

POLICE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT. By V. A. Leonard. Brooklyn: The Foundation Press, Inc., 1951. Pp. xviii, 507. \$5.00.

LEONARD'S book is a thoughtful and stimulating addition to those dealing with the subject of police administration. Throughout this carefully documented work, the author, Chairman of the Department of Police Science and Administration, State College of Washington, has emphasized the need for a professionalized police service. He frankly admits that police administration trails other public services in its standards of efficiency and performance. He states, however, that "an inventory of the comparatively youthful career of this new enterprise reveals creditable evidence of progress toward professionalization even within this short time. But the advance is slow and is opposed by almost insuperable odds." From this thesis, Leonard explores in detail the organizational methods and the operational techniques by which this advance may be furthered.

The book has ten chapters and seven appendices. These emphasize problems of personnel selection; training programs and curricula; development and distribution of an efficient patrol force; sound beat construction and adequate patrol distribution; maintenance and use of adequate records; analysis of statistical records data in predicting needs; and proper use of specialized forces as supporting elements of the patrol force.

Leonard calls upon police administrators to bring to their departments the same efficiencies and economies as are practiced in business; to plan for general and special operations in advance, rather than to improvise; and particularly to make use in their departments of the technological advances and discoveries made in other fields. And since many police operations are essentially military in character, Leonard also advocates the use of military tactics and strategy both in the field and in the collection and evaluation of intelligence for police planning.

The present system of arrest, prosecution, conviction, and punishment, he believes, has failed in its war on crime, which is on the increase. He reasons, therefore, that police officials should look in other directions for more effective measures of control. Police functions should place greater emphasis on the application of the biological and social sciences to the field of crime prevention and control.

The author advocates a change from the old appeals for more manpower to a demand for better manpower. Thoughtful persons in the field, while acknowledging a critical personnel shortage in many police forces, will agree with Leonard's statement that "[c]onscientious police executives know that mere addition of manpower does not enhance the ability and efficiency of the individual officer and that such additions do not increase to any appreciable degree the overall effectiveness of the department as a whole. Mere numbers do not make a strong fighting organization."¹

1. P. 15.

Leonard also discusses the proper degree of police specialization, a problem currently of deep concern to many departments. Leonard warns them against the dangers of specialization at the expense of the patrol force. In his view, all other units, including detective, traffic, and crime prevention, are secondary and collateral to the patrol division and are only extensions of that division. The author's warning is in agreement with the comments of other outstanding experts in the field. Bruce Smith, for example, has asserted, "Since all organization depends in some measure upon the subdivision of tasks, and therefore upon a degree of specialization in executing them, there is a continuing danger that this phase of the process may be over-emphasized."² And O. W. Wilson adds: "[T]he indiscriminate transfer of the most capable personnel from patrol to special units jeopardizes effective patrol service."³ August Vollmer's statement is one of the finest this reviewer has seen:

"Specialization should never, under any circumstances, be permitted by the chief of operations until every other possible method of controlling the need has been completely exhausted. All requests for special duty and for diversion of manpower from the patrol division to other operating units should be denied unless it can be proved that there are aggravating or dangerous circumstances which compel special consideration. These calls for special services, despite their compelling nature, must always be weighed against the loss of the patrolman's time which follows his detachment from the patrol force."⁴

On the heatedly controversial issue of single versus double officer motor patrol, Leonard advocates the single patrol in the interest of economy and efficiency. He states further that the "factor of safety of the individual officer is increased by the availability of a larger number of patrol units. . . . An officer patrolling by himself in a car is actually safer than when accompanied by a brother officer."⁵ Most police administrators will disagree with this statement, at least until more research has been done in the field. Many factors, including the size of the force, the time element, and the crime rate of the area patrolled, enter into the question of the number of men to be assigned to a patrol car. Leonard agrees with Vollmer and some others on the desirability of the complete motorization of the force. The relative merits of foot and motorized patrol have created considerable controversy. Yet most police administrators currently feel that each has a function to perform and, thus, use both men on foot and men in patrol cars.

2. SMITH, *POLICE SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES* 268 (1940).

3. WILSON, *POLICE ADMINISTRATION* 83 (1950).

4. VOLLMER, *SURVEY AND REORGANIZATION OF THE DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT* 100 (1944).

5. Pp. 262-3.

Of particular interest is the police rating system, devised by Leonard to measure the efficiency of a police department. Measuring scales have been the subject of articles and papers in the past, but, in general, have received only partially favorable reaction. Indeed, Bruce Smith has said: "No satisfactory general measure of police activity and efficiency has ever been devised, and it seems at best doubtful whether one ever will be. Police activity is too pervasive and too varied to lend itself to close measurement."⁶ Leonard's scale uses ten fundamental criteria for the measurement of combat strength; these criteria serve as the basis for evaluation of a department at a given time. Each of the ten has separate inventory items so arranged that they may be valued in five degrees: from zero to best practice. Admittedly, the evaluation is a task for the expert. When the scale is properly employed, "it is possible to examine any given item of the inventory in its departmental setting and arrive at a descriptive evaluation concerning the extent to which it measures up to minimum professional standards."⁷ The scale is not presented by the author as a final answer. It does, however, embody those principles which Leonard believes to be the accepted professional standards of modern police service.

Police Organization and Management is a valuable work. It presents to police administrators a high standard for achievement. It should be carefully studied by all persons interested in the general field of law enforcement.

DAVID A. McCANDLESS†

6. SMITH, *POLICE SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES* 43 (1940).

7. P. 360.

†Director, Southern Police Institute, University of Louisville.