

## CRIME, CORRUPTION AND MALFEASANCE IN THE EARLY MODERN POLICE FORCE

### TOM ANDREWS

There have been numerous histories of the British Police charting its growth from 1929 and before to today. None of these works however take an in-depth look at when officers failed to live up to the high standards expected of them in that time. The aim of this study is to therefore examine crime, corruption and malfeasance in the first hundred years of the police force since the Metropolitan Police Act.

Definitions and perceptions of wrong and right have shifted over the years, and therefore it is more complicated than simply studying the number of dismissals from forces to examine malfeasance. In the period in question, officers could be dismissed for numerous 'offences' as Simon Dell tells us in his book *The Victorian Policeman*. "Policemen were dismissed if a member of the public complained about them or if they committed any offence, kept bad company or broke police regulations such as being late on duty being improperly dressed or absconding from a beat." To highlight the scale of dismissals, between the years 1830 – 1838 nearly 5000 men were dismissed, and 6000 resigned from the Metropolitan Police, many compulsorily. In its first year, 42 men of Yorkshire's East Riding Constabulary were dismissed, equivalent to the total number of officers, and "in Ipswich in August 1842 the force was dismissed *en masse*". Figures of dismissals alone are not enough to study rates of malfeasance, as they do not explain *why* officers were sacked. It is therefore necessary to look at specific actions and offences and how prevalent they were.

Too much cannot be read into some reports of officers behaving poorly, as Capt. Melville Lee points out in his *History of Police in England*. "The routine duties of a constable were, and are necessarily, performed in the eye of the public, and every bystander is free, through the columns of newspapers, to tell the rest of London what he has seen." This is particularly relevant during the police's early years as they were not well liked by the general public, and people would take opportunities to discredit them. This can be seen in rhetoric following the infamous 'Bloody Sunday' riots in 1887. One article afterwards read "I saw repeated charges made on a perfectly unarmed and helpless crowd: I saw policemen not of their own accord, but on the orders of their superiors, repeatedly strike women and children; I saw them invariably choose those for assault who seemed least likely to retaliate". Even future Prime minister Herbert Asquith wrote "[There is] No doubt the police lost their heads and acted in a most brutal and unjustifiable manner". The police were also frequently the subject of satirical cartoons criticising their duties and roles. It is therefore important to consider any contemporary anecdotal evidence with a certain degree of bias.

The social historian Richard Storch has argued that the reason for this anti-police sentiment was that they were viewed by the proletariat as lackeys of the upper classes, whose role was to maintain the social hierarchy. This is supported by the observations of the historian William Woodruff in his autobiography detailing his childhood in 1920's Blackburn:

"For us [the police] had a stigma; we were brought up to distrust and avoid them. We distrusted them because they defended the rich. We avoided them because they used their truncheons rather than words. We got the 'short end of the stick'."

If this were the case then it could be argued that the whole police system was a form of corruption by not being impartial. Richard Cowley counters this, arguing that the laws they were accused of abusing existed prior to the new police, and that the officers merely provided the first pro-active enforcement; before Peel, law and order was solely reactionary. Cowley's argument seems to be the more likely, as Storch fails to take into account that any more stringent enforcement of rules is going to be viewed with hostility by those whom it affects. He also fails to account for the new police dealing equally with the gentry as with the lower classes as Clive Emsley demonstrates, when he details the policing and arrest of duelling aristocrats. Woodruff's opinion can also be approached with the view that even today, people recall the village bobby giving misbehaving children a 'clip round the ear'. As for supposedly discriminating against the poor, the rich have less reason to commit 'acquisitive' crimes, and also represented a far smaller percentage of the population, so were less likely to regularly fall foul of the police. It seems more appropriate therefore to examine specific categories of misconduct by individuals or groups, rather than whether the police as an idea was institutionally corrupt.

Drunkness, on and off-duty, seems to have presented the biggest problem during the period, and so seems the best place to begin. The first commissioners of the Metropolitan Police confessed that 80% of dismissals were due to drink. In 1863, 215 officers were dismissed from the force for drunkenness, and this statistic is not an isolated example. Police Orders from the Metropolitan Police of 6<sup>th</sup> January 1859 state "It is a great gratification to the Commissioner that the number of police guilty of the offence of drunkenness during the late Christmas holidays has been much lower than last year...". Police officers' drinking habits also drew the attention of foreign tourists, with German travel writer Max Schlesinger commenting that constables on night patrol seem overly confident, and he suspects that "a glass of brandy now and then may contribute to produce the above effect".

The problem was not limited to London either with two Middlesbrough officers in the mid 1880's who were overlooked for promotion turning to drink, initially punished by fines and reprimands when first caught drinking on duty, they ultimately lost their jobs. Supporting Schlesinger's assertions, in 1875 the entire Birmingham Police Force petitioned to the Watch Committee for their 'right to a glass of ale,' arguing that 'the work they had to do could not properly be performed unless they did have some refreshment'. It seems that policing in the cities led officers to stopping for drinks, with the Manchester Watch Committee in April 1897 thinking it necessary to send a copy of section 16 of the Licensing Act 1872 – that forbade licensees to supply alcohol to any police constable on duty – to all licensed premises, suggesting that the issue was widespread there too. Histories of rural forces are also littered with examples of officers discovered drunk and being sacked. Nor it seems did the problem diminish over time; as late

as 1922 Commissioner Horwood of the Met highlighted the problem of young in service officers being troublesome due to drunkenness. Not all senior officers were so against drink, as the Head Constable of Bury St. Edmunds showed in 1845 when *he* was dismissed for drunkenness. It is possible to garner from this evidence that police officers drinking on duty was contrary to regulations, and could result in dismissal for those caught, regardless of rank. It also seems likely however that social attitudes towards this practice by officers and the public were relaxed, particularly in cities.

It is possible that drinks provided to officers were seen as a perk, and intended to sweeten-up the recipient; or that the officer was simply a part of the local community, and the drink was a method of thanks. In an interview with a police officer who served between the 1920's – 1950's, Clive Emsley was told that when young in service, the constable was advised to never go out without a bag on his bicycle handlebars, because if the local gentry liked you, they would drop a few eggs or perhaps a chicken into it. These gratuities were not limited to rural officers, with city counterparts expecting free tram travel, and tickets to music halls, theatres or cinemas on their patch. This seems to have been as acceptable to the public as police officers drinking, with even Mr Marks (of Marks & Spencer), handing out cigars and gifts to officers. Some perks were not merely goods but payments of money, as in the case of Inspector William Fairbrass, who in 1848 whilst off-duty saved an eminent citizen caught up in the middle of a riot, and was rewarded with a box of sovereigns. These perks were most likely seen as acceptable in a time when strict rules governed officers' work and private lives, and their pay was little more than a farm labourer's and less than a miner's. This low pay could lead to officers finding alternative sources of income, with one contemporary observer noting that "Policemen are but men, their pay but scanty, their situations precarious, and it would be too much to expect that all are so pure as to decline to make a little money when favourable opportunities present themselves". Their 'precarious situation' was the ease at which officers could be dismissed, which created a catch-22; expected to be pinnacles of integrity but not sufficiently rewarded to be so, officers sometimes resorted to illegal methods to supplement their income. Not all their extra-curricular activities would necessarily be seen as illegal or massively corrupt however. Officers working night shifts in industrial towns and cities for example could earn pennies from workers by acting as 'knocking-up' men, banging on doors to wake residents.

A whole other range of making extra money existed which *were* clearly illegal. This included officers selling information on individuals to people for a fee, such as the Chief Constable of Bedford in 1857 who was known to have provided information on an individual to their prospective employer. In 1863, the Chief Constable of Lincolnshire stated that many officers had received letters requesting information about the character, respectability and monetary value of private individuals from prospective employers or neighbours. He suspected that many officers had provided this information, and that the practice was commonplace nationwide. This may have been regarded as unacceptable by many senior officers, but it is conceivable that officers thought that by providing such information, they may prevent respectable business owners from employing potential criminals. They may have considered themselves to be upholding the police's founding philosophy that the "principle object to be attained is the Prevention of Crime".

A less obvious moneymaking scheme was that officers acted as prosecutors in some cases. Before the introduction of any form of standardised criminal prosecution service, victims had to prosecute offenders at their own expense, winning the costs back following a guilty verdict. Many poorer victims could therefore not afford to bring prosecutions, or the guilty party could not afford to pay. In such examples, along with 'victimless' crimes, the police would prosecute and be awarded costs. This provided scope for profiteering activities though, and "There were ... stories reported to the mid-[19<sup>th</sup>] century Select Committee on Public Prosecutors of policemen supplementing their low wages by engineering malicious or trivial prosecutions to win the costs that the courts awarded...".

Other officers were far more blatant at making money. In 1868, PC John Gillings of Ipswich Borough Police accepted money for allowing two men to visit a prisoner in the cells, and in 1850, a Superintendent in Shropshire was dismissed for embezzlement. Other officers were dismissed for simple theft offences, such as PC Owen Thomas of the Worcestershire Constabulary, who gluttonously helped himself to sandwiches at a fair in Bath in 1880. In 1892 PC 379A Best was forced to resign from the Metropolitan Police after being found with a tea-can "the property of another constable, obliterating the owners number, substituting his own name and number, telling a deliberate falsehood in connection therewith; and considered unfit for the police force". In Coventry in 1861 the Chief Constable no less, absconded with £56 from the police fund. Officers did not limit themselves to one type of criminal enterprise either, with Superintendent Joseph 'Jack the Lad' Young, who retired in 1872, a poster-boy for police malfeasance. Throughout his career he was found guilty of drunkenness, withholding information, falsifying accounts, forging other officers' signatures, loaning out his police horse, and perhaps most bizarrely of all, working in a local butcher's shop in full uniform! Somehow he appears to have kept his job through all this, and received a pension, at a time when officers' pensions were sporadically awarded, and mostly based on good conduct.

The above cases are a handful of examples of constables acting on the fringes of petty crime, and have been cited as the kind of offences that officers of all ranks were involved in. Some officers however became deeply involved in criminality, bringing the whole new police into disrepute. Perhaps the most famous of these is the 'Turf Fraud' scandal in London in 1877. Three senior detectives were implicated in a conspiracy revolving around receiving bribes to tip-off criminals about upcoming police action. Three detectives stood trial at the Old Bailey, and were sentenced to two years imprisonment. As a result the Detective Branch was re-organised and re-christened the Criminal Investigations Department. Almost half a century later, in 1922, these circumstances were repeated, but even more wide-spread. In London, the wholly corrupt Sergeant George Goddard, was investigated for participating in illegal gambling rings, and more importantly taking and distributing bribes around his station, again aimed at tipping off the bookmakers. He was exonerated, and in a cruel twist the police officer who reported him was dismissed for doing so falsely. Goddard appeared to be unperturbed by this, continuing his practices, even expanding them. He was eventually caught and dis-

missed in 1928 and prosecuted, receiving 18 months hard labour, a fine of £2000 and ordered to pay costs. In the resulting fallout, two Sergeants and two PCs were dismissed for accepting free meals and associating with brothel keepers, and a short time later an inspector and 26 constables were fired for accepting money from bookmakers, and another inspector and 23 PC's moved to other divisions.

Other officers became involved in the criminal underworld, such as PC Charles King of the Met who was dismissed in 1854 and sentenced to 14 years transportation for theft after it emerged that he had been running a criminal gang of children, somewhat akin to *Oliver Twist's* Fagan. Only one year later in 1855, PC Jesse Jeaps was dismissed after rumours linked him to the criminal underworld where he was known as 'Juicy Lips'. It was believed he was supplying confiscated stolen goods for re-sale and arresting competitors to his gang's criminal enterprises. He had previously been hailed as an exemplary detective as a result of his high number of arrests of offenders, and retrieving of goods from burglaries.

Such instances appear to be comparatively rare, and perhaps received a lot of publicity due to their extremely corrupt nature. Particularly prevalent was the sentiment against plain-clothed officers, who were viewed as spies. The public were warned that non-uniformed officers were being run as a state secret police, out to 'inform' on people. This was scare-mongering by the socialist press, but two cases heightened the fears and played into the hands of the detractors. The biggest scandal during the police's early years were of the actions of Sergeant William Popay of the Met, who infiltrated the radical National Political Union in 1833. Ordered by a superior to attend the meetings in plain clothes to gather intelligence, Popay went above and beyond his remit, getting heavily involved and even becoming a key agitator. He was eventually spotted sitting in a police station by a NPU member. When the news of this 'spying' police infiltrator hit the press, a petition arrived at the House of Commons alleging they had:

*"seen those whom they know to be policemen disguised in clothing of various descriptions, sometimes in the garb of gentlemen, sometimes in that of tradesmen and artisans [sic], sometimes in sailor jackets, and sometimes in ploughmen's frocks: thus feeling themselves living among spies, seeking their lives, and sorely feeling the taxes heaped upon them for the maintenance of those spies, they make this appeal to your honourable house."*

Believed to be exaggerations and generally a lie, it was still investigated by a Select Committee, who examined the actions of the entire new police force. The Metropolitan Police was cleared of institutional wrongdoing, but it was held that Popay had gone beyond his orders and was dismissed. Plain clothed patrols were allowed to continue too, with the Detective Branch being formally established in 1842.

The actions of detectives in 1880 however showed that whilst the use of plain-clothed officers may have been ratified, their actions could still be controversial. In a case that would clearly constitute entrapment today, the wife of an officer was sent into a chemist's shop suspected of illegally supplying abortion drugs. The lady claimed to want the medication for her daughter, but the chemist was apparently suspicious and refused her; and again a second time when she went in with a letter written by an inspector, purporting to be the father. It was only on the third attempt when the woman went in with a sergeant masquerading as the father that they managed to buy the drugs, at which point the chemist was arrested and prosecuted. He was found guilty, but there was considerable public outrage at the underhand tactics of the police. Generally however, plain clothes officers proved a success, and as with uniformed officers, the shock and outrage of the public and the press at such incidents of malfeasance would suggest that these instances were the exceptions and not the norm.

Perhaps the most oft-cited example of misconduct arises in the general category of 'police brutality'. The press was full of tales of officers being heavy-handed in their use of force, particularly at protests. The first protest to be 'policed', was at Coldbath Fields on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1833. The rally had been banned by the Home Secretary, who warned that any persons attempting to attend would be prevented from doing so by the police. The 70 preventative officers deployed could not prevent the meeting from happening, and so they and 400 reinforcements then attempted to disperse the crowd. A large disorder ensued in which three officers were stabbed, one fatally. One contemporary socialist account leaves no uncertainty as to the cause of the disorder;

*"The speaker was here interrupted by the cry of "Police!" who had arrived at the end of Calthorpe Street, and formed right across it, whet, they advanced in double-quick-time upon the meeting. Another party came up by a side street, and also attacked those assembled."*

*The Chairman made some few further remarks, and called out to the meeting to "stand firm;" but with these words in his mouth, he jumped down from his position, and escaped by the back of the House of Correction. The police came on, and used their staffs pretty freely, their object evidently being to catch the Chairman, and those connected with him in the meeting".*

Such rhetoric has to be interpreted with bias however, as one of the opening lines demonstrates when it claims that 3000 officers were present, at a time when the entire force numbered no more than 3500. It is widely acknowledged though that after the police had initially dispersed the meeting, officers then pursued participants from the scene for some distance unnecessarily. There were also allegations that some officers were drunk; had attacked innocent passers-by; and even set upon women who had fallen over in the melee with truncheons. The police were fully exonerated by an inquiry, but apparently not by the public. A coroners inquest jury returned a verdict of 'justifiable homicide' regarding the slain officer. This shows the perceived infringement by the police on people's right to protest, suggesting that police actions were over-zealous, and, if the coroners jury are to be believed, illegal in their use of force.

Lessons were apparently not learnt from the Coldbath Fields incident by a detachment of 90 Metropolitan officers who in July 1839 were requested by Birmingham Magistrates, who had no new police of their own, to help with the policing of a series of protests. The superintendent in charge commanded the crowds to disperse. When they took no notice of him, the police were ordered in with truncheons drawn, and a large disorder broke out in which the police were bested. Two days of rioting followed, and order only restored by the military and police armed with cutlasses. The magistrates said afterwards that they regretted requesting the police aid, believing that they had made the situation worse. This did not stop the government passing emergency legislation allowing it to form its own police force, which the magistrates did in November of the same year.

Almost 25 years after Coldbath Fields, at protests in Hyde Park, after being heckled by crowds, the police charged them with the liberal use of truncheons, and even a bull-whip by one mounted Superintendent. This incident resulted in officers' collar numbers changing from being fancifully embroidered to block numbers following allegations that officers had attempted to hide them. November 1887 saw perhaps the most infamous example of protest policing at 'Bloody Sunday' in Trafalgar Square. Three protestors were killed and hundreds more allegedly assaulted by the police. It is interesting to note the view taken by mainstream press, that seems to have been unbridled support of the police, with *The Times* reporting that London was celebrating the police's victory. It included examples of various organisations showing their support, such as stockbrokers who collected £400 for the police. It can be assumed that by this time popular sentiment was in favour of the police and their actions at protests; particularly those organised by radicals. It does not alleviate the possibility of criminally heavy-handed policing tactics however, as it does not escape the deaths and injuries of the protestors.

The Metropolitan Police were not the only force facing brutality complaints either. Nottingham's police were accused of baton charging crowds gathering in the town for the 1885 general election without provocation. The subsequent inquiry ruled against the police, concluding that officers had failed to obey orders to stand firm, and used their truncheons most inappropriately. Liverpool too had its own 'Bloody Sunday' as late as August 1911, when officers attempted to deal with a large strike resulting in two days of rioting, during which two people were killed and many more injured. The Met also continued to generate criticism in the early twentieth century, when in 1907 officers dispersed a crowd of some 800 suffragettes, with further allegations of brutality being made.

It could be argued that the new police, who had no experience of policing demonstrations, needed to learn and develop tactics, and that mistakes were part of the learning process. It must also be remembered that prior to Peel's newcomers, demonstrations had generally taken place without any fear of reprisals unless they got out of hand, when local militia would be called in, or special constables sworn in prior. Now protestors faced censure and the prospect of their meetings being prevented. The police however were only acting in most instances under the Home Secretary's orders to prevent prohibited meetings; particularly 'Bloody Sunday', where the protestors were demonstrating specifically against the banning of public assemblies in Trafalgar Square. It is also plausible that protestors sought to divert attention from their own aggressive behaviour, by shifting focus to 'police ruffians' trying to violently suppress legitimate protest. With appropriate legal warning given however that crowds would be dispersed using whatever force necessary, it cannot be concluded that police were acting illegally.

Clive Emsley has an alternative theory of why accusations of police brutality were common, with the idea of a 'tough copper'. He argues that Victorian officers were expected to patrol with simply a truncheon and rattle through the slums of the industrial towns where the men were tough, so officers had to be tougher. As Emsley puts it, "a policeman's beat could . . . be a dangerous place, and it needed a tough man to walk it.". Assaults on police officers were common throughout the period as David Taylor demonstrates with the shocking statistic that even as late as between 1903-1906, 2500 Metropolitan officers were assaulted, equating to approximately one-in-four constables being attacked each year. In 1860's Middlesbrough, statistically a policeman might expect to get assaulted twice a year; these only being the ones that got recorded, which an officer was unlikely to do if he lost, for fear of perceived weakness. Officers would therefore have felt the need to 'prove themselves', especially in the face of popular culture that often perceived them as dandies. This need could manifest through violence and apparent heavy-handedness, to demonstrate control in a language the criminals understood. It would therefore be hard to conclude that officers were institutionally corrupt, when they were simply products of their society.

What this theory fails to take into account is the actions of officers towards detainees, or individuals who were not the hard men of the slums. The need to stand together to prove strength may have in fact proved misconduct, as the memoirs of constable John Monk suggest. He speaks of a Detective Sergeant who assaulted a prisoner in the cells in front of an inspector and five other constables who did nothing. At a subsequent trial the officer was found not guilty, but the judge remarked that he strongly suspected the officers of perjury to cover the incident up. The idea of the 'tough copper' even extended to the relations between colleagues, with disputes often settled by violence. Between men of equal ranks, this was intended to resolve the dispute, but if the loser complained he could well be ostracised. The rank structure did not necessarily prevent officers from using physical violence either, although it tended to have more dramatic outcomes. When PC's Thomas Taylor and Jewitt Hardy of the Middlesbrough police in the 1860's assaulted their sergeant they were dismissed, as was Oldham's John Bottomley after striking the Chief Constable. These examples are but a few of many, and support the idea of the policeman having to not only prove that he was physically capable of handling himself, but also the view of 'manliness' at the time. Other officers attempted to prove their masculinity through womanising, even though simply associating with women of ill-repute could mean trouble. A popular opinion in satirical publications and songs throughout the period, was one of the 'bobby' who took time out of his patrol to chat with maids. This problem appeared serious enough to warrant its repeated inclusion in the Metropolitan Police's General Orders in 1830, reminding officers that to be caught doing so was to face dismissal. Such 'community engagement' could hardly be considered corrupt by today's standards, but other officers took it further. PC Cook of the West Suffolk Rural Police allowed a prostitute to stay in his room at Mildenhall Po-

lice Station, and even left his keys with her when he went on patrol; and Oldham constable James Brook whose *one-week* career saw him both ‘misbehaving’ with a married lady and “taking indecent liberties with the daughter of Inspector Winterbottom”! One officer from Worcestershire was dismissed in 1880 after being caught having intercourse with a woman twice on duty in broad daylight, in view of nearby children. Interactions with women on a larger scale were also a cause for allegations of corruption, such as when the Met Commissioner ordered a crackdown on prostitution in 1883. Officers on patrol seemingly believed any woman out after dark on her own was ‘up to no good’. This resulted in numerous complaints from women claiming to have been falsely arrested. It also led to claims of widespread corruption by officers blackmailing women, for money or ‘favours’. This clampdown resulted in the wrongful arrest for soliciting on 28<sup>th</sup> June 1887 of Elizabeth Cass. At court PC Bowen Endacott testified that he had seen Cass loitering numerous times previously on Regent Street. Cass though called to her defence her employer, who testified that Cass had only been in London a short time, and had never been out late at night. Cass was acquitted, and her case raised in Parliament. PC Endacott was investigated and fired, before being tried but cleared of perjury. The ‘Cass’ case marked the end of this clampdown, but did not stop another, equally unsuccessful and controversial one being attempted less than twenty years later. The crackdown on prostitution in London also highlighted the potential for Chiefs and watch committees to abuse their authority according to their own values. The Met commissioners had targeted prostitution, as did the Watch Committee of Liverpool in 1890. Others imposed their temperance views on their boroughs, such as the Chief Constable of Birmingham who in 1880 decided to prosecute all drunks, regardless of their being disorderly. The Watch Committee of York encouraged similar firm action against drunks, and any form of associated activity such as street gambling. Superintendent Heaton even launched the ‘Huddersfield Crusade’ in an attempt to improve the morals of the whole town, clamping down on public houses, animal fights, Guy Fawkes celebrations, and even attempted to prosecute (unsuccessfully) three men for watching cricket having been ordered to attend church. Such actions that ran counter to the desired impartiality of the police could be deemed a form of corruption, and one that could only be perpetrated by the higher ranks.

The cited examples could be taken in one of two ways; either indicative of the whole, or as isolated examples of ‘bad apples’. It would be unjust to conclude that the actions of a few represent the actions of the many, as a study today would also find. Similarities can be drawn between the main scandals in the first century of policing, and those of the twenty-first century. It would be wrong for example to criticise the ‘brutality’ of the early police’s public order tactics, when in 2009 a man was killed during a demonstration in London, and several days rioting followed the police shooting of a man in 2011. Officers tipping off organised criminals can be similarly linked to the actions of DC Charles Fletcher of Nottingham, who supplied information to the Gunn family of criminals. The case of Sergeant Popay is very similar to the infiltration of environmental protestors by PC Mark Kennedy and even cases of officers providing information about people in exchange for money has found an echo with officers selling information to the *News of the World* newspaper. Other inquiries into policing such as Macpherson’s have returned verdicts such as the police being “institutionally racist”, or the Hillsborough tragedy highlighting the widespread amending or colluding of statements. With such examples occurring today, it would be easy for a future historian to conclude that officers now are generally corrupt, but our experience shows this is not true. The ‘bad apples’ theory would therefore seem more likely, with the actions of rogue officers making headlines and selling newspapers. It is interesting to note that perhaps the most widespread issues of police malfeasance during the period in question – drunkenness and receiving perks – have undergone a paradigm shift. Drunkenness on duty particularly is unheard of, and it’s unlikely that any licensee would serve a police officer in uniform. The expectation of gratuities and perks is also dwindling. The uncertain early days of the new police seems to have provided enterprising officers more opportunity to devise extra-curricular income streams, before it was codified against. The ease and frequency with which officers were dismissed from forces however would suggest that only those officers of the very highest calibre maintained a career as a ‘Peeler’, and as such it cannot be concluded that corruption, criminality or malfeasance were in any way widespread. Moreover that the early ‘Bobbies’, patrolling on foot without pause, for long shifts in all weathers, in ill-fitting clothes with little in the way of personal protective equipment and facing animosity from a broad sector of society, can be held as an example to their counterparts of today.

**CAN YOU WRITE A STORY ABOUT YOUR SERVICE.  
WHETHER YOU SERVED AS A POLICE OFFICER OR NOT,  
THE JOURNAL EDITOR IS INTERESTED IN ANY ARTICLE ON  
CURRENT OR HISTORICAL MATTERS RELATING TO  
POLICING.**

