it's here to this day...the public are out there...the police are here...and it's like a necessary evil that we have to have..." (I).

It is important to look at how events such as Grunwick impacted upon the officers' perceptions of their relationship with the public. If officers viewed such events as increasing their isolation from members of the public it may be that such events do intensify certain correlates of police occupational culture. It would be interesting, however, in a follow-up study to assess, for example, if such perceived changes to the culture were reversible or not.

22. Differences in Cultural Dynamics between Geographical Areas/Police Stations

Existing literature (for example, Skolnick (1994) and Smith, and Gray (1983)) in the field of police culture tends to give the impression that few if any variations occur in the culture between police stations. However, many of the sample were of the opinion that the particular social nuances of a station or area might greatly

influence the culture among the officers there. One interviewee claimed that stations got good names and bad names - the result of anything from the socio-economic make-up of the area to the strategy implemented by a high-ranking officer.

This research appeared to show a large variation in cultural dynamics between both geographical areas and police stations. One interviewee spoke of how the culture of a police station was largely determined by the attitude of the police officers. For example,

> "...As I say, it depended entirely on the station, you see, stations got bad names and good names...some stations, you would have a lot of young, pushing blokes at the station and the discipline would be really very hard...but, generally speaking, the PC's had...the last word because if a bloke wanted something done on his relief...say there had been complaints...they'd say, "We want..."...but, you see, if one of these pushing blokes came...they'd walk past them...and wouldn't take any notice at all...so it worked both ways..." (R).

The above quote shows how the presence of very enthusiastic officers in a station could lead to stricter discipline. However, the quote also illustrates how the low amounts of supervision and high amounts of discretion which characterise beat policing meant that beat officers had a lot of freedom to police in the style they wanted to. This appeared to happen regardless of the atmosphere nurtured inside the station by more senior officers.

Over half of the officers claimed that the geographical location of the station was a very important factor in determining the behaviours and attitudes (and, therefore, the cultural dynamics) of the police officers. One officer said that,

> "...People did take on the colour of their area...and I knew several pleasant people from A division, Cannon Row, and round there...Buckingham Palace and that...but they did take on an element of

bullshit to be honest...just the same as West End coppers took on another rather more unpleasant aspect...and perhaps we took on the characteristics of the East End...and we'd use...certainly I used Yiddish words all the time and criminal slang..." (V).

Perhaps the greatest cultural chasm between geographical areas in inner London existed between the East End and the West End. Five officers pointed to the cultural distinctions between East End policing and West End policing - a distinction seemingly informed by the particular social and cultural background of the areas,

"...we found that the Londoners in the East End, round about my days, were friends. In the West End, Chelsea and around there...it was cosmopolitan...the people were snooty and looked down on coppers...they wanted to rule the roost and you had to be careful how you dealt with them, but with the East Enders, I don't say you could get away with anything, but you could deal with East Enders a lot more easily...I found that East Enders wanted to be friendly with the police more than the West Enders. And when I went out to Enfield it was wartime...a lot of young men had gone to the War...they'd built an estate out there and transferred a lot of people from the East End and when they started clearing the slums from the East End a lot of East Enders came out there, but...I don't think it seemed to be the best of the East Enders...we didn't get on with those like we did when they were on their own patch around Whitechapel and so on..." (B).

Similarly,

"...I was loaned to C Division for six months...in the West End and I was an East End copper...and I was then in Piccadilly on traffic duty and I saw a woman standing on the edge of the kerb...she was an old lady and I said, "C'mon Ma" and she came across the road...she stopped in front of me...she said, "I'm not your ma"...I said, "Oh, I'm sorry"...I went across

the road...never thought anything more of it...When I went off at 2 o'clock I was called into the office and she'd made a complaint...she'd complained that I'd called her 'Ma'...to me it's laughable...but up in the West End...He said, "You're an East End copper. You call the women 'Ma' in the East End...but you mustn't do that here. It must be 'Madam'". It just shows you the difference between the East End and the West End..." (X).

As the above quotes appear to show, officers appeared to have a far greater empathy with the denizens of the East End. The officers seem to have identified themselves far more closely with the values, behaviours and traditions of the East End which were predominantly working class - like the bulk of the police officers themselves. The West End, however, tended to be populated with the middle and upper classes who were perceived as expecting the police to show deference to them merely by virtue of their background.

However, despite the fact that officers appeared to prefer policing the working class neighbourhoods of the East End, that is not to say that officers enjoyed a good relationship with the public in all poor districts. The following officer describes the differences between policing the East End and the working class neighbourhoods of South London,

"...it depended on the area you worked, you see. Your working environment and the people you deal with have such a great bearing on how you feel when you work. Now, I worked in the East End of London...thoroughly enjoyed it...but you've got...whatever the scale is of the socio-economic group that they say now...but a happy bunch of...a mixture of villains, hooligans, all walks of life...but basically I liked working with them. Subsequently, many years later, I went to work over at...a part of my patch was Kennington with those big blocks of flats...Disaster!...Brixton I worked at...Stockwell Park Estate...Disaster! Because the people there didn't want you. They wanted to run themselves but run it their way which was the wrong way...the blokes,

they didn't have the same sort of attitude,...They were a bit, 'Bloody Hell. I'll be glad when I've got my three years and my five years and they bloody move me. This is hard work'. So, yeah, you did get a change..." (D).

Another ex-officer spoke of the differences between different parts of London,

"...I served at Kenley, and Sydenham, the Elephant and Castle...When I went to the Elephant and Castle and the bloke said, "You're in the underworld now"...you were! And you had to talk a different language. This old copper said, "You've got to talk their language...It's no good trying to be nice and kind to them 'cause they won't appreciate it"..." (M).

Once again, it appears that officers in working class areas sought to adopt some of the local mannerisms or speech to be accepted by a community. It is interesting to contrast this with the attitude of some of the more prosperous areas where officers were positively discouraged from becoming part of the environment.

It may be the case that some areas of London were viewed differently by many officers because of the fact that a different type of policing was required and that this differentiation was made in terms of the socio-economic class of people who lived or worked there. The following two quotes show how officers stationed in Kensington had a somewhat different role from those in the East End,

"...I was transferred to Kensington which wasn't bad...when I saw the Chief Inspector...he told me that, at Kensington, my main job was to keep the people happy so we didn't get any complaints...and if I caught any thieves on top of that, better still. But the main object was to stop Kensingtonians complaining. I did that quite successfully as far as I was concerned...totally different policing to what it was in South London at the time..." (F).

Similarly,

"...I liked the smaller station...Kensington was a little station and very friendly...everybody got on well...it was a little family almost...we were mainly dealing with tourists and traffic and the big things like Olympia and Earls Court...I suppose that I didn't, like the East End would have done...didn't get so much involved in the community work..." (L).

Thus, it seems that for Kensington, at least, police work did not so much revolve around law enforcement as keeping happy both residents and tourists alike. This shows a marked difference with policing in the East End where officers were drawn more into the fabric of the environment and, therefore, played a greater role in the lives of the inhabitants. Policing more prosperous areas necessitated a more removed presence and this can be seen as being due to two main factors. In short, the East End was perceived to have a crime problem whereas Kensington was not perceived to have a crime problem.

It also appears that there may have been a reluctance on the part of the police to enforce lower level laws against the inhabitants of wealthier areas probably because of the fact that it appears that such individuals felt the law did not apply to them. One officer said,

"...St John's Wood is a very, very, predominantly Jewish area...I mean, you may pick up on the fact that I'm talking about Greeks, Irish, and Jews...policing in those days was very, very, conscious of different groups, if you like...you could say the police were very fascist, I don't mean that in a heavy duty sense of the word, but fascist in that they were white and Anglo Saxon and British and everything else was kind of like foreign, so to speak. But St John's Wood was very, very, wealthy...pop stars and people like Bob Monkhouse and Joe Loss used to live there...and, yes, you did behave differently...if you found Joe Loss's car parked on a yellow line in St John's Wood you could put a ticket on

it...but it was a pointless and wasted exercise...so, yes, you did treat people differently..." (I).

Whilst a minority of the interviewees claimed that small police stations instilled more camaraderie than the larger stations, one officer claimed that a significant crime rate or element of danger was also required to create a strong bond between the officers. The following quote appears to show how the size or location of a station can affect the culture within it,

"...Well, it depends on their size...and the locality you're in. Now, Barnes...I was a DC there and there was one Sergeant...and we were the lord of the manor. We were attached to Richmond police station...Now, Lavender Hill, rough old quarter, but we all stuck together...down the pub. We were all friends together...the DI and the whole lot because you had to stand together..." (N).

Similarly, another officer described what he perceived as the difference in levels of camaraderie between an East End station and a suburban Essex station,

"...At Lemon Street...a PC coming in from the street...he would see people at the counter...if the Sergeant didn't shout to him...he would deal with it automatically...you would say, "Can I help you?"...But at Romford I made myself disliked because I went into the reserve room and said, "I want someone to come out here and assist me". They thought that was very bad form. The fucking Essex mentality...they didn't work as a team in the suburban areas...there was a massive gap between Sergeants and PC's..." (V).

Another officer, who was used to working in the inner divisions of the Metropolitan area, appeared, like the previous interviewee, to find some aspects of rural or suburban policing as distasteful. He said,

"...I got promoted to Sergeant...my first station after getting promoted from a PC at Chelsea was at Epsom which was a different police game altogether...oh dear, oh dear, a lot of the 'old pals act' down there...ooh, not half!..." (O).

The same officer details just how different rural policing is from inner city policing and therefore clarifies the ways in which markedly different cultures might arise in police stations situated in such areas,

"...Up in Central London it's mainly street work...all kinds of things happened there...but out in the country it's different altogether...things with animals and all that sort of thing. And there was Mr so-and-so...he's a friend of so-and-so, all that bloody nonsense. Oh that sort of thing did go on, but I was only at Epsom for about six or seven months...but it was a different world down there. And another thing down in Epsom, I always seemed to be doing...the very first job I had as station officer in Epsom was a pub transfer...and in those days pub transfers...oh dear, the forms you had to fill in...they used to come in with the brokers, and both parties to transfer from one to the other...do the forms, submit the forms. And stray dogs and stray cattle and things like that. And down in Epsom it was rather funny. They used to run two books when I was there...missing persons. And you had West Park, Harden...four big mental hospitals down there. And they used to walk in and out of these hospitals...the patients... at their own will and I remember on one occasion...I was station officer on a Sunday night...the phone goes...one of these nutters got out, it began raining, and he got soaked so he phoned up to see if we'd pick him up...Yes, a variety of things used to happen down there. It was a very queer place...very, very queer...I wasn't exactly sorry to leave..." (O).

Another factor peculiar to some police stations that may affect the levels of camaraderie within is that of whether or not a particular station is viewed as a 'punishment' station. 'Punishment' stations were so known because of the fact

that most officers who were posted to them had either committed some disciplinary offence or had had a run-in or confrontation with a more senior officer. One officer said,

"...Somers Town...was a punishment station and Lemon Street was one...they finished up...these punishment stations in being renowned for their being happy places. Everyone was in the shit together as it were..." (V).

It, therefore, appears that a number of factors might contribute to differences in cultural dynamics between areas. The varying crime and criminality rates of areas, the differing amounts of danger and pressure to gain results, the predominant social class of inhabitants and the size of the police station all interacted to create distinct cultures within police stations.

One crucial factor has, so far, been left out of the analysis - the individual. It would be extremely remiss to fail to acknowledge the roles played by the personalities of individual officers in shaping the culture of a police station or even it's individual reliefs. One officer said,

"...I think a lot of the different styles or approach was just different people...different individuals had different styles...you know, different Inspectors, different Superintendents, different Sergeants, and, probably, I would even think that different reliefs had styles because you became a bunch of guys who worked together and you tended to have a style of working..." (E).

23. Relationship with Left and Right Wing Organisations

Some of the literature in the area of police work (eg, Skolnick 1994, Farrell 1993, Reiner 1992) makes the point that police are, generally, more favourably disposed towards right-wing rather than left-wing groups. The retired police officers interviewed for this research appeared, generally, to take a neutral or unbiased view towards political groups. Such groups appeared to be judged, not

by their political leanings, but by their propensity to cause trouble for the police. Over half of the ex-officers spoke about the extreme right-wing groups like Oswald Moseley's British Union of Fascists rather than the left-wing groups. One of the ex-officers said, "...I'm surprised he lasted as long as he did until someone took a pot at him...we had enough to cope with without going to his marches or his meetings..." (Y).

Whereas, the above quote implies that some officers viewed far-right activity as tiresome because it prevented them from getting on with other work, others were aware of the potential violence such groups were capable of. Another interviewee said that,

"...there were nasty ones, like the League of Empire Loyalists, and so on and we were required to take goggles with us on this thing because they were expected to use ammonia sprays on the police and, yes, there were some nasty things..." (P).

Similarly, another interviewee, talking about Moseley's Blackshirts, said,

"...They were nasty...they were very nasty people...They were more or less thugs he [Moseley] recruited...you see...and you got a battle between them and the communists in those days. They had what they call the Battle of Royal Bridge Street...it got quite nasty..." (R).

Another ex-officer viewed the actions of the BUF and their propensity to incite public disorder. He said that, "...going into the East End where there was a large Jewish population and a lot of them were very left wing, and what with Moseley's lot being fascist...the whole thing was really set up for fighting..." (A).

Thus, it appears that the ex-officers interviewed for this piece of research did not appear to display any particular feelings of sympathy for the right-wing groups. It could be argued, however, that they were sympathetic to their ideas but not their

methods. Right-wing extremist groups were viewed as being violent, thuggish and as attempting to stir up violence in the East End, one area with which several of the ex-officers had a particular affinity. One ex-officer also was of the opinion that the police had enough to do without having to deal with such matters.

The fact that the ex-officers did not appear to have any great affinity with the right-wing groups does not imply that they were particularly in favour of the left-wing groups. One ex-officer said that,

> "...You wouldn't feel very friendly disposed to either of them and, on the other hand, the communists...a lot of them...were fairly well-educated people and, so, you were always warned...if you had a decent Inspector in charge...was if you were going to take any action make sure that your action is justified...that it can be justified. What do you do? Because they're not fools, the majority of them, they weren't fools. They were quite an educated people and so...if you took any really excessive action...you were in trouble..." (R).

Thus, it may be the case that officers disliked or distrusted both sets of extremists but for different reasons. Whereas the right-wing groups were viewed as thuggish, the left-wing groups presented a different problem in that they were, generally, educated and would not tolerate any unjustified police actions. It appears that any police objections to such groups were not based on ideological grounds but on practical ones as such groups threatened the physical safety of the police.

Another ex-officer said,

> "...I remember once...the communists were having a meeting in Hyde Park and getting a bit uppity and then bloody Unity Mitford started parading through the middle of them wearing one of Hitler's swastikas...of course, that didn't go down very well...so we had to shield

her and the commies were shouting, "Hang her! Throw her in the Serpentine". Then a bright spark shouted, "Hang the police"...Then it got rough...we formed a circle round her 'cos we had to protect her...luckily, there was only a few of us coppers so the circle was strong...but that was quite violent..." (Q).

24. Relationship with Law-Breakers

The ex-police officers interviewed for this research identified two distinct types of law-breakers. One was characterised as being respectful to the police (a respect which often appeared to be reciprocated) and the other was characterised as one who could cause trouble for officers. This view is articulated by the following officer who said, "...There were villains who didn't used to beat about the bush...they were caught and that was that...and you got villains who'd put you to a lot of trouble..." (X).

The following interviewee tells of his experience with a law-breaker,

"I knocked off a bloke for a house break-in or something and he went up and pleaded 'guilty' good as gold. And so...about two or three summers afterwards I'm at Hastings, on holiday in Hastings, and the bloke comes up to me and says, "Hello Guv, how are you getting along?" I said, "Oh Christ!", I said, "What are you doing now?" He says, "A bit of this and that"...ha ha ha...But, you know, he wanted to take me and buy me a drink and that sort of thing...And so...there's a lot of common ground between them and us to a large extent. If you do 'em dirty that is it..." (R).

This idea that police officers could see 'common ground' between themselves and law-breakers recalls, to an extent, the relationship between themselves and prostitutes. It appears that, sometimes, police officers were willing to extend co-operation to law-breakers who treated them with respect,

"...if the chap was a bit reasonable...you were just wasting the court's time and everyone's time and the blokes themselves...these petty

criminals...they knew they could sort of 'settle everything' with us, they called it. I don't say that the police work with criminals but...there's no black and white policing...it's impossible. If you kept to the book you'd never have an arrest. I mean, I've heard, you know, real good thieves and good criminals go up and they plead guilty to something that normally they would plead 'not guilty'...and he'd plead 'guilty' and wouldn't make any fuss..." (R).

Unfortunately, the ex-officer quoted above does not articulate what is exactly meant by the term 'settle everything' yet it probably refers to some use of the discretion afforded to officers resulting in some leeway being granted to the offender. The concluding part of the above quote reiterates the concept of the 'good thief' and the 'good criminal'. Within this context, the adjective 'good' refers not to the offenders ability to commit crime but to their respect for an unofficial code of police conduct which dictates that if they treat the police with some respect they also will be treated that way. Another ex-officer described a similar example of such adherence to the unofficial code,

"...In those days a good villain respected the law and, if you arrested him, you either arrested him for something he'd done or if you couldn't...he'd probably put his hands up to something knowing full well you hadn't got him for what you really should have got him for...and he'd put his hands up to it and there was none of this punch-ups every time you arrested somebody" (C).

This code of mutual respect also appeared to sometimes manifest itself in the aforementioned 'arresting by appointment'. Although usually reserved for prostitutes, this concession was also apparently used with some 'good villains'. One interviewee said,

"...Oh yeah...you used to do things like appointment...you used to do it on appointment...you know. An example could be...you knew that you were looking for a particular person. It was circulated that he was

wanted, he was on your patch, he'd done something. You could go round knock on his door and he wouldn't be there, of course, but his wife would be there and you'd say, "George is wanted. I know he isn't here. Just tell him to be down the police station", at whatever time you wanted the following day or two days time, "So he can put his house in order, get you sorted out, Mum, and the kids and all that and then...I don't know if he's going to get bail or not because I don't know the seriousness or all the bits and pieces". And, I tell you what...nine times out of ten you could arrest by appointment...because if you showed them courtesy, to get their house in order, get the money sorted out, all that type of thing,...they would honour that...rather than you crashing through the door at 2 o'clock in the morning with a warrant in your hand and dragging them out of bed..." (D).

Another interviewee spoke of his approach to dealing with a young offender. He said,

"...Some bods brought a lad over who'd nicked a car radio...he said he nicked it from a car on our patch...I went and chatted this laddy up... Now, that was the old soft talk...I used to chat people up...I was the old father figure..." (N).

Again, during the course of this research, one could argue that the issue of the police relationship with law-breakers may have prompted a certain amount of 'Golden Age' sentimentality amongst a minority of the interviewees. One said that,

"...If you arrested somebody that was it...they came. It was literally 'It's a fair cop, Guv'...We never got involved...we had a few punch-ups, yeah, but nothing like the modern day coppers...they're useless, in my book. You go into three areas, one white, one grey, one black. The white area, you didn't arrest, the grey area could go either way but you usually just

slap a caution on, the black area you arrest. A modern day copper doesn't think of that..." (C).

Another ex-officer describes the way in which one ex-convict greeted the news of his impending retirement. He said,

"...When I retired from Battersea, the troops [fellow officers] said, "Are you giving us a piss up?" I said, "No...The firm should give us a piss up". They rang me a few days later and told me to go to the Freemasons Arms for a presentation on Tuesday...So I went down there and the Freemasons Arms was full...All the CID from Division were there...They were all there from Superintendent down....A bloke crept up to me, he'd just come out from 12 months...I'd done him for shopbreaking. He said, "Here, Guv...What's all the fucking Law doing here?" I said, "I've retired...it's a presentation" He said, "Fuck me! That's done it...we knew where we stood with you"...Now that is a Battersea criminal...The old expression, 'It's a fair cop, Guv'..I've heard it many times. When you've got a man to rights...if you're working it on them you've got trouble..." (N).

One ex-officer, however, warns of the tendency amongst some retired officers to invoke almost mythical reminiscences of a lost 'Golden Age'. He said,

"...that's part of the myth that people, when they look back, they see it sort of rose tinted...I mean, you used to get these old coppers saying, "Oh...when I was a kid the local copper would come and clip you round the ear"...Well, I don't ever remember those days...Whether those days were around in the '40s and '50s I don't know...I suspect they weren't...I suspect they were a lot of rosiness...I mean, if you nick somebody fairly and squarely, bang to rights as we used to say...yeah, that was OK...the next day you'd talk about it with them..." (I).

25. Role of the Police. Thief-Taking or Public Service?

In many ways, this section continues the final theme examined in the previous section - that of the 'Golden Age' of policing which may (or may not have) existed in the past. Such an age was characterised by the view that police work was, predominantly, concerned with serving the public rather than enforcing the law. About a quarter of the older ex-officers who were interviewed saw the War years as epitomising the public service aspect of police work. One such interviewee said,

"The War cemented it...it did really...you were asked in anywhere for a cup of tea...I think it was the best period for policing, as such, and when I mean policing I don't mean knocking people off but for general helping and keeping order that I've been through. The fact that people would help you, would tell you things that normally they wouldn't and you would do things for them sometimes well outside the scope of duty...but it was done and the public appreciated it" (R).

Another ex-officer managed to secure a reduced sentence for an offender. He said,

"I remember I did a bloke at Barnes and when his case came up at Surrey Assizes at Kingston...I remember the Judge said, "I had intended giving you eight years imprisonment", he said, "You'll go to prison for five"...Because I conned him to confess, by telling him to confess, I said I'd speak for him. The judge said, "I think the law has lost a good advocate in you..." (N).

However, this reduced sentence was not negotiated through any compassion on the officer's part for the offender. In reality, by 'conning' the offender into confessing, the officer had guaranteed a conviction with a minimum of difficulty - that is, the outcome in this situation was that the case was decided by the actions of the police and not the jury.

The fact that officers sometimes intervened, beyond the call of duty, to aid an individual is reported by another ex-officer. He said that,

"I did a young lad for office breaking...put him in the detention room...I went into the office and said, "I've got Jimmy Hubbard, in there"....They laughed and said, "You're wasting your bleeding time. We've all had him in"...I went to talk to the lad...I said, "What's your trouble...your mum or your dad?" He said, "Stepfather"...I said, "Oh, yeah. What's the matter with your stepfather?" "He goes for my younger brother and I stand up to him"...I went down to see his parents and gave them a right old rollicking...I went to see the probation officer and I said, "Got Jimmy Hubbard coming up on Wednesday. What about probation?" He said, "Oh God. No I daren't....he's had two or three probations". I said, "Well, actually, I think I've put my finger on the trouble....Parents"... so he looked at me and said, "For you", he said, "I'll give it a run"...This is what people thought of me...He got probation for the lad...and that lad...he never looked back...I'd see him in the street and he'd be really cheerful....poor little bugger was a murder victim...after I put him straight like that...ha ha ha" (N).

As indicated earlier in this chapter, the reduced role of female police officers earlier in the century probably went some way to ensuring that their work focused on the public service role. One female ex-officer described how her job concentrated on the public service role of policing. She said,

"...It was mainly children and young persons...I can remember patrolling around...Earls Court when the Royal Tournament was on...we would patrol there   for hours because the soldiers had their billets there and, of course, the girls would be round there, so we were on patrol there to chase these girls around...There was a lot more concentration on the children walking about the streets and...if we saw kids walking around the streets when they should have been a school we would deal with them..." (L).

Despite the fact that female officers may have viewed their job mainly in terms of public service, that is not to say that some male officers did not also view the public service role as paramount. One interviewee said,

"People always refer to it as the police force...but it's the police service...that's what I like to think of it as...It's got to be a police force at times because of public order...and you can't enforce public order with kid gloves can you? Sometimes you've got to use a bit of force...It's preservation of life first...life not property...preservation of life is the most important thing really...and then property and then prevention of crime and if a crime is committed you've got to chase up the people who did it and make sure they go before the court" (P).

Similarly,

"...I was quite happy to walk around the streets and have people come up to me and ask the way to whatever...but I think you were there to serve whether it was to serve by getting crime off the streets or to be there for somebody who wanted help..." (J).

The above two quotes appear to indicate that whilst the police tended to view their work in terms of the service role, it was not always possible to differentiate between this need and the need to protect property and promote peace. It is probably unhelpful to try and view these three factors as intrinsically different as, during certain incidents, all three issues become intertwined. For example, the public are still being served whether the police are helping old ladies across the road or engaging in the prevention or detection of crime.

26. Cynicism/Hardened

Reiner (1978, 1992) suggests that cynicism is prevalent amongst police officers and this was confirmed by the views of the majority of the ex-officers interviewed for the present research. For example,

"You get hard...experienced, if you like. A dead body doesn't harm me now. When I was at Battersea and I had youngsters coming into the job I used to take them down to the mortuary every now and again and say, "Get used to that. A copper who blocks out when he see's a dead 'un is no good to me"...so you do get hardened to it that way...you get hardened...You tend to take a story with a pinch of salt until you're satisfied...you're very susceptible to doubt...but you do get the end thing done...assess it on the spot. I'm nothing special but I feel that I can instinctively know when a person's telling the truth, whether he's genuine or not" (N).

Similarly,

"Totally...both...I go along with that a hundred per cent...you see so much death and destruction of one sort or another...I mean, I've been down railway lines picking up bits of dead bodies...A little 8 year old girl was raped and stabbed, I remember, I was holding her in my arms...I saw an 8 year old boy, outside my house, went under a car and all his bones and bits...and I thought it was my son because it was my son's playmate...I still have nightmares about that to this day and...Cynical?...I'll tell you what...it makes you cynical and hard...very much so...Like they say, once a copper always a copper, it's all up here (points at head)...but the day you pack it in you start then to think, 'This is life in the real world'...you do get cynical...I mean, little old ladies tell blatant lies...I mean, 'Yes, Vicar...No, Vicar'...I mean, you could have the Archbishop of Canterbury...you catch him on a yellow line...he'll tell you lies...It's human nature so, yes, you become cynical...very much so" (I).

Cynicism (or police pessimism) may, therefore, have been commonplace in the Metropolitan Police Force between the 1930s and the 1960s. Such cynicism appears to have predominantly been caused by the day to day aspects of

policing, although the following quotes highlight the fact this is not exclusively the case,

"...don't forget that I was an East Ender. The street I lived on lead down to the Regents Canal...boys were pulled out every August. And when I was a lad we used to cycle up the River Lea and we'd see bodies floating and pulled out...you get hardened, don't you...?" (G).

Another interviewee also appeared to have been hardened prior to joining the police force, "Not with me...it hardens you a bit. I was hard when I came in...'cos of the navy. I was soft as putty at school. When I came out of the navy...don't forget I was an operating theatre nurse" (H).

Such cynicism or hardening appears to be justified by the officers with the use of two types of example - observing death at close quarters and incidents which involve the pain, death, or suffering of children. The cynicism, however, appears to be wider than such coping strategies might suggest and it might be the case that factors such as suspicion also inform it.

Over half of the interviewees appeared to have been very affected by witnessing death at close quarters. The first of three quotes describes the carnage caused by a German bomb hitting Madame Tussauds,

"...I remember I was down our section when Madame Tussauds was hit...this PC came up to our section house which was up Marylebone Road and he was telling me that they was all mixed up...there was some human remains and some waxworks remains and there'd be a wax arm there and a human arm over there sticking out...I suppose that was a bit of comic relief but very macabre...that's what happens, even when you go in to a mortuary. You usually find that the mortuary attendants are making jokes and that's their way of relief of dealing with that bloody awful job and I sometimes used to think that that was terrible but then I

came out and think I don't know if I could cope with a job like that at all..." (A).

"As a Detective Inspector you have to go to post-mortems...I've seen the mortuary keeper prepare a body for post-mortem...I won't go through the sordid details 'cos you might not like it...and one occasion, I think it was the worse one I ever did, was when a man jumped under a train with his 3 year old little girl in his arms and the parts of him finished in various places up the line and he was mangled so much they had to pump his arm to get a blood sample from it and I had to take a sample of his bowel up to the Yard for examination and all that...so I did have a bit of sordid experience" (B).

"My first ever bloody one was a railway engineer who walked into a train that was just leaving. He was totally disembowelled...we put all the pieces in this tarpaulin and waited for Dr Nelson who was the Divisional Surgeon to turn up...ha ha ha...and this is 1937 I'm talking about. He says, "Find me an arm" and we had to open this lot to find an arm and he gets out his gold Hunter and his feeling the pulse and he goes, "Yes. He's dead"...And I thought, 'How ridiculous'" (G).

A number of ex-officers spoke of how incidents concerning children often had a profound effect on them. For example,

"...It is terrible...a 9 year old girl...raped, buggered up the back passage by a man in a car...In those days we had a few women to help...but...you just have to shut it out and kind of pull a blind down" (N).

"One of those tragic deaths which has always stuck in my mind...I don't know the real circumstances in which she died but when you're training you have to go to the mortuary...and one of the sights...they're taking all the guts out and chucking them in a bucket...and that was alright...but then they pulled out the trays of the dead bodies...they kept them

192

refrigerated...and there was a little girl, a little child, blonde and she'd died of some constriction in her throat and I shall never get rid of the sight of that child's face...it's always stuck in my mind" (O).

"Oh yeah, especially to begin with and especially when perhaps a child was involved...but like a lot of things really, I suppose, you get a bit hardened to it if you see it virtually every night" (A).

Although death, especially that pertaining to children, was seen as a major source of a general cynicism or hardening to life in general, one interviewee's experiences led him to display cynicism towards the criminal justice system in general. He said, "We had this thing before the CPS...it used to be the DOPP...we used to call it the 'Director of Pleas of Guilty'..." (M) which refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions (the precursor to the Crown Prosecution Service) and the supposed reluctance of the organisation to press charges against any individual who did not plead guilty.

The cynicism or hardening experienced by officers tended to be seen as a necessary evil. One ex-officer said, "...I'll take the second one first...Does it make you hardened?...Yes, it does...but hardens is not necessarily a bad thing..." (D). Similarly, "...a lot of policemen did get callous but if you didn't you couldn't do your job" (Y).

It may also be the case that, historically, the traumas which officers experienced were not really considered, unlike today, as issues to be addressed and that this intensified feelings of cynicism. One ex-officer claimed that,

"...I can't understand, these days, when these people talk about the 'traumas' and all the rest of it...during the war we never thought about 'traumas'...you got on with it didn't you?..." (M).

27. 'Once a Copper, Always a Copper'?

One way to assess the strength of the occupational culture of the police is by assessing officers' views of how lasting the habits gained through their working life are. The majority of those officers who were interviewed were of the view that old habits do, indeed, die hard,

"Oh, you'd better ask my wife about that. She says, "You never leave it alone, do you?" Everytime I go down the street...(laughs)...all the time...'He's up to some villainy or other'..." (A).

"My wife used to tell me that I arrested her when I took her across the road...I'd get hold of her elbow..." (G).

"You have a certain way of looking at people..." (G).

"Yeah...you can't get it off your mind, can you? Your eyes are everywhere and you can't help it...it's instinctive...you can't stop it. Wherever I go my eyes are on the look out for out-of-date tax discs" (N).

"A hundred per cent...a hundred per cent true. I still write car numbers down on a bit of paper if I've seen something I'm not happy with...I will always react. Yeah, you never lose it...you never stop thinking like it, that's your problem...so when you're in the street or in a situation you're still thinking like a copper, you're still wondering why that person is doing what they're doing...yeah, you never lose it and I'm 60 now so I'm never gonna lose it" (E).

Although the majority of retired officers remained suspicious in their general outlook, one ex-officer took a more active role by working with a serving officer to make an arrest. He said,

"My wife says that, even now. I had three arrests when I was mini-cabbing. One at Ilford...a young copper is having a punch up with two

people. I stop the car to help the copper...I held one, he got the other. Now, he was a lucky copper...there was a pound of cocaine...we got the carrier and the minder. Back at the station it took about ten minutes for someone to come along and take my statement, so I said "Give us a 1992 and I'll do it myself". He says, "What? Your ex-job aren't you?" I said, "Yeah" "Do you mind putting your name on the charge sheet, it'll help with the youngster" Well, as soon as they found out they pleaded guilty to possession" (C).

Similarly,

"I think there is...I've had two commendations from the Commissioner since I left the police...Incidents which I've dealt with...If you're a good copper or a good detective I think you know, within the first two or three sentences, whether someone is telling you the truth or not. My wife says to me, "You're always suspicious" and I think probably I am. You try not to be...I've been out of the job 30 years now...I was in the job 31 years, you see, and I've been out since May 1967...it's a bloody long time...but I enjoyed every minute of it" (M).

Despite the fact that the great majority of the interviewees appeared to experience some difficulty in shedding the habits which became ingrained during their working lives there was one notable exception. One ex-officer claimed,

"No...not at all...For me, I was looking towards another life after the police and I went down the road of teaching, I decided I wanted to go into teaching quite early on...so I did all the OU [Open University] bit, got a degree, went to teacher training college, did all that, and here I am, you know, doing what I want to do. A lot of people don't...you won't have known this but at least either two or three of the security people downstairs are ex-coppers...There's nothing else they can do, I mean, what can an ex-copper do really...when you think about it...what are they

fit for? If you feel that as one door shuts another opens then, fine, you do that. So, I don't think there is any truth in that...I think it's just a cliche because all the policemen I ever worked with or knew...they say, "That's it!"...I mean, you might go to reunions and stuff like that...but you get on with doing, you know, what you do" (I).

The above quote appears to show that if one wants to, one can shed quite easily aspects of a 'working personality'. As with other aspects of police culture, it appears that the individual can choose to what extent he or she desires to internalise it. It may, however, be the case that the research was always more likely to attract officers who had enjoyed their days in the Metropolitan Force and who still took an interest in it than those who did not. If this is the case, then it might explain why the findings indicate that camaraderie was perceived as such an important factor to the interviewees.

Chapter 5

Analysis

Introduction

In the following chapter, I will draw together the main themes, issues and debates which arise from this piece of research into police occupational culture. To do this I will first of all provide an in-depth overview of Skolnick's (1994) work where he provides a 'Sketch of the Policeman's Working Personality'. This piece is important in that it provides a thematic template for the study of police occupational culture and has been of lasting influence upon other pieces of research in the area (e.g. Smith and Gray, 1983).

Despite this, there is a real lack of contemporary research in the area of police culture and there does appear to have been a real shift away from attempts to analyse police behaviour within cultural frames of analysis over the last decade. Two examples may highlight this and they both pertain to the police use of force. Skolnick and Fyfe (1993) attempted to provide a contemporary analysis of police violence in the United States but failed to refer to any recent research in the area of police culture. This may indicate that recent years have seen a general shift from attempts to explain police behaviour in terms of police culture. Similarly, a recent anthology of pieces addressing police violence against members of ethnic minorities edited by Nelson (2000) views such malpractice in terms of individual psychology rather than in terms of police culture.

Secondly, I shall compare the findings of the present research with the ideas discussed in the literature review. This section will mainly address issues revolving around the problem of 'determinism' which arise when investigating police occupational culture. These include the political background to Skolnick's work, the importance of internal and external factors in causing variation in police culture, the cultural specificity of Skolnick's work and the limitations of Skolnick's triumvirate of danger, authority and efficiency.

Thirdly, I shall compare and contrast the findings of the present research with those of the more established works on a number of key correlates of police occupational culture. By investigating the differences (and similarities) between the findings of the existing research and the present research we should be able to isolate key issues to aid us in our understanding of the subject. Finally, the importance of wider societal factors in determining the intensity of police culture will be addressed.

1.An In-depth Overview of Skolnick's Conception of the Police Officer's 'Working Personality'

In this part of the chapter I shall undertake a more in-depth analysis of Skolnick's theory of the police 'working personality' and assess it's impact upon the culture of the police.

Skolnick's investigation of the police 'working personality' starts with the assertion that individuals in certain occupations, "...develop distinctive ways of perceiving and responding to their environment" (p.41). He views certain elements of the police role as being crucial to shaping the way officers respond to their own environment - namely, danger, authority, and efficiency. These, "...combine to generate distinctive cognitive tendencies and behavioural response in police: a "working personality."..." (p.41) which leads to "...distinctive cognitive tendencies in police as an occupational grouping" (p.41).

The element of danger, Skolnick suggests, likens the job of policing, in some respects, to that of being a soldier. Similarly, the aspects of authority and the need to be seen as efficient are not dissimilar to the pressures felt, respectively, by schoolteachers and industrial workers. However, members of no other occupation, argues Skolnick, experience such a combination of factors. Variations in any of these three conditions may have a small effect upon the culture of the police but generally the culture is viewed as unchanging.

Skolnick builds upon the work of Janowitz (1964) in asserting that the 'working personality' of the police officer is more a lifestyle than an occupation because of the life and death tasks that it may sometimes involve. Variations in this 'working personality' may be caused, according to Skolnick, by the internal division of labour (and, therefore, occupational specialisation) of officers. However, the 'working personality' of the police officer does appear to revolve around certain common reference points, linked to the duties and working life of the beat officer, by nature of the fact that every officer has experience of this role. Skolnick

199

explains how the 'working personality' of the officer contributes to the occupational culture of the police as follows,

"The process by which the police officer's "personality" is developed may be summarized: The police officer's role contains two principal variables, danger and authority, that should be interpreted in the light of a "constant" pressure to appear efficient. The element of danger seems to make the police officer especially attentive to signs indicating a potential for violence and lawbreaking. As a result, the officer is generally a "suspicious" person. Furthermore, the character of police work makes an officer less desirable than others as a friend, because norms of friendship implicate others in the officer's work. Accordingly, the element of danger isolates the police socially from that segment of the citizenry that they regard as symbolically dangerous and also from the conventional citizenry with whom they identify" (p.43).

Thus, the element of danger makes officers suspicious, whilst the very nature of police work isolates the officer from the general public. The officer, therefore, is alienated from both law-breakers and law-abiders. Danger is not, however, the only factor which alienates the police. The factor of authority also exacerbates this chasm between the police and the public as members of the public suspect that officers may not themselves abide by the laws which they enforce. Skolnick goes on to say that, "...danger undermines the judicious use of authority" (p.43) and that this explains why British police might be seen as appearing to work closer to the letter of the law than their American counterparts. Thus, Skolnick suggests that the greater the threat of danger to an officer, the greater the chance that an officer will utilise his or her authority in an inappropriate manner.

A potentially problematic issue arises at this juncture. First, when Skolnick writes about how danger serves to disrupt adherence to procedural regularity this appears to cut across the bows of his earlier assumption that variations in police culture were due to internal police factors such as division of labour and specialisations within the police role. It may be, however, that specialisations

within the police role lead to variations in the amount of danger faced by officers engaged in different roles.

Skolnick goes on to address those situations and individuals which might pose a threat to the authority of the police. He writes of how,

> "...they [the police] develop perceptual shorthand to identify certain kinds of people as symbolic assailants, that is, as persons who use gesture, language, and attire that the police have come to recognize as a prelude to violence" (p.44).

In other words, police officers are viewed as stereotyping individuals by means of the non-verbal cues and body language which those individuals exhibit. Sholnick goes on to claim that the threat of violence which such individuals represent is often under-emphasised by individual officers and this may be an example of a coping strategy to help them deal with the danger they face. The way in which the threat of danger leads to suspicion is described as follows,

> "...However complex the motives aroused by the element of danger, its consequences for sustaining police culture are unambiguous...This element requires the police officer...to live in a world straining toward duality, and suggesting danger when "they" are perceived. Consequently, it is in the nature of the police officers' situation that their conception of order emphasizes regularity and predictability. It is, therefore, a conception shaped by persistent *suspicion*" (p.46).

Skolnick continues to expand upon the idea that the police are isolated not only from the marginalised groups which they police but from citizens in general. He wrote that officers claimed that the most serious problem facing them, "...was not racial problems, but some form of public relations: lack of respect for the police, lack of co-operation in enforcement of the law, lack of understanding of the requirements of police work" (pp. 48-49).

This attitude of the public serves to alienate the police from them in off-duty as well as on-duty situations. Skolnick illustrates this with extracts from interviews with officers who describe the difficulties they experience in off-duty situations with people who are not police officers. One of the officers claimed that he did not enjoy going to parties where he was the only officer there. Another spoke of how he did not want his family to become a 'police family' and how he did not let people know that he was a police officer because of the effects it would have on his relationships with people.

Skolnick goes on to show how the bond between police officers is exceptionally high even when compared to other tightly-knit occupations. There appear to be two main sources of discontent which promote such high levels of solidarity amongst officers. Some are related to the job itself (e.g. police pay, police prestige and the perception that much of the criminal justice system is biased against the police) whereas the rest are related to the attitudes of the public (e.g. public apathy and a lack of public support). As Skolnick writes,

> "...The police do not believe that their status as civil servants should relieve the public of responsibility for law enforcement. The officers feel, however, that payment out of public coffers somehow obscures their humanity and, therefore, their need for help" (p.52).

This idea, of police and public working in partnership against crime, is one which the police appear to strive to forge and one which the public appears to seek to avoid. The police may be critical of a perceived lack of public support, yet see themselves as the experts and the public as a mere resource to provide, for example, information. Ideally, it appears that the police would like the support of the public for their work but not their direct involvement in it. On the other hand, Skolnick states that members of the public encourage this split between themselves and the police as they are reluctant to acknowledge the humanity of police officers as this would then implicate them in their work.

Authority is generally viewed as being a major factor contributing to the social isolation experienced by police officers especially in the context of the enforcement of traffic laws. Such legislation is seen as having a great effect on the police/public relationship for two main reasons. Firstly, the enforcement of traffic laws has succeeding in 'criminalising' (albeit at a minor level) a large segment of the population which would, previously, have been viewed as law-abiding. Secondly, there is the suspicion that traffic indictments are controlled by quota systems and are, therefore, as much a result of 'budget requirements' as the need to maintain public order.

Police officers, however, do not merely hold authority and *direct* the citizenry but also, "...*regulate public morality*" (pp 54-55). The wide ranging role of the police officer means that he or she has to enforce regulations and laws which seek to control sexuality, gambling, intoxicating drugs and alcohol - all of which are very subjective and, therefore, difficult behaviours to judge. Whilst being employed to regulate public morality, Skolnick argues, there is the suspicion that the officer does not always subscribe to those rigidly defined behavioural norms which he or she is enforcing. In fact, it may be argued that the type of personality best suited to deal with the various aspects of policing is diametrically opposed to the puritanical personality usually associated with such conformity to the law. Skolnick indeed notes how, from his own experience, that puritanical is not an adjective which would frequently be used to describe the average police officer which he encountered during his research. Similarly, he notes that when police officers do 'let go' they tend to do it in the presence of their colleagues and not members of the public. Police officers, therefore, attempt to hide any behaviour which could be considered unsuitable from the eyes of the public so as to not be seen as hypocritical.

Skolnick, like Whitaker (1964), believes that police solidarity grows with perceived decreases in the authority of the police and with perceived attacks on the authority of the police. Such solidarity is not 'forced' but is valued highly by the men who experience, "...strong feelings of empathy and cooperation" (p.57). Skolnick views such strong occupational bonding as being due to the presence

of danger (both potential and realised) in the police role and their, "...shared experiences of hostility" (p.57) presumably from both law-breakers and law-abiders.

Whereas, the potential for danger creates suspiciousness in the mind of the police officer the authority vested in the police officer tends to make them conservative. Skolnick wrote that,

> "...police are notably conservative, emotionally and politically. If the element of danger in the police officer's role tends to make the officer suspicious, and therefore emotionally attached to the status quo, a similar consequence may be attributed to the element of authority. The fact that a person is engaged in enforcing a set of rules implies that the person also becomes implicated in affirming them". (p.58)

Thus, the police tend to view the laws they enforce as just and correct. Similarly, police officers tend to support the Establishment and this conservatism has not been hindered through police involvement in union disputes over the years. Skolnick's research indicated that although such conservatism is by far the norm, he did encounter one officer who exhibited more radical views, but who resigned before finishing his probationary period.

Skolnick goes on to address the possible existence of differentiation in the correlates of police occupational culture between both different cultures and different police roles. He suggests that the similarity in role and activities of police officers between American cities means that we can assume a similarity in attitude between police officers. Variations in the police 'working personality' are seen by Skolnick as being due to factors controlled by the police. Greater citizen hostility is seen as being due to the fact that the police are 'high caliber' and not because of factors external to the police such as public knowledge of police malpractice. In other words, Skolnick appears to be of the view that variations in police 'working personality' are due to police specialisation or other occupationally controlled factors such as police policy. The findings of the

present research appear to support Chan's idea that wider societal factors have an effect on the culture of the police. Further to this, such factors may possibly account for variations in police 'working personality'.

Skolnick investigated the work of Banton (1964) who compared policing in Scotland and the United States. On the subject of social isolation, Banton saw the British police as more isolated than their American counterparts due to their having a more detached and impersonal manner. Similarly, although much has been made of the fact that British police face a lesser degree of violence than American police, this does not mean that they do not face hostility. In fact, Skolnick claimed that despite facing a somewhat lower threat of physical attack, police officers in the United Kingdom face a significantly larger chance of encountering attacks on their professional integrity.

Another significant difference between the police in the United Kingdom and the United States lies in the causes of social isolation. The isolation of American officers is seen as a direct result of the hostility of the public, whereas the isolation of their British counterpart is due to them taking it upon themselves to distance themselves from the public. Skolnick asserts that it might be the case that American officers would like to be less isolated from the public whereas British officers would not. Skolnick claims that,

> "The elements of danger and authority in the police officer's work evidently impede gregarious tendencies and, in general, account for similar cognitive inclinations in American and British police. To be sure, differences exist in the salience and character of these elements and in the process by which danger and authority affect the officer's way of looking at the world. Nevertheless, both elements seem to be present, specific outcomes such as social isolation are similar, and, most importantly, the British and American police seem to see the world similarly" (p.64).

Skolnick is aware that at least one apparent contradiction arises from his work: despite an apparent similarity of 'working personality' among British and American officers, the former appear to have a greater conformity to legal procedure. He states that, "...relations of the police organization to the community and a less moralistic substantive criminal law" (p.64) may contribute to less police malpractice in the UK but also claims that police malpractice is more visible in the US.

In his analysis, however, Skolnick argues that there is a general assumption that British police officers work more strictly to the letter of the law than their American counterparts. Skolnick quotes police oral testimonies from Fryer (1957) to support the notion that the British police are skilled at *appearing* to conform to procedural regularity rather than actually conforming to it. He goes on to develop this idea by stating that,

"A key distinction between the English and American police is that the former tend to be more *discreet* in an interactional sense as well as *discrete* in an administrative one, thereby avoiding the censure that is often the lot of the American police" (P.65).

In conclusion, Skolnick states that the combination of danger and authority in the police officer's role is incompatible with a strict adherence to procedural regularity as danger leads to defensiveness and authority cannot be used objectively within such a situation. Thus, Skolnick suggests that policing becomes less humane and less subtle as the elements of danger and the pressure to be seen as efficient become more common. He illustrates this point with examples of police malpractice from a 1963 inquiry into the Sheffield Police where pressure on the police to gain results led to officers using both fists and weapons in an attempt to extract confessions from two prisoners.

2. Comparison of the Findings of the Present Research to the Literature Review

The present research does, at first sight, appear to support many of the correlates of police occupational culture proposed by writers such as Smith and Gray (1983) and Skolnick (1994). Evidence of police racism, sexism and corruption, to name just three, were apparently present amongst Metropolitan officers between the 1930s and the 1960s.

At another level, however, the present research appears to suggest that, despite the presence of these familiar correlates, the nature of police culture may allow officers to display a greater variation in behaviour than is often suggested. Writers like Skolnick (1994) have tended to isolate a number of negative attributes, such as, racism, sexism and corrupt practice and then look for evidence of officers exhibiting such behaviour. Presumably, police behaviour which did not exhibit an adherence to such negative values was not deemed as falling within the study's remit. This approach to the study of police occupational culture has tended to give existing literature in the area a very negative tone as all police officers are viewed as adhering to a certain number of essentially negative traits.

The existing literature does recognise that there may be some variation in the degree of adherence to such values and that this is usually caused by variation in the police role between rank or tasks. For example, Skolnick (1994) suggests that traffic cops will have a slightly different 'working personality' from CID officers,

"...By no means does such an analysis suggest that there are no individual or group differences among police. On the contrary, most of this study emphasises differences, endeavouring to relate these to occupational specialties in police departments. This chapter, however, explores similarities rather than differences, attempting to account for the police officer's general dispositions to perceive and to behave in certain ways" (p.43).

Skolnick, therefore, regards variations in the working personalities of officers as being due to variations in police role through specialisation. Such an argument may explain some group differences but may be inadequate as an explanation of all individual differences. For example, differences in the behaviour of police officers who have similar occupational roles may not be explained solely by specialisation-based factors. This leads us to question the extent to which individual differences in the 'working personality' are attributable solely to variables within the police profession. Ultimately, it appears that Skolnick wished to view the 'working personality' of the police officer as being entirely shaped by factors particular to policing. Exhibited behaviour which varied from the norm tended to be explained as being due to the specialisation of some aspects of police work. At no time does Skolnick appear to articulate the idea that individual differences in 'working personality' might be due to the influence of factors external to the police force. Neither proactive factors (such as an officer's personal attributes) nor reactive factors (such as the reaction of that officer in a volatile situation) appear to be viewed as factors relevant to police occupational culture.

A counter argument might suggest that Skolnick is correct to ignore individual differences and address themes of generality because the word 'culture' implies group rather than individual activity. However, the findings of this piece of research appear to support the view that the 'culture' of officers is a flexible phenomenon determined by many factors, of which some are external to the occupation of policing, and that these all have an impact on officers' behaviour.

Skolnick's work can be seen as having both positive and negative effects. At a purely practical level it brought into the open the fact that the behaviour of some police officers was unacceptable or prejudiced or corrupt. At the same time, it encouraged others to follow his lead and undertake systematic ethnographies of police work and, therefore, add to our knowledge of social control. On the other hand, Skolnick's legacy appears to have influenced others to embrace, unquestioningly, his thematic framework. Unfortunately, however, Skolnick's

framework was a politicised one - in many ways, his work tells us more about police malpractice than police culture.

In short, Skolnick's legacy has been to lay down a framework which assumes that police culture is to be seen in purely negative terms. These negative values are seen as not being due to the individual's own psychological make-up, but as a result of the overbearing nature of the occupational culture and the individual's inevitable socialisation into it.

The results of the present research suggest that, to some extent, variations in the 'working personality' of the police officer are shaped not so much by factors internal to the police organisation but by factors external to it. The quality of the relationship between the police and the public in a particular area appeared to have a great effect on determining the adherence of officers to the various component parts of Skolnick's ideal type of the 'working personality'. For example, officers who served in the East End of London generally considered their relationship with the local population as amicable and this may be directly related to the fact that such officers tended not to display the negative attitudes associated with Skolnick's typology. In other words, police officers who display behaviours which conform to Skolnick's negative stereotypes may enjoy less amicable relationships with the communities they police than officers who behave in a less confrontational manner. However, a note of caution must be sounded when faced with such accounts of policing in the East End. Skolnick's research was based on serving officers whereas the present research asked for officers' opinions on policing in the past and it might be the case that such recollections are susceptible to overt fondness or nostalgia which might not accurately reflect what really happened.

It may also be the case that individual officer's attitudes and behaviours were shaped by their own personalities as much as by virtue of being a member of the Metropolitan Police Force. Much of the present research appears to suggest that officers' own personalities had more influence on their professional behaviour than Skolnick's work might suggest. For example, one officer interviewed during

the course (and quoted in the Findings chapter) of the present research stated that the style of policing undertaken at a particular police station could vary between reliefs purely because different individuals had different approaches to work. He said,

"...I think a lot of the different styles or approach was just different people ...different Inspectors, different Superintendents, different Sergeants...I would even think that different reliefs had styles because you became a bunch of guys who worked together and you tended to have a style of working" (E).

This is not to suggest that all shifts were radically different in their approach to policing but that the culture was not ingrained to such an extent that it was non-flexible or non-negotiable.

As previously mentioned, one of the main problems with Skolnick's framework is that it tends only to address bad police behaviour and ignores the good. Surely for any research to be balanced, we need to analyse those sporadic and episodic instances of bad police practice in the light of the generally good practice indulged in most of the time by most officers. This sentiment was echoed in the HMIC Report of 1999 which said of the phrase 'canteen culture',

"This commonly used expression fails to take account of evidence found on this inspection that many officers, partly due to publicity around Sir William Macpherson's Inquiry, have police and race issues at the forefront of their minds. The number of officers who are nominated each year for community awards (most with an outstanding record of service to all sections of the community) are part of the same culture. The blanket use of the expression "canteen culture" is as misleading as it is mischievous. Expressions or labels, which may be seen as discriminatory since they are perceived to taint all, will not move any organisation forward". (p.9)

To understand such a deterministic and inflexible conception of police occupational culture it may help to look at the background to Skolnick's work. It was conducted in the 1960s at a time when there was both a heightened awareness of human rights issues and a growing, and justified, concern at the inappropriate behaviours exhibited by some police officers. Emsley (1996) charts the way in which there was a growing concern within the UK at the time that several groups of protestors (including members of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament) had received heavy handed treatment at the hands of police officers. Against such a background, it is not surprising that the notion of police culture became synonymous with purely negative values and behaviours and also that such values and behaviours were viewed as being totally determined by the occupation itself. Policing was viewed, ultimately, as having a negative influence on anyone who joined the profession - regardless of that person's values or personality prior to joining.

One explanation for this traditionally negative view of the police 'working personality' may be the fact that Skolnick's work reflected the policing of a large city in California. Such a locality presents certain increased threats to an officer as is shown when Skolnick (1994) wrote, "Exposure to physical danger represents the height of vulnerability, a situation the British police officer encounters less often than the American" (p.62).

The very fact that police officers in the United States are generally more at risk of encountering physical violence than in the United Kingdom might lead us to exercise caution in assuming that Skolnick's conclusions can be applied directly to the UK experience of policing. Similarly, it might be the case that cultural differences occur between California police forces and forces in different states within the same country. For example, it is not hard to imagine differences in the occupational culture of California police officers when compared to, for example, officers from a state with less recorded violence. It appears, therefore, that Skolnick's theory may fail to address the issues of urban/rural differentiation of police culture and, also, the effect of the political background of the era in which the research was undertaken.

One example of an issue relating to the possible cultural specificity of Skolnick's work is what he saw as the main determining factor of the police 'working personality' - the importance of the interplay between danger, authority and efficiency. Skolnick implies that relatively high levels of all three contribute to the particular outlook attributable to the 'working personality'. With regards to the variable of danger, the findings of the present research do not appear to indicate anywhere near as high levels as described by Skolnick. On those occasions when officers did face physical confrontation they tended to view it not so much as a potentially hazardous situation, but as more of a physical challenge.

With regards to the issue of authority, Manning (1977) views it as implying an absolute morality and equates it to the state. In Manning's view, then, the state is viewed as having absolute morality and it is, therefore, the police role to defend the state. Here, another problem arises - despite the illusion of an absolute morality many of the police officers in the present research appeared to view morality as not being wholly reflected in the laws of the state. This is shown by many of the interviewees who spoke of 'common sense' policing. Such an approach is characterised by the widespread use of unauthorized discretion and one whereby the choice to arrest is made not on whether the law was broken or not but by factors such as the motivation of the individual involved. Police officers tend to view 'common sense' as being unique to police officers and as being something that can only be acquired through being an officer. In some ways, it may serve as a means of self-legitimation by providing officers with a way of justifying any action with no chance of being legitimately criticised by non-officers. Similarly, the amount of paperwork which would be generated by the prosecution of an individual would be weighed up in relation to the perceived seriousness of the crime.

The issue of authority is further brought into question when one takes into account the fact that several of the interviewees in the present research did not believe in the moral reasoning behind some of the laws which they were meant to enforce. Skolnick (1994), however, dismissed this issue when he wrote that

the, "...hypothetical issue of not believing in the laws they are enforcing simply does not arise for most police officers" (p.58).

Authority is also a very hard concept to measure and this begs the question, *which yardstick do we use?* First, one could see authority in terms of those powers vested in police officers by the law. Secondly, we could, hypothetically, investigate that authority which is actually exerted after bearing in mind that many offences are ignored by the police. Thirdly, we could measure authority in terms of the *perception* of those who are policed - i.e. the perception of police authority by the public. This final means of measuring is interesting in that it raises the issue that police authority can only be realistically measured in how it affects the attitudes and actions of those who are on the receiving end of it. The concept of police authority is, therefore, a problematic issue and this should be noted when investigating the culture of the police.

The concept of efficiency is, similarly, a quite problematic area. First, this depends upon what we wish to view as the function or functions of the police. Morgan and Newburn (1997) claim that,"...The police undertake crime control. They are the principal law enforcement agency" (p.75). If we are to take the crime clear-up rate as a yardstick with which to measure police efficiency we are immediately faced with a dilemma with regards to the present research. The present research appeared to uncover contradictory evidence for the existence of pressure to secure arrests. On the one hand, some officers recounted that there was a high pressure for arrests and this appeared to be much more pronounced amongst CID officers. However, such pressure was apparently present in the uniform ranks as well as was the case at Tooting police station where a wallchart was used to measure the 'efficiency' of each officer. Whereas an increased pressure to appear efficient amongst CID officers can be explained by Skolnick's theory that such differences are due to police specialisation, the existence of such differences in pressure amongst uniform officers in different stations may appear to be due to other non-institutional factors or variables. Such variables may include the possibility that the police in the period being studied for the present research were much less controlled by a centralised

police policy thus giving senior officers much more discretion to run a station as they themselves saw fit.

It may also be true that pressure for efficiency is more an aspect of contemporary policing than policing *per se.* Police efficiency, it could be argued, is directly linked with the concept of police accountability which has become a dominant issue in policing during the later decades of the 20th century. However, Skolnick's work is presented as a universal theory that should explain police occupational culture in a variety of settings. In other words, his theory should be applicable to any instance of policing in any era or locality. Again, we have to question whether Skolnick's work is a realistic appraisal of a universal police culture or the appraisal of American policing in a Californian city.

The fact that danger, authority and efficiency are all seen as interacting to form a universal 'working personality' may be viewed as problematic due to the fact that not all of these factors will be present in the working lives of all police officers. For example, many of the officers who were interviewed in the present research did not view danger as an integral part of their working lives. This may be seen as posing a problem for Skolnick's theory as it assumes that perceived high levels of danger are the norm for officers. However, a counter argument might claim that danger can structure an officer's working life even if it is not an integral part of it. For example, police training programmes might teach officers how to defend themselves even if they are to be stationed in an area where there is little or no threat of physical violence.

There may, therefore, be several factors which account for the weaknesses in Skolnick's theory that danger, authority and the need to appear efficient are crucial to the development of the 'working personality' of the police. First, Skolnick's theory may be somewhat culture-bound. The fact that the work was undertaken in an American city with a relatively high crime rate does not mean that the findings will necessarily be of use in explaining police occupational culture in other societies. Skolnick, apparently, wished to create a universal theory of police occupational culture. Unsurprisingly, due to the fact that the

research was conducted on the American West Coast of the 1960s, the research represents more a 'smash and grab' approach than a systematic study into the supposed universality of the police 'working personality'. Any attempt at formulating a universal theory would need to incorporate comparative cultural analysis. Only by studying the police culture (or cultures) of different communities and their evolution over time can we begin to consider the possibility of a universal theory.

The fact that Skolnick's framework for the analysis of police culture has been adopted by many others has, unsurprisingly, led to a situation where the findings of later studies appear to support those of the original. When, for example, Skolnick finds evidence of racist behaviours and attitudes amongst officers so does the PSI study conducted by Smith and Gray (1983). Some police officers do exhibit some racist behaviour. However, research tends to concentrate upon those occasions when officers do exhibit negative behaviour and this tends to lead to an unrealistic portrayal of policing.

The great variations in danger, authority and efficiency (as well as the wider correlates of police culture) encountered in the present research are probably due to the fact that those officers who were interviewed were drawn from a variety of areas and socio-economic backgrounds - the only common factors being that the officers worked within the London Metropolitan area between the 1930s and the 1960s. Massive changes in policing (including specialisation) over the time period, coupled with the vast range of types of community within the Metropolitan area, have probably rendered unviable the idea of a universal culture of policing as there is no longer (if there ever was) an homogeneous police force. The sheer diversity of policing experienced by the interviewees mirrors the diversity of opinion which they had regarding police work. It is unsurprising to suppose that an officer who worked closely with the public during the Blitzes of the Second World War will have a vastly differing opinion of the police's relationship with the public from that of an officer who policed the miners strike. These examples can be perceived as, respectively, the zenith and the nadir of 20th century UK police relations with the public.

Similarly, the diversity of communities which the police worked in undoubtedly coloured their opinion of the police work, the public and society. Those officers who served predominantly in the East End had a much more positive outlook than those who served in more volatile or anti-police communities such as Brixton in the 1960s. Such factors do not appear to support Skolnick's view that differing working personalities are caused by police specialisation. One might argue, tentatively, that such a lack of a homogeneous attitude or approach to police work (which may negate the idea of a universal police culture) is caused by a variation in the police relationship with different communities. Crucially, however, such variation is not instigated by the police as an institution - it is merely a reaction to the different needs of different communities - and is made at an individual as opposed to an institutional level. In other words, variation of the police 'working personality' may be seen as being directly influenced by the particular environment in which the police operate as the behaviour and attitudes of the local citizens informs the police response. Skolnick (1994), however, does not address such factors (those which are external to the police) as having an effect on police culture.

The fact that the present research appeared to find a great degree of diversity amongst the experiences, attitudes and opinions of the ex-officers interviewed does appear to support the work of Chan (1997). Her claim that the function of the police varies between and within police forces makes possible the formulation of theories which acknowledge, "...the existence of multiple cultures within a police force and variation in cultures among police forces" (p.66). Such an approach is perhaps the only adequate means of explaining the different policing experiences between areas as diverse as Kensington and Kilburn between the 1930s and the 1960s.

Chan's second criticism of existing research is that the socialisation that officers undergo is often portrayed as a one-way process. The findings of the present research appear to show that sometimes a police culture can have a powerful effect on an officer's behaviour. For example, Officer E said of CID

work that, "...a lot of it was wrong but we were young and we thought what we were doing was right". At other times, an officer might be angered enough by another officer's behaviour to restrain him from hitting a prisoner. The evidence, therefore, does appear to point to the fact that there has been, historically at least, some kind of confusion as to what officers believe is acceptable and what officers believe is unacceptable behaviour. This may be due to variations in internalisation of police cultures.

The fact that police work does not occur in a void, or separated from other contexts, is Chan's third criticism of existing literature on police occupational culture. Again, the findings of the present research appear to be consistent with those of Chan's work. Indeed, the sexist and racist views encountered when interviewing some ex-officers during the present research may not have been informed by police culture but by the prejudices of wider culture.

Chan's final criticism of existing theories of police culture is that they do not adequately account for change or variations in police culture. The fact that the present research does appear to show large amounts of cultural variation does appear to support this idea of fluid and evolving police occupational cultures. Indeed, the recollections of many of those ex-officers interviewed appear to support this notion of widespread change within the occupation. Many of the officers spoke of the aftermath of World War II generally giving way to an era of anti-police sentiment amongst members of the public and a growing cynicism amongst officers. Despite a lack of cultural consensus amongst officers many did appear to feel a change in the relationship with the public which signalled an end to any Golden Age of policing. Such changes do not appear to be adequately accounted for by existing theories.

3. Direct Comparison of Key Correlates of Occupational Culture between Existing Research and the Present Research

In this section I shall compare the findings of the present research to those of existing literature with regards to the following correlates of police occupational culture: discretion, suspicion, pragmatism, the craving of excitement, social

isolation, social solidarity, camaraderie, 'sense of mission', pessimism/cynicism, conservatism, masculinity and racial prejudice.

The present research appeared to support the accepted view that discretion is widely utilised by police officers. There are several examples of both delegated and unauthorized discretion being used by police officers in this study (delegated discretion referring to that which is integral to the officer's job and unauthorized discretion referring to that which is unsanctioned). Interestingly, several officers spoke of the use of unauthorized discretion being used to benefit members of the public. This is an issue which is not usually addressed within the literature of police culture and there appears to be an unwritten assumption that unauthorized discretion is generally used for negative ends.

Traditional literature in the area of police occupational culture views suspicion as a fundamental part of the police 'working personality' and is seen as a direct result of the potential danger of policing as an occupation. However, American research appears to place a greater emphasis on the dangers of the job than British research. This difference in emphasis is shown both by Skolnick (1994), who used a paramilitary analogy to explain the danger facing American police officers and Manning (1977) who wrote of the 'Threat-Danger-Hero' mentality that affected police officer's everyday working lives. Reiner (1992), writing about the English police, viewed the perception of danger in less severe terms and stated that it was due to the unpredictability of human nature. With regards to the present research, it appeared that potentially dangerous situations were viewed, by the officers interviewed, as less of a threat and more as a potential physical challenge. In other words, danger did not appear to be viewed as a potentially life threatening issue by the officers in the present study. The impact of danger on officer's working lives, as described by Skolnick (1994), appears to have little in common with the experiences recounted by the interviewees in the present study. That violence which was encountered by the interviewees was generally minor and did not tend to involve weapons although it did appear to be getting worse during the1960s. Officers did show quite high levels of suspicion although

these did not appear to be informed by any perception of threat of violence from a 'symbolic assailant'.

According to Reiner (1992) the police, generally, have a, "...very pragmatic, concrete, down-to-earth, anti-theoretical perspective" (p.128). Despite the apparent mystique of the profession (at least, in the way it is presented to the public) several interviewees in the present research spoke of the 'common sense' nature of policing. Such a common-sense perspective was seen as coming from one's experience of policing the streets and officers were quick to stress that such a perspective could not be taught. In other words, there was a perception by officers that police work was something that only police officers could understand.

Smith and Gray (1983), in the PSI study, spoke of the fact that many officers crave excitement. The type of 'excitement' usually referred to in this context is that involving vehicle pursuits. The present research uncovered very little evidence to support this view. Metropolitan policing between the 1930s and the 1960s did not appear to be characterised by officers deriving satisfaction from confrontational situations such as car chases. This may be due to the fact that widespread motorised patrols are more of a contemporary than historical aspect of policing as is the widespread use of motor vehicles by criminals.

Much has been written of the social isolation and social camaraderie experienced by the police and both appeared to play a significant part in the working lives of the officers in the present research. With regards to the camaraderie of the police, many officers spoke of the close bonding they had with their colleagues. However, the existence of such camaraderie is usually seen as indicating a poor relationship with the public and the findings of the present research did not appear to support this theory. In short, the findings of the present research appear to show that it is possible to have a reasonable relationship with the public and a sense of camaraderie with one's colleagues.

For some of the ex-officers, the camaraderie of the police appeared to justify police fabrication of evidence and perjury. It is very difficult to assimilate the often contrary viewpoints which were espoused by officers upon the subject of fabrication of evidence. Some supported it whereas others did not and those that did support it claimed only to do so when they knew that the defendant was guilty. This serves both as a self-justification and as a self-fulfilling prophecy in that those they believe to be guilty, ultimately, will be found to be guilty and punished as such. The fact that many officers who did not agree with the fabrication of evidence still condoned it by refusing to report the offence appears to show that occupational bonds within the police force are very strong.

Similarly, some interviewees reported a low level of camaraderie between CID officers and uniform officers, a factor that has been addressed in the existing literature. However, the fact that other officers reported a relatively high level of professional co-operation between uniform and CID officers appears to suggest that previous explanations may be too simplistic. Such differentiation was, according to one ex-officer, due to the influence of senior officers on police practice at different police stations with one officer saying, "...It depended on the top...and how the top of the two sides got on" (J).

Likewise, despite reported camaraderie being relatively high, social solidarity appeared to be significantly lower with a high number of officers not wishing to immerse themselves in the social life of the police. Similarly, inter-rank solidarity (with regard to uniform officers) did not appear to be as high as is assumed by Skolnick (1994) a point which was acknowledged by Reiner (1992). Again, it is possible that there may have been differences between police stations.

Whitaker (1964) wrote that police camaraderie and solidarity increased when the police feel under threat from the public, the Government or even the upper echelons of the police service. Such a notion implies that high levels of camaraderie are synonymous with the perception of threat. However, most officers in the present research appeared to experience high levels of camaraderie without displaying evidence of feeling threatened. Again, this

implies that the issue of camaraderie may be a more complex issue than was previously assumed.

Skolnick wrote that one reason why the police are alienated from the communities they police is that the public do not believe that officers abide by the moral norms which they enforce. There was some suggestion that not all officers who were interviewed agreed with the legislation concerning issues such as street book-making yet this did not appear necessarily to lead these officers to believe that there was alienation between the police and the public. This may have been because of the attitude of the individual officers towards such legislation which often appeared to manifest itself in a more lenient enforcement of such laws. The outcome of such examples of unauthorised discretion may be to actually bring the police and the public together.

Reiner (1992) wrote of many officers having a 'sense of mission' whereby they come to view their occupation as a way of life in an increasingly chaotic society and how, consequently, their view of the police tended to emphasise the crime detection role at the expense of the service role. Many of the interviewees did appear to agree that policing was a way of life. However, Reiner's typology implies that policing can only be viewed as way of life where the crime detection role, as opposed to the public service role, is the dominant one. For example, Reiner (1992) wrote that, "The core justification of policing is a victim-centred perspective" (p.111). This may further imply that an officer who is highly committed to the public service role of police work (that is, the non-victim-centred role of police work) would not view policing as a way of life. This did not appear to be the case in the present research. However, it may be the case that Reiner's conclusions were drawn from research in an area where there was a poor relationship between the public and the police and where the crime detection role of the police was viewed as paramount.

Westley (1970) was one of several authors to write about police pessimism and how the police view the public as enemy. Although most officers in the present research had a certain degree of cynicism or pessimism, levels did not appear to

be as high as previous research in the area might suggest. Thus, Manning's assertion that "Man is seen as a translucent Machiavelli" (1977, p.26) did not appear to be supported unreservedly by the findings of the present research. Literature in the area of police culture also maintains that police officers exhibit high levels of cynicism because of their exposure to the more unpleasant parts of human nature. This was, to an extent, supported by the findings of the present research.

It should be noted that of those officers interviewed who worked in the 1960s, only one displayed a high level of cynicism which was wholly directed at the police force itself and not the public as is usually the case (see Reiner, 1992). The officer's cynicism appeared to have been caused by a number of publicised incidents of corruption as well as a growing rift between the police and the public which occurred at the time. Further research might wish to address the issue of whether it is possible to differentiate between cynicism or pessimism which is directed against the public and that which is directed against the police itself.

Although there appeared to be some conservatism amongst the police officers interviewed in the present research, it did not appear as rigid in its nature as described by Skolnick. Skolnick (1994) claimed that, "...a Goldwater-type of conservatism was the dominant political and emotional persuasion of police" (p. 59) and it might be that the present research has uncovered a less right-wing set of political views amongst officers. This might be due to a number of factors. For example, it might be suggested that the United States is predominantly more right-wing than the United Kingdom and this might explain why the police officers interviewed by Skolnick exhibited such right-wing views. One might also suggest that right-wing attitudes amongst officers might emerge in areas which are characterised by a poor relationship between the police and the public. Such areas, where the police feel threatened, might encourage a strict 'law and order' outlook as opposed to a more 'laissez faire' approach in less volatile communities.

Young (1991) described the police world of his research as, "...a primarily masculine domain where metaphors of hunting and warfare dominate" (p.191). Whilst the findings of the present research appear to indicate that many of the officers viewed police work as a predominantly male occupation in terms of its role, female officers were, generally, appreciated. This may well be due to the fact that female police officers in the period under investigation had a more limited role and were not seen by male officers as a professional threat. In other words, they were accepted because they fitted the male view of the female role. Similarly, apart from some sexism in some of the testimonies of officers serving during the 1960s, sexism did not appear to be a widespread problem. One example, from the 1930s or 1940s does stick out, however, when an Inspector dismissed the matron and spent some time in the cell with a female prisoner. It is not made clear what exactly occurred in the cell but it seems plausible that some act of sexual abuse could have occurred. It must be stated, however, that the above incident appears to be an exceptional one.

Similarly, another strand of this 'Cult of Machismo' (as Smith and Gray, 1983, referred to it) is that of the police being attracted to violence. The present research found that only a small number of ex-officers appeared to have witnessed violent physical attacks on prisoners and that two informal rules seemed to apply. It was acceptable to hit a 'guilty' prisoner (1) as long as the attack does not result in serious injury and (2) the attack is one-on-one and, therefore, fair.

Racial prejudice amongst police officers has been widely documented in existing works in the field of police occupational culture. Within the present research, some of the interviewees appeared to harbour racist attitudes. In many cases, however, these were not directed solely against individuals of Afro-Caribbean origin but also against groups such as the Irish. None of the interviewees who appeared to hold racist attitudes, however, used racist language such as that documented in the PSI study and, in the most part, such prejudices did not appear as extreme. Similarly, it generally appeared to be the case that if an officer held racist attitudes, he or she claimed that they would not let such

sentiments affect the way in which they dealt with members of ethnic minorities. This apparently supports the work of Foster (1989) who described the way in which an officer's personal racial prejudices may be suppressed during their encounters with such minorities during their professional life. However, it must be noted the present research relied upon the oral testimonies of officers regarding their behaviour at work and it may be the case that some of their accounts might be inaccurate. This issue is dealt with in the Methodology chapter.

Overall the present research appears to show that, for those officers interviewed during the present research, policing in the Metropolitan Police Force between the 1930s and the 1960s was not characterised by as much negative behaviour as one might expect. It may be possible to criticise this apparent finding as the result of officers filtering reality through the rosy glow of retrospective recollection to paint an altogether 'softer' version of the police role during this period. However, the fact that instances of police negative behaviour were, on occasion, reported leads the researcher to believe that the accounts are realistic in their portrayal of day to day policing. Furthermore, the researcher believes that they represent a real difference to the findings of Skolnick.

4. The Importance of Wider Social Factors in Accounting for Variations in Police Culture

The findings of the present research suggest that wider social factors have a large part to play in accounting for variations in police culture. The diversity of experiences recounted by the interviewees, especially with regards to the perceived police relationship with the public, perceived changes in the relationship between areas and perceived changes in the relationship over time appear to show that police culture can be affected by factors relating to different areas and eras.

At a more fundamental dimension, these wider factors tend to affect the intensity of Skolnick's three main variables of danger, authority and efficiency.

For example, whereas Skolnick's work addresses policework in an area (and era) characterised by high levels of all three variables, the present research appeared to show that between the 1930s and the 1960s within the Metropolitan area these variables varied in their intensity. None of the interviewees reported high levels of danger, authority and efficiency although high levels of efficiency were reported by a minority of officers. Variations in the intensity of danger, authority and efficiency appear to have led to variations in wider correlates of police culture on occasion.

It did appear, throughout the present research, that some officers were very sensitive to many of the subtleties of the police/public relationship. One example is the fact that a minority of the interviewees talked of how arresting by appointment appeared, in some situations, to be an accepted policed tactic. Such a use of police unauthorised discretion may have been used to show a respect for some law-breakers. In other areas or eras, arresting by appointment might be unheard of and offering such a courtesy to those who break the law might be considered as unthinkable. Similarly, six of the interviewees spoke of how they perceived a change in public attitudes occurring after the 1950s which had precipitated a change in the relationship between the police and the public. Thereafter, they claimed that the public appeared to be less amenable to those uses of police discretion which had formerly been apparently accepted.

Such differences might be caused by wider social factors and the way in which they impact upon the policing in different types of community over different periods of time. In short, it is important to look at wider social factors that are manifested in the state of police/public relations as a more fundamental dimension structuring the intensity of danger, authority and efficiency. Furthermore, these may help us to understand variations in police culture across time and space.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

This piece of research was undertaken in an attempt to find out more about the nature of police occupational culture. More specifically, it addressed some of the shortcomings of the existing work in this area which tended to follow the methodology of Skolnick (1994). That is not to say that all existing research into the topic of police occupational culture is flawed. Indeed, many pieces of such research have been instrumental in bringing to our attention police malpractice and for explaining some police behaviour. However, such studies have tended to employ variations upon the methodological template used by Skolnick (1994) and have emerged with similar findings - namely, that police officers are, amongst other things, racist, sexist, isolated and cynical. Only Chan's work appears to fully acknowledge that police cultures can be viewed as fluid and evolving rather than static.

Undoubtedly, police officers do display negative characteristics as described by Skolnick and Smith and Gray yet, ultimately, research which addresses positive as well as negative behaviour may aid us further in our understanding of the culture of the police. Similarly, whilst much of the existing research gives examples of 'cutting edge' police work, everyday examples of the mundane are often left unexplored. Another possible shortcoming of existing research is that it tends to lack historical perspective because interest in the subject goes back only as far as the 1960s. By striving towards a more rounded portrayal of police work, it may be possible to further increase our understanding of the nuances, subtleties and dynamics of police culture.

To achieve a more rounded knowledge of the nature of police occupational culture in the Metropolitan area, 26 ex-officers who served between the 1930s and the 1960s were interviewed. This sample included male and female officers and uniform and plain clothes officers. They served in a great variety of locations throughout the Metropolitan area - from the hectic West End, to the run down

inner-city, to the rural suburbs. The interviews brought forth a fantastic amount of information which illustrated both the sheer diversity of police work and the inappropriateness of existing stereotypes in describing the experiences of the ex-police officers. What quickly became apparent was that existing research did not always appear to do justice to the subtlety and variety of much police work and the individuality of those officers who undertook it.

There are several reasons which may go some way towards accounting for the lack of real depth in much of the existing research. Skolnick's work was undertaken in a quite violent West Coast American city during a period of civil unrest and it may be that more recent pieces of research have utilised a similar type of methodology and concentrated upon aspects of police behaviour which Skolnick himself concentrated upon. Such an explanation may account for the large number of accounts of police racism, police targeting, police solidarity and police violence. Similarly, not only was the work of Smith and Gray (1983) undertaken at the request of the Metropolitan Police Force it was also partly funded by them. Furthermore, the authors acknowledged that, "...a series of events heightened the importance of the issues under study and the amount and intensity of public debate about them" (p.1) during the course of the research and these included the Deptford Fire and the Brixton Riots. Just as policing is affected by wider social contexts, so too is police research and it might be the case that contemporary social issues influence the direction which research takes. When research takes place against a background of tense police/public relations it may be easy to ignore positive aspects of police work and to concentrate upon emotive or negative aspects such as police racism. Indeed, Smith and Gray's work was commissioned as a means of establishing what had caused the damage to the relationship between the police and the public in London. This meant that the finished work is very descriptive and does not analyse police behaviour in terms of police culture, only in terms of the individual actions of the officers. Again, it is a piece of research which attempts to explain some aspects of police behaviour rather than a piece of research which attempts to explain police behaviour per se.

The findings of the present research point towards the fact that the intensity of Skolnick's three core components of danger, authority and efficiency may be influenced by wider societal factors. Despite the significance of these factors to the officers in his research, these factors appeared to be susceptible to some variation in intensity to those officers who took part in the present research. Cultural and legislative differences between the United Kingdom and the United States have led to a greater ease of public access to firearms in the latter and this may perhaps account for the fact that interviewees in the present research did not appear to view danger as a particularly important issue.

Skolnick's dual factors of authority and efficiency also appear to vary in their intensity when addressing the policing experiences of officers within the present research. Over half the officers within the present research claimed that they rarely had to use their invested authority. The concept of police efficiency is likewise problematic in that it appears to be much more a feature of contemporary policing than policing *per se*. In the present research, over half the interviewees did not appear to experience any pressure to appear efficient.

In short, therefore, Skolnick's work appears to assume that high levels of danger, authority and efficiency are a universal feature of police work. The present research suggests that we should be aware of the effect of wider societal factors upon levels of danger, authority and efficiency. High levels of danger, authority and efficiency do appear to occur in areas where there is a poor relationship between the police and the public but not in areas where there is not. Correspondingly, accepted key correlates of police culture such as racism, sexism, solidarity and corruption were all evident within the present research but were subject to variation in intensity. In short, wider societal factors appeared to create variations in police culture across time and space.

During the course of the present research, a number of issues have come to light which might benefit from further research. Research in the area of discretion could attempt to analyse the impact of both factors internal to the police (e.g.

departmental policy) and factors external to the police (e.g. public opinion and individual officer attributes) upon the application of unauthorized discretion.

Correspondingly, another follow-up piece of research could be based around a cross-cultural comparative analysis of the experiences of retired British and American officers who served between the 1930s and the 1960s. Such a piece of research would, I believe, be instrumental in giving the literature of police occupational culture a real grounding in the differences between the two countries' modes of police work. Once such variations are analysed it may be possible to address those issues which pertain to the problems of comparison between British and American research in the area of police culture.

There were some potential methodological problems which were encountered in the present study. First, there was a real problem in gaining a sample of sufficient size to make the research worthwhile. Although this problem was eventually overcome it did mean that the research took longer than anticipated. Another methodological problem pertained to the transcription and analysis of the interview tapes. Again, this proved to be a much more arduous task than was originally envisaged although the quality of the information which was gathered made the process worthwhile.

In conclusion, this piece of research has drawn attention to the fact that the intensity of Skolnick's principle factors of danger, authority and efficiency appear to be affected by wider social factors manifested within police/public relations. At the same time, the present research has, I believe, succeeded in demonstrating the sheer diversity of police experiences within the Metropolitan area between the 1930s and the 1960s. In line with the findings of the 1999 HMIC report, it has appeared to show that stereotypical categorisations of police officers, their work and their culture are unhelpful in contributing to our further knowledge of the subject area.

References

Adorno, T.W., et al (1950), The Authoritarian Personality, New York: Harper

Baldwin, J. (1962), Nobody Knows My Name, New York: Dell

Baldwin, J. & Moloney, T. (1992), The Supervision of Criminal Investigations in Serious Criminal Cases RCCJ Research Study No. 4

Banton, M. (1964) The Policemen in the Community London: Tavistock

Bloch, M. (1954), The Historian's Craft (tr. Putnam, P.), Manchester: Manchester University Press

Broderick, J. (1973) Police in a Time of Change Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning

Brogden, M. (1982), The Police: Autonomy and Consent, London: Academic Press

Brogden, M (1991) On the Mersey Beat: An Oral History of Policing Liverpool between the Wars Oxford: Oxford University Press

Cain, M. (1973), Society and the Policeman's Role, London: Routledge

Chan, J. (1992), Policing in a Multicultural Society: A Study of the New South Wales Police, Final Report to the New South Wales Police

Chan, J. (1997) Changing Police Culture: Policing in a Multicultural Society Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Clare, P. (1995), Quoted in the Observer newspaper, (30/7/95)

Cockcroft, T. (1995) Occupational Culture in a South Wales Police Station, Unpublished M.Sc. dissertation

Downes, D. & Rock, P. (1988), Understanding Deviance, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Downes, D. & Ward, T. (1986) Democratic Policing: Towards a Labour Party Policy on Police Accountability, London: Labour Campaign for Criminal Justice

Emsley, C. (1996) The English Police: A Political and Social History London: Longman

Engels, F. (1969), The Condition of the Working Class in England, St Albans: Granada

Farrell, A. (1993) Crime, Class and Corruption: The Politics of the Police London: Bookmarks

Festinger, L. (1957), A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Illinois: Row-Peterson

Fielding, N. (1988), Joining Forces: Police Training, Socialization, and Occupation, London & New York: Routledge

Fontana, A. & Frey, J.H. (1994) "Interviewing: The Art of Science" in Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds) A Handbook of Qualitative Research London: Sage

Foster, J. (1989), "Two Stations: An Ethnographic Study of Policing in the Inner City", in Downes, D. (ed) Crime and the City, London: MacMillan

Fryer, W.T. (1957) (ed) Selected Writings on the Law of Evidence and Trial, St Paul: West Publishing Company

Gans, H. (1982), "The Participant Observer as a Human Being: Observations in the Personal Aspects of Field Work" in Burgess, R.G. (ed) Field Reseach: A Sourcebook and Field Manual, London: George Allen & Unwin

Gerth, H.H. & Wright Mills, C. (1991), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Graef, R. (1989) Talking Blues London: Collins

Hall, S. (1979), Policing the Crisis, London: Macmillan

Harris, R.N. (1973), The Police Academy: An Inside View, New York: Wiley

Heidensohn, F. (1992), Women in Control? The Role of Women in Law Enforcement, Oxford: Clarendon

HMIC (1999) Winning the Race- Revisited: A follow up to the HMIC thematic inspection report on police community and race relations (1998/1999) London: HMSO

Hobbs, R. (1989), "Policing in the Vernacular" in Downes, D. (ed) Crime and the City, London: MacMillan

Holdaway, S. (1983), Inside the British Police, Oxford: Blackwell

Howgrave-Graham, H.M. (1947) The Metropolitan Police at War London: HMSO

Hunt, J. (1984) "The Development of Rapport Through the Negotiation of Gender in Fieldwork Among Police, Human Organization", 43/4

Janowitz, M. (1964) The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait New York: The Free Press

Jones, S. (1986) Policewomen and Equality London: Macmillan

Kahn, R.L., & Cannell, C.F. (1957), The Dynamics of Interviewing: Theory, Technique, and Cases, New York: Wiley

Kvale, S. (1996) Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing London: Sage Publications

Leach, E.R. (1957), "The Epistemological Background to Malinowski's Empiricism" in Firth, R. (ed) Man and Culture, (119-37), London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Lipset, S.M., Trow, M.H. & Coleman, J.S. (1962) Union Democracy New York: Anchor Books

Loevinger, J. and Ossorio, A. (1959), "Evaluation of Therapy by Self-Report: A Paradox" in The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58, p. 392

MacPherson, W. Sir (1999) The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: report of an Inquiry/ by Sir William MacPherson of Cluny, advised by Tom Cook, The Right Reverend Dr John Sentamu, Dr Richard Stone, presented to Parliament by Command to Her Majesty, February 1999.

Maguire, M. & Norris, C. (1994), The Royal Commission on Criminal Justice: The Conduct And Supervision of Criminal Investigations, London: HMSO

MacInnes, C. (1962), Mr Love and Justice, London: NEL

Manning, P. K. (1977), Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing, Cambridge, Mass. : MIT

Manning, P.K. (1993), "Toward a Theory of Police Organization Polarities and Change", Paper to the International Conference on 'Social Change and Policing', 3 - 5 August 1993, Taipei

Mark, R. Sir (1978), In the Office of Constable, London: Collins

Morgan, R. & Newburn, T. (1997), The Future of Policing, Oxford: Oxford University Press

National Union Catalogue of Manuscript Collections (1971), Information Circular No. 7, Library of Congress, Descriptive Cataloging Division, Manuscript Section

Nelson, J. (ed) Police Brutality: An Anthology London: W. W. Norton

Pollak, O. (1950), The Criminality of Women, New York: A.S. Barnes

Punch, M. (1979), "The Secret Social Service" in Holdaway, S. (ed) The British Police, London: Edward Arnold

Reiner, R. (1978), The Blue-Coated Worker: A Sociological Study of Police Unionism, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Reiner, R. (1992), The Politics of the Police, London: Wheatsheaf

Reuss-Ianni, E. & Ianni, F. (1983) "Street Cops and Management Cops: The Two Cultures of Policing" in Punch, M. (ed) Control in the Police Organization, Cambridge, Mass. : MIT

Rossi, P., Berk, R. & Eidson, B. (1974) The Roots of Urban Discontent New York: Wiley

Royal Commission on the Police Final Report (1962) Cmnd. 1728, London: HMSO

Royal Commission on the Police (1961), Minutes of Evidence 15, London: HMSO

Samuel, R. & Thompson, P. (eds) (1990), The Myths We Live By, London: Routledge

Scarman, Lord (1983), The Scarman Report: The Brixton Disorders 10-12 April 1981, London: HMSO

Seldon, A. & Pappworth, J. (1983), By Word of Mouth: Elite Oral History, London: Methane

Shearing, C. (1981) "Deviance and Conformity in the Reproduction of Order" in Shearing, C. (ed) Organisational Police Deviance Toronto: Butterworth

Sheehy Report (1993) Report of the Enquiry into Police Responsibilities and Rewards CM2280, I, II, London: HMSO

Skidelsky, R. (1975), Oswald Mosley, London: MacMillan

Skolnick, J. (1994) Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society (3rd Edition), London: Wiley

Smith, D. & Gray, J. (1983), Police and People in London: Vol. 4 - The Police in Action, London: PSI

Spradley, J.P. (1980) Participant Observation London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch

Starr, L. (1977) "Oral History", Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science, 20, p.440, New York: M.Dekker

Steer, D. (1970), Police Cautions - A Study in the Exercise of Police Discretion, Oxford: Blackwell

Temple, R. (1995), "The Metropolitan Police and the Anti-Fascists 1934 - 40" in Journal of the Police History Society, 10, pp. 34 - 44

Thompson, P. (1978), The Voice of the Past: Oral History, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Tonkin, E. (1990), "History and the Myth of Realism", in Raphael, S. & Thompson, P. (eds), The Myths We Live By, London: Routledge

Tonkin, E. (1992), Narrating Our Past: The Social Construction of Oral History, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Vansina, J. (1985) Oral Tradition as History, London: James Curry and Heinemann

Van Maanen, J. (1983) "The Boss: First-Line Supervision in an American Police Agency" in Punch, M. (ed) Control in the Police Organisation Cambridge, Mass: MIT

Walker, M. (1987) "Interpreting Race and Crime Statistics", Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A, 150 (1): 39-56

Walker, R. (1985) "Racial Minority and Female Employment in Policing", Crime and Delinquency, 31/4: 555-572

Walsh, J.L. (1977) "Career Styles and Police Behaviour" in Bayley, D.H. (ed) Police and Society Beverley Hills: Sage

Wambaugh, J. (1970), The New Centurions, Boston: Little, Brown

Weber, M. (1949), The Methodology of the Social Sciences: A Selection and Translation of Essays by Shils, E. and Finch, H.A., New York: Free Press

Westley, W. (1970), Violence and the Police, Cambridge, Mass. : MIT

Whitaker, B. (1964), The Police, Middlesex: Penguin

Young, M. (1991), An Inside Job, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Extra Resource

Transcripts of interviews conducted with retired police officers by Dr B.Weinberger and currently held at the National Sound Archive (Collection C684), London.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Core topics Covered in the Interviews

Place and date of birth

Motivation to join the police

Reaction of friends on joining the police

Police training

Discipline

First posting

What was the first day out in uniform like

General life on the beat

Police work during the Second World War (if applicable)

The relationship between uniform and CID officers

Camaraderie/solidarity

Social isolation

Police relationship with magistrates

Discretion

The Relationship between police and law-breakers

Relationship with barrow boys an street bookmakers

Differences in police work and relationship with the public between areas

Threat of danger

Pressure to get summonses or arrests

Corruption

The 'Rubber Heel' Squad

Organised crime

Impact of female officers on policing

Relationship with the public

Relationship with ethnic minorities

Relationship with political protestors/Attitudes to demonstrations

Cynicism

Suspicion

Best and worst parts of the job

Changes in the job

'Once a copper, always a copper?'

Appendix 2

Details of the Interviewees

Officer Code	Dates Served	Station(s)	Rank
A	1939-1959	Paddington	PC, 17 years in the Flying Squad
B	1938-1964	Chelsea, Enfield	PC, CID (Detective Inspector)
C	1952-1978	Paddington Green, Putney, Richmond	PC, Aide to CID, CID, Area Driver
D	1960-1978	Bethnal Green, Kennington, Brixton	PC, CID (Detective Sergeant)
E	1955-1959 (in the Metropolitan Police Force)	Golders Green (went on to join the Brighton Force)	PC, Aide to CID,
F	1938-1969	Stoke Newington, Lavender Hill, Kensington, Gypsy Hill, Balham	PC, Sergeant (1st Class), Detective Inspector
G	1935-1958	Brockley, Bow Street	PC, Sergeant
H	1950-1982	Chelsea	PC, Aide to CID
I	1960-1980	Albany Street, Croydon	PC
J*	1947-1967	Kingston, Tooting	WPC, CID
K	1931-1956	Streatham	PC
L*	1953-1960	Shepherds Bush, Kensington	WPC
M	1936-1967	Balham, Tooting, Earlsfield,	PC, Aide to CID, CID (Sergeant)

		Peckham, Deptford, Rotherhithe, The Borough, Kenley, Sydenham, Elephant and Castle, South Norwood.	
N	1936-1966	Chiswick, Barnes, Lavender Hill	PC, CID
O	1936-1967	Chelsea, Epsom, Tooting	PC, Sergeant
P	1948-1968	Kenley, Croydon	PC
Q	1937-1967	Shepherds Bush	PC, Area Driver
R	1931-!951	Brixton, Southwark, Chelsea	PC
S	1937-1962	Lemon St, Ealing, Loughton	PC
T	1937-1967	Harrow Rd, Kilburn	PC
U	1935-1955	Limehouse, Hyde Park, Portsmouth	PC
V	1948-1965	Enfield, Lemon St, Romford	PC
W*	1949-1951	Lemon St, Bow St	WPC
X	1934-1959	Bethnal Green, Bow	PC
Y	1936-1944	Tower Bridge	PC
Z	1931-1956	Acton, Notting Hill, Vine Street	PC, Sergeant

* denotes female officer