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INTRODUCTION
A Police-Centered Story of Juvenile Justice

When most modern Americans think of police officers and juvenile delinquents in past decades, the first image that comes to mind is that of Officer Krupke, the tough street cop in the 1957 Broadway musical and 1961 film, West Side Story. A big, gruff, uniformed officer, Krupke constantly pounded his nightstick in his hand, chased the young gang members at the center of the story away from their street corner hangouts, and threatened repeatedly to “run [them] in” if they didn’t cooperate. On the one hand, Krupke embodies the notion that police officers could and would use intimidation, arrest, and physical discipline to maintain order on their beats in U.S. cities. On the other hand, he was not very effective. The boys he threatened did not take him seriously, and he could not prevent the violence that drove the story. Audiences remember Krupke not because he was a particularly important character, but because of a song about him, “Gee, Officer Krupke,” which satirizes prevailing attitudes about juvenile delinquency. In the song, the boys recount the many times that Krupke has “run them in,” only to be released by soft-hearted judges, psychiatrists, and social workers who forgive the boys’ misbehaviors on the basis on their own pet theories of delinquency. The song reminds us that tough cops like Krupke had to work with an array of other professionals, and were often subordinate to them. Even though the Krupke of the song’s narrative keeps trying to discipline the boys, they always know that they could get away with anything. At the end of the song, the boys declare, “Gee Officer Krupke, Krup you!”

Today this image of Officer Krupke as both intimidating and impotent perhaps arouses mixed reactions. An older generation may feel some nostalgia for an earlier time when police officers could personally correct recalcitrant youth. In contrast, those more interested in due process or in children’s welfare than in immediate solutions may believe that it is just as well that
officers like Krupke are restrained. For the most part, however, today's Americans assume that police have only a limited role in dealing with young offenders. Police officers may run them in, but judges, probation officers, and social workers decide how best to handle them.

This current arrangement—and the assumptions behind it—grew out of the particular circumstances of the United States at the turn of the twentieth century and the success of social reformers during that time. Between the 1880s and the 1910s, child welfare advocates, social settlement workers, and legal professionals sought consciously to lessen the power of the police over young people. This goal was one aspect of more wide-ranging campaigns to protect young people from the dangers of urban-industrial life. These reform campaigns regarded delinquent behavior as a symptom of the social dislocations that urban environments fostered among working-class and immigrant youth. Reformers also maintained that existing criminal justice institutions exacerbated delinquency by treating young offenders as if they were adults. As a solution, many reformers advocated the creation of separate juvenile courts. Juvenile court, they argued, would not only segregate children and youth from adult criminal courts and jails, but would also provide treatment to help eliminate the social and environmental sources of delinquency. Lobbying from these reform movements led the state of Illinois to create the world's first juvenile court in 1899 for Cook County (Chicago) and contributed heavily to the creation of similar institutions in most other U.S. cities in the ensuing twenty years. For the remainder of the twentieth century, juvenile courts separate from and parallel to criminal courts for adults have been the primary mechanisms of justice for juveniles. Moreover, although not everyone agreed with it, the abstract idea that young offenders needed protection and guidance represented at least the starting point for subsequent thinking about delinquency. In the contest to shape institutions and discourse, progressive reformers won.

Most of the scholarship on the history of juvenile justice has focused on the origins of this separate system and the ideas it exemplified, examining the founding and early years of juvenile courts between 1899 and 1925. By concentrating on reform movements and juvenile courts, however, this scholarship has overlooked a key question: how was juvenile behavior regulated on an everyday basis outside of the courts? In other words, how did the real Officer Krupkes deal with delinquency?

To borrow a model from the legal scholars Lawrence Friedman and Robert Percival's study of turn-of-the-century Alameda County, California, we might imagine criminal justice as a wedding cake, in which the cases were divided into informal graduated layers. Applied to juvenile justice, at the top layer we
would find a small portion of cases that result in long-term confinement or the transfer of juvenile offenders into adult criminal courts. In the larger middle layer would be routine delinquency cases, mainly involving theft or disorderly behavior, adjudicated in juvenile courts. At the bottom, largest, layer would be a wide range of complaints about juvenile misbehavior handled by the police or other ground-level treatment agencies. Almost all juvenile cases would enter the system at the bottom layer, but successively fewer would proceed to each of the higher layers.4

If we think of the justice system as a wedding cake, then we realize that much of the real action of regulating delinquency took place on the bottom layer, prior to and outside of the official operations of juvenile court. Examining decisions made as close to the action as possible—by police on the streets and in the station houses—clarifies our understanding of how law enforcement officials sought to manage youthful misbehavior from day to day. Observing the interactions between cops and kids from the bottom up is precisely the goal of this book. And the story that emerges may be surprising. Both before and after the creation of juvenile courts, the police did not function simply as foils to young offenders nor did they function as oppressors, but instead they used their authority in complicated ways to try to correct the behavior of youths. Day-to-day interactions between cops and kids represented a form of discipline, started legal mechanisms in motion, and shaped the ensuing operations of the courts. Furthermore, while juvenile courts had been intended to remove this authority from the police, they did not accomplish this goal. After the turn of the century, the police became less central to juvenile justice at a formal policy level, but in practice they remained key players who often initiated the process of regulating juvenile delinquency.

Examining how police handled young offenders presents problems of both scale and evidence. This story is a national one about what happened on a neighborhood and street level. For that reason, it derives much of its information about ideas of delinquency and juvenile justice from national sources: periodicals, conference proceedings of both child welfare workers and police, and publications from fields such as sociology, social work, and law enforcement. At the same time, it derives much of its information about what happened on a neighborhood and street level from local sources such as police records, annual reports of police departments and correctional agencies, court records, and interviews with young offenders.

Drawn mainly from Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles, these local sources suggest distinct strategies that these cities used to deal with delinquency. All three locations share a great deal in common. Each experienced
remarkable growth in both industry and population, Chicago and Detroit at the turn of the twentieth century and Los Angeles somewhat later, between the 1920s and 1940s. All three cities underwent sharp demographic changes due to the migration first of Europeans, then of African Americans during the era of World War I, then of Latinos and Mexicans between the 1920s and 1940s in Los Angeles. In all three cases, these urban transformations seemed to generate visible increases in crime and, especially, juvenile delinquency. Yet all three cities offer something distinct and important as locations for closer examination. Chicago, as the home of the first and foremost juvenile court, represents the standard model against which all other histories of juvenile justice must be compared. Even there, police played a crucial but rarely noticed role. Detroit might be regarded as a control, a city much like Chicago, yet one that followed a different path in juvenile justice and one that provides insight into a more typical trajectory for a city that was not on the cutting edge of reform. And examining Los Angeles at a slightly later point in time illuminates how juvenile justice evolved in a similar context but in a period when the influence of the progressive juvenile court had been superseded by new models of crime and delinquency, and new demands on the justice system.

Across these locations and over time, the factors that shaped police officers’ actions display remarkable continuity. For much of their history, American police are best understood not as agents of public policy or of the will of their departments but as individual “officers of the neighborhood.” Municipal governments in the United States founded police departments only in the middle of the nineteenth century, and well into the twentieth century officers operated primarily at their own discretion rather than on the basis of department policies, rules, regulations, or training. The duties of policemen involved mainly walking a beat, dealing with a host of minor problems, responding to complaints, and serving as roving general magistrates. Thus, public demands, everyday encounters with citizens, and their own discretion shaped the actions of individual officers. Regardless of whether we look at the 1890s or the 1940s, police decisions when dealing with youthful misbehavior were often based on a general sense of public interests and on the specifics of interactions with kids and complainants. In contrast to the treatment-oriented approach of progressive reformers, the police disciplined youth in a manner consistent with public expectations and their personal perspectives, often jaded by years of walking a beat and dealing with young miscreants.

Likewise, juvenile delinquency also demonstrated fundamental continuities as well. Boys constituted the large majority of young offenders and represented the main source of concern for most observers. Police officers, court officials, and even many social reformers conceptualized juvenile crime and
delinquency primarily as a male problem. Moreover, youthful misbehaviors also changed little over time. Boys’ offenses remained opportunistic, precocious, and for the most part, relatively mild; girls’ offenses continued to involve violations of moral standards or their families’ expectations. To be sure, rates of arrest, the offenses for which young people would be arrested, and the demographics of these youths would all change over time. Rather than indicating clearly that juvenile crime increased or worsened in degree, however, these measures evidence the ways in which the both urban environments and the legal mechanisms for dealing with young offenders were transformed.

How police dealt with young offenders—and how juvenile justice operated more generally—would change in subtle but significant ways between 1890 and 1940. Not surprisingly, the creation and evolution of juvenile courts contributed heavily to those changes. In fact, the history of juvenile courts provides the framework for organizing the story of cops and kids. This story divides loosely into three parts. It begins by examining how police disciplined young offenders before the creation of juvenile courts, until roughly 1900. Then, it considers how the policing of delinquency evolved during the height of juvenile courts’ influence, between the 1900s and the 1920s. Finally, it analyzes how policing young offenders changed between the 1920s and the early 1940s as enthusiasm for juvenile courts plateaued but new ideals of preventing crime and new demands for tougher policing reshaped the justice system.

In addition to juvenile courts, two other factors also drove changes in how police dealt with youth. First, a gradual, painful process of professionalization transformed American police beginning as early as the 1890s, blossoming in the 1910s, and lasting through at least World War II. These changes themselves were rooted in even broader changes in urban life and municipal government. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, at the peak of the industrial revolution and the gradual transfer of industry from rural to urban settings, U.S. cities experienced massive growth. Many cities doubled in size from decade to decade, and this population explosion brought both sharp social dislocation and the potential for increased crime. By the turn of the twentieth century, municipal leaders increasingly found the old generalist model of policing inadequate to maintain order, and pressured police to organize themselves better to meet the new situation. In fits and starts, different cities’ departments adopted organizational models from business and from social welfare agencies so that, by the 1930s, the most advanced among them had become more capable of effective policing.7

Second, the newly expanded population of U.S. cities was also very different than before. Between the 1880s and the 1900s, a flood of immigrants
from southern and eastern Europe fueled American urban growth. Police—composed at the time mainly of men of northern European ancestry—monitored a population increasingly distinct from themselves in ethnicity. By the 1920s, World War I and federal immigration restrictions slowed this flow of foreign arrivals to a trickle, but African Americans moving from the South to the North took their place. In addition, western cities like Los Angeles experienced a profound influx of Mexican migrants in this same period. In short, social changes brought on by urbanization and migration to the cities—both foreign and internal—forced police to deal with a rapidly changing population. Disparities of ethnicity and race emerged sharply in the policing of youth. Newcomers had long been the primary subjects of law enforcement, but this was especially the case in the early twentieth century.8

The emergence of official juvenile courts, the professionalization of the police, and the transformation of urban populations all contributed to shifts in handling young offenders. Juvenile courts have been central to our understandings of the history of juvenile justice, but, in many ways, the decisions of the police—the policies of departments and the discretionary choices of individual officers—made the system run. The police determined in large part how to intervene with children and youth, whether to make arrests, where to detain kids, whether to refer kids to courts, and what sorts of experiences young people had in the legal system. Their treatment of young offenders shaped the options available to other institutions. Further, their decisions were governed not so much by policy but by their sense of popular demands and by daily encounters with the public. By focusing on the police, we can also see how the treatment of young offenders evolved over a fifty-year period of sharp change in American urban life.

More generally, the story of cops and kids also opens a window into how thinking about youth and youthful misbehavior changed over time. The experiences of American youth were transformed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as more and more young people spent more time in school and made transitions to work later and later. New intellectual formulations for understanding the teenage years as a vulnerable passage from childhood to adulthood also emerged at the turn of the twentieth century.9 Examining how police dealt with young offenders allows us to see these evolving models of youth in a new light by illuminating the everyday way of dealing with adolescents who were not making the transition to adulthood in a socially approved fashion. The working concept of juvenile offenders maintained by the police (and apparently, by a segment of the general public) developed rapidly over this period. In the 1890s, before the rise of juvenile courts, police thought of them mainly as public nuisances or habitual truants.
In the 1900s and 1910s, at the height of juvenile court influence, police partly accepted the reform movements’ formulations and regarded them as victims of social dislocation amenable to guidance. But from the mid-1920s onward, this perspective was tempered by a simultaneous view that juvenile offenders were likely to become young criminals. By the late 1930s, the concerns of law enforcement increasingly shaped the operations of juvenile justice. On the eve of World War II, the police were clearly winning the ongoing contest to shape institutions and discourse surrounding juvenile delinquency.

And as police dealt with increasingly diverse urban youth populations, efficiently implementing this crime control perspective fostered conflicts with the communities policed. The transformation of juvenile justice by the late 1930s illuminates the historical precedents for abiding tensions between America’s police and minorities that have characterized the latter half of the twentieth century. These tensions are rooted in part in competing ideas of delinquency that emerged in the latter half of the nineteenth century.
Conclusion

The 1940s represent a turning point in the histories of both juvenile justice and juvenile delinquency. On the one hand, during the 1940s, the rehabilitative ideals that had driven the juvenile court movement continued to lose support. As juvenile crime seemed to increase during World War II, the general public increasingly regarded the treatment-oriented goals of juvenile court as inconsistent with the practical demands of maintaining public order. In addition, the legal profession began to criticize juvenile courts’ loose procedures and rehabilitative goals as denying young people their due process rights. Juvenile courts also encountered practical impediments. After 1933, Chicago’s pioneering juvenile court fell under the influence of that city’s Democratic political machine and became a vehicle for the patronage appointments that its founders had dreaded. As historian Mara Dodge has shown, by the 1940s, leading child welfare advocates such as Juvenile Protective Association President Jesse Binford feared that the Chicago court had “become more like a Criminal than a Parental court.”

Any remaining enthusiasm for innovative juvenile justice reform seemed to have migrated west from Chicago to California, where the state established the California Youth Authority (CYA) in 1941. Created in response to both the negative stimulus of two inmate suicides at Whittier and the positive stimulus of widely publicized reform proposals advanced by the American Law Institute, the CYA acted as a coordinating agency for all juvenile courts and correctional facilities in the state. Previously, county-level courts had operated on their own, but the CYA placed them under state supervision. The CYA became a centralized agency to diagnose the state’s young offenders, design plans of treatment, and coordinate sentences and parole. It also assumed control of the state’s reform schools. In effect, the CYA acted as a super juvenile court, but it also transferred the center of authority from the county to the state level. While most states did not go as far as to establish equivalent agencies, the CYA nonetheless represented the new cutting edge in juvenile justice.

On the other hand, the 1940s also saw increased public fears about juvenile delinquency. World War II was believed to have generated a sharp
increase in juvenile crime. Although scholars have questioned whether delinquency did in fact increase during the war, there is no doubt that the public and the press perceived it to be on the rise. Encouraged by sociologists and social workers concerned that wartime conditions would foster youthful misbehavior, in 1942 and 1943 newspapers, magazines, and newsreels were filled with reports of juvenile delinquency, bringing what historian James Gilbert has characterized as a “rather marginal issue to the center of public attention.” Boys, with access to income from wartime jobs but reportedly lacking the paternal guidance of male role models away at war, were expected to engage in property crimes and violence. Girls, supposedly enamored of men in uniform, were feared to be at increased risk for sexual delinquency. Much of the blame fell upon a perceived breakdown of the family. In a series of speeches and articles, for example, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover attributed a sharp wartime increase in juvenile offenses to “adult delinquency”—the moral laxity of parents—and, in particular, mothers working outside of the home.

Beginning in the early 1940s and continuing into the postwar years, urban gangs did in fact undergo qualitative changes. As Eric C. Schneider has demonstrated in his study of New York City, ongoing urban transformations—continued migration to the city, reduced job opportunities for young men with limited education, and pressures on neighborhood housing and facilities created by urban redevelopment—all encouraged working-class youth to band together as gangs. Furthermore, experience in the armed forces during the war allowed some older youth to return to their cities better trained and better armed. Thus, gang violence and homicide increased in the mid-1940s.

This wartime increase and change in juvenile crime—both perceived and real—fostered increased conflict between police and youths in U.S. cities. In Los Angeles, the LAPD renewed its policy of conducting mass arrests and interrogations of suspicious youths, reserving its particular antipathy for Latinos. On the one hand, Los Angeles officials issued a number of policy papers in the early 1940s blaming Latino youths for a perceived crime wave, and the LAPD fed stories of Latino depredations to the local press. On the other hand, in 1942 and 1943, the nationally publicized Sleepy Lagoon murder case—in which the LAPD arrested hundreds of Latino youths for the death of one teenager, placed twenty-two on trial, and convicted seventeen on various charges—revealed the indiscriminate tactics that the LAPD routinely used to control juvenile crime. And the “Zoot Suit Riots” further highlighted the divide between police and urban youth. For eight nights in June 1943, white soldiers, sailors, and civilians stationed around Los Angeles attacked Latino youths while the LAPD did little to stop the upheaval other
than arresting over six hundred Mexican American boys and young men, the
victims of the riots. A race riot in Detroit just a few weeks later followed a
similar pattern. White youths and workers attacked African Americans, and
again the police intervened by arresting a disproportionate share of black
youth.7

In reality, these wartime conflicts had less to do with juvenile delinquen-
cy than with changes in American society. At the time, many people believed
that these conflicts illustrated the growing hazard of unrestrained youth.
During World War II, delinquency seemed to be out of control. In retrospect,
however, these conflicts suggest something different. The wartime fears of
delinquency, the public response, and the urban riots all highlight a newly
combative relationship between urban communities and the agencies desig-
nated to police them. Young African Americans and Latinos, finding their
own ways to adapt to urban industrial life, frequently found themselves at
odds with established law enforcement authorities. This clash between local
populations and the police seems to be one of the dominant themes of urban
history in the second half of the twentieth century, highlighted so much by
race riots and accusations of police brutality and racial profiling. Yet the his-
tory of police and juvenile offenders suggests that all the pieces were set into
place for this discord much earlier.

The emergence of professional policing and modern juvenile justice in the
late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries laid the foundations for ongo-
ing relations between kids, cops, and courts. Already at the turn of the twen-
tieth century, reform-minded advocates of juvenile courts and law
enforcement–minded police leaders maintained different concepts of delin-
quency. Reformers tended to regard delinquency as a symptom of the
degrading effects of social change and urban industrial life, whereas police
tended to regard delinquency as a more natural behavior. To cops, the key
question was not the source of delinquency but how to minimize it. In
Detroit, juveniles arrested at the turn of the century could fit either view.
Young offenders paralleled the demographic profile of Detroit’s adolescent
population as a whole, and they were arrested mainly for opportunistic theft
and for status offenses such as truancy, often as a result of complaints from
victims or from the public. From the perspective of child welfare reformers,
these misbehaviors might be signs of deeper problems, but from the per-
spective of policemen and law enforcement officials, they were more likely
to have been regarded as kids’ stuff; and at the turn of the century, Detroit
police and courts largely treated delinquency as if it were kids’ stuff. They
rounded up and arrested young offenders but also found ways to protect
them from the worst consequences of their own behavior, diverting them
from the harsh penalties that they could face in courts, jails, and prisons intended for adults.

Following the turn-of-the-century establishment of juvenile courts, the new system of juvenile justice began to cast a wider and stronger net over young offenders. More children and youth were arrested than before the creation of juvenile courts, more faced official adjudication, and more spent increased time under official supervision or in correctional facilities. From the perspective of reformers and juvenile court advocates, this was precisely the purpose of the new institutions. They intended to bring more young offenders under supervision so that officials could help address the fundamental social and familial sources of their delinquency. Reformers also intended for juvenile courts to replace the discretionary authority of the police with the more expert decision making of judges, social workers, and psychologists. But police continued to exercise power within the new system, and, in particular, changes in policing also encouraged an expansion of juvenile justice. As police departments such as Detroit’s sought to professionalize in the 1910s, they embraced new models of business-like efficiency and social welfare-minded friendliness to children. Both strategies brought them increasingly into contact with youths and encouraged them to bring more into the juvenile justice system.

The results of expanded juvenile justice could be problematic, however. As the Great Migration beginning in the 1910s relocated more and more African Americans to northern cities such as Detroit and Chicago, the expanded population of minority youths became disproportionately subject to arrest as well. And in cities like Chicago, where juvenile courts had limited resources and the police department did not undergo a process of professional reform, police officers assigned to deal with youth and even beat officers retained extraordinary discretionary power. In deciding on the streets and in the station houses whether to arrest a young offender or to discipline him informally, whether to petition him to juvenile court or to release him with a warning, the individual values of the police officer often superseded the institutional values of the juvenile court.

Police assumed more visible positions in the operations of juvenile justice in the 1920s and 1930s. As juvenile court innovations gradually lost public enthusiasm and intellectual support, outside crime prevention programs—especially those operated by police departments—became centers of innovation. These police programs often adopted the rhetoric of modern social science but continued to embrace older naturalistic thinking about delinquency. Popular concerns about crime—fueled first by Prohibition Era gangsters and then by Depression Era bandits—granted police programs added urgency as they argued that today’s delinquent would become tomorrow’s
criminal. By the 1930s, police began to define a new model for regulating juvenile delinquency, exemplified by the Los Angeles Police Department. The LAPD established some of the most extensive “crime prevention” programs designed to intervene early with potential delinquents both because such programs added to their aura of professionalism and because they facilitated the LAPD’s larger goal of getting tough on crime. Allowing the crime prevention division to handle minor offenders permitted police to concentrate more narrowly on fighting serious juvenile crime by arresting a greater share of young felons and by focusing its attention on policing minority communities.

By 1940, juvenile delinquency had not changed much from the turn of the century. Kids from immigrant backgrounds not too dissimilar from urban kids as a whole still committed opportunistic offenses. Complaints from the public still helped determine what offenses constituted delinquency and warranted police intervention. The world around these kids had changed, however. Because they were available, young offenders in 1940 stole cars more often than candy (or at least they were arrested for stealing cars more often). Police, in turn, took thefts of expensive property in public seriously, and targeted auto thieves for intervention and arrest. Urban growth and population in-migration, particularly by African Americans and Latinos, had also changed the social environment in which cops and kids coexisted. In Los Angeles, these changes fostered a Latino youth subculture both more violent than most other juveniles and more clearly targeted by the police. And finally, police get-tough policies had contributed to a toughening up of juvenile courts. The LAPD’s arrest practices subtly altered the intake and operations of Los Angeles County Juvenile Court by requiring it to handle an increasing concentration of serious offenses. By 1940, juvenile courts still maintained a rehabilitative ethos, but dealt with an increasingly criminal clientele and dealt with them via increased use of institutional placement and supervision.

In essence, the means by which the police sought to regulate juvenile delinquency shifted from child protection to crime fighting. From the perspective of most histories of juvenile justice, this finding is counterintuitive. The juvenile court and subsequent community-based innovations in delinquency prevention had been expected to reduce the role of the police and to ameliorate police treatment of youth. Instead, the new institutions widened and strengthened the net of juvenile justice by encouraging the police to adopt a more interventionist and authoritative model of regulating delinquency. Furthermore, the police were able, at least in part, to reshape the juvenile justice system to reflect their priorities. In practice, the everyday control of juvenile delinquency revolved around the police.

This study suggests that the policing of juvenile delinquency in U.S.
cities—and the public regulation of behavior more generally—can best be understood by examining actions as close to the source as possible. Looking at decisions made on the streets and in police stations, rather than in the more removed setting of juvenile court, helps to develop a clearer picture of how juvenile behavior was typically managed on an everyday level. More broadly, focusing on cops and kids also provides a historical window for seeing how social change affected the regulation of behavior in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Larger dynamics including social welfare reform, police professionalization, the explosive growth of U.S. cities, and a partial rethinking of the nature of youth all combined to transform the means used to maintain order in urban environments. And finally, a police-centered approach to juvenile justice helps reveal some of the precedents for conflicts between law enforcers and communities policed that have characterized much of the subsequent decades. The roots of today’s problems can be found in the interactions between cops and kids between the Progressive Era and the New Deal.
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